Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks

# Deer Program Report

**Prepared by Wildlife Technical Staff** 

# **Quality Food Plots** YOUR GUIDE TO BETTER DEER AND BETTER DEER HUNTING

### The Quality Deer Management Association Is Proud to Introduce Quality Food Plots!



- The MOST comprehensive book on food plots EVER PRODUCED!
- 324 pages
- Full color
- 14 chapters written by more than a dozen of the nation's **Top Experts**
- 38 species profiles
- Hundreds of photos
- The ultimate reference to soils, weed control, nutrition, seed mixtures, equipment, hunting tactics, and more.

"Quality Food Plots is well-written, beautifully illustrated, and informative. Anyone who is interested in growing food plots for deer needs a copy." - Don Ball, Extension Agronomist/Professor, Auburn University

To order call (800) 209-3337 or visit www.QDMA.com

# Receive the latest knowledge 6 times a year with QUALITY WHITETAILS!

At the nonprofit Quality Deer Management Association (QDMA), our mission is helping hunters and landowners become better deer managers. By joining QDMA, you will receive our bimonthly journal, Quality Whitetails, which is the most comprehensive source of practical, reliable information on food plots, habitat, nutrition, whitetail management and more. QDMA members also receive: Access to deer management seminars and short courses . Opportunities to



participate in QDMA Branch events • New members will also receive an exclusive gift from QDMA including a QDMA vehicle decal and membership card.

#### \*\*Join QD/NA Today\*\*

\$30 1-YEAR ADULT \$80 3-YEAR ADULT \$250 ANNUAL SPONSOR MEMBER \$20 1-YEAR JUNIOR (15 & UNDER) \$25 1-YEAR STUDENT

IF YOU CHOOSE TO BECOME . SPONSOR MEMBER, YOU WILL RECEIVE ALL THE STANDARD MEMBERSHIP BENEFITS PLUS THESE EXCLUSIVE SPONSOR GIFTS:

- ◆ Decal
  ◆ Embroidered cap
  ◆ Pewter lapel pin
  ◆ Camo QDMA Gun Sling

Visit www.QDMA.com or call (800) 209-3337 for more information or to join.

# WHY BUY LIABILITY INSURANCE THAT'S NOT DESIGNED FOR HUNTING?



# ARE ` YOU COVERED?

- \$1 million in coverage per occurrence, \$2 million aggregate
- \$100,000 fire legal liability
- Member-to-member coverage
- Guest coverage
- No hidden exclusions for claims involving firearms, treestands, ATVs, limited watercraft, and more.
- No deductible

Policy Includes a complimentary QDMA membership, subscription to Quality Whitetails and more!

Whether you are a landowner or member of a hunting club, hunting club liability insurance is essential. For the complete protection of you, your family and your hunting partners, not just any insurance will do. That's why Mossy Oak and the Quality Deer Management Association have joined forces to offer the most comprehensive and affordable insurance program available. For as little as 14 cents an acre, you can receive \$1 million in coverage with no deductible. Unlike some other policies, there are no hidden exclusions for claims involving firearms, treestands, ATVs, fire and more.

# HUNTING CLUB LIABILITY INSURANCE • (800) 209-3337 • WWW.QDMA.COM



# MISSISSIPPI DEER PROGRAM REPORT 2006



MISSISSIPPI DEPARTMENT OF WILDLIFE, FISHERIES AND PARKS 1505 Eastover Drive | Jackson, MS 39211

i

#### GOVERNOR OF MISSISSIPPI HALEY BARBOUR



2006

LIEUTENANT GOVERNOR Amy Tuck

#### SENATE Wildlife, Fisheries, & Parks Committee

House of Representatives Wildlife, Fisheries, & Parks Committee

LYNN Posey Chairman, Union Church

**BOB M. DEARING** Vice-Chairman, Natchez SIDNEY ALBRITTON Picayune SCOTTIE R. CUEVAS

Pass Christian

MERLE FLOWERS

Southaven

Tommy A. Gollott Biloxi CINDY HYDE-SMITH Brookhaven

SAMPSON JACKSON II Preston **Ezell Lee** Picayune

Walter Michel Jackson

ERIC ROBINSON Chairman, Quitman JOEY HUDSON Vice-Chairman, Monticello

> TRACY ARINDER Morton LARRY BAKER Senatobia

LEONARD BENTZ Biloxi C. Scott Bounds

Philadelphia Bryant W. Clark Pickens

Angela Cockerham Magnolia HERB FRIERSON Poplarville

WARNER F. MCBRIDE Courtland AMERICA (CHUCK)

MIDDLETON Port Gibson BILLY NICHOLSON Little Rock

DERYK R. PARKER Lucedale

Randall Patterson Biloxi

ROBERT E. VINCE Sandy Hook



#### COMMISSION ON WILDLIFE, FISHERIES, AND PARKS

**BILLY DEVINEY** Chairman, Jackson JOHN STANLEY Vice Chairman, Corinth WEBB LEE Biloxi BRYAN JONES Yazoo City JAMES HUFF Taylorsville

#### ADMINISTRATION

SAM POLLES, PH.D. Executive Director AL TUCK Deputy Administrator ROBERT L. COOK Executive Officer

**Don Brazil** Director of Law Enforcement, Wildlife, and Fisheries

2005-2006 Mississippi Deer Program Report

# **Table of Contents**

12 and

6:

0

Governor and Legislative Committees	ii
Commission on Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks	ii
Table of Contents	iii
Acknowledgments	iv
Introduction	1
Wildlife Technical Staff Directory	2
Wildlife Management Areas	3
Wildlife Management Area Information	
Wildlife Management Area Directory	
Wildlife Management Area Narratives	
Regional Narratives	
Road Kill Survey Data	20
Depredation	21
Chronic Wasting Disease	
Epizootic Hemorrhagic Disease	
Mail Survey Data	
Deer Tags	
Antler Regulations	29
Deer Management Assistance Program	
Statewide DMAP Data	
Mississippi Soil Resource Area Map	
Batture Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	37
Delta Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	
Upper Thick Loess Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	
Lower Thick Loess Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	40
Upper Thin Loess Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	
Lower Thin Loess Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	42
Black Prairie Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	43
Upper Coastal Plain Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	44
Lower Coastal Plain Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	45
Coastal Flatwoods Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	46
Interior Flatwoods Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data	47
Enforcement of Deer-related Citations	48
Citations Summary by County by District	49
Hunting Incident/Accident Summary	
Magnolia Records Program	52
Pope and Young Record Non-typical Deer.	53
Pope and Young Record Typical Deer	53
Boone and Crockett Record Non-typical Deer	54
Boone and Crockett Record Typical Deer	55
Status	
Recommendations	56

# Acknowledgements

Numerous people are responsible for the information presented in this report. The vision and work of Mississippi Game and Fish Commission patriarchs like Fannye Cook and Bill Turcotte initiated plans in the 1930's that ultimately provided Mississippi Sportsmen with the deer population we enjoy today.

Leaf River Refuge Manager Quinton Breland, Upper Sardis Refuge Manager Garald Mize, and other dedicated Commission employees protected, trapped, and relocated hundreds of deer throughout the state during the days of Mississippi's deer restoration. In addition, game wardens of the deer restoration era protected a growing deer population through the early period of wildlife conservation. During this time in the history of Mississippi's Wildlife Management Agency, game wardens provided their own gun and vehicle. Mobile communication with other officers was little more than a futuristic dream. Wildlife enforcement, or the game warden that interfered with the "jacklighting" of deer and illegal harvest of game, was not a welcome sight to some hunters at that time. Refuge managers and game wardens of the restoration era are pioneers of the deer population restoration success of today.

Today the conservation officer is considered differently. Most men and women who enjoy the bountiful wildlife that exist today regard the conservation officer as a partner in wildlife conservation. As those who are responsible for the deer populations we treasure are remembered, the conservation officers of today should not be forgotten.

The Mississippi Legislature is also to be thanked for their historic and sustained funding of this agency. Since the establishment of the Game and Fish Commission in the days of the Great Depression, the Mississippi Legislature has funded efforts necessary for the wildlife conservation success story of the white-tailed deer.

Mississippi landowners have made deer in the Magnolia State a reality. Without landowner desire to have deer, most agency efforts would have proved ineffective. Those of us who hunt, study, or admire the white-tailed deer truly thank you.

This report would not have been possible without the efforts and cooperation of the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks (MDWFP) wildlife bureau technical staff and district field personnel. An extra-special appreciation is extended to Dene Smith for assistance with many aspects of producing and mailing this report.

Special thanks and recognition goes out to Bill Lunceford. Bill had the vision and foresight to put the first DMAP Annual Report together in 1988. In 1993 the report changed to the Mississippi Deer Data book. Without Bill's vision of the DMAP program and the Deer Data Book, today's report would not have been possible.

Mississippi's deer hunters deserve special recognition. Your data collection efforts, concern, and support for white-tailed deer are vital to the success of the White-tailed Deer Program.

Photographs used in this year's Deer Data Book were from MDWFP employees, DMAP club members, and istockphoto.com.

Look for this information soon on www.mdwfp.com/deer. If you have any questions, feel free to contact us.

William > m=King

William T. McKinley Deer Program Leader

Chad Dacus Deer Program Coordinator

Chris McDonald Southwest Biologist







This report is produced by the Technical Guidance Project, Statewide Wildlife Development Project and Statewide Wildlife Investigations Project and is primarily funded by Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration.

# White-tailed Deer Program Report 2005-2006

The first Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP) report was completed in 1982. The DMAP report evolved into the Mississippi Deer Program Report in 1992. Since its inception, the purpose of this report was to consolidate all deer-related information obtained by the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks (MDWFP) personnel. Compilation of these data provides managers the opportunity to analyze trends in deer harvest and physiological condition. In the future, managers will have a chronicled reference to more effectively critique effects of changes in season framework, hunter success, and climatic conditions on the deer population.

Decision makers such as the Mississippi Legislature and the Mississippi Commission on Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks have served the sportsmen of the state well. Deer harvest and management opportunities exist today that were considered far-fetched twenty years ago.

Deer hunting regulations are subject to change each year. The most notable change is the creation of two deer management zones (See page 29).

Annual mail surveys are used to monitor trends in hunter harvest and effort. This report includes mail survey data from the 2004 – 2005 hunting season. Currently, Mississippi State University conducts these mail surveys. Recognizing that biases exist in mail survey data, and assuming all biases remain constant, the estimates obtained from the survey provide adequate indices for monitoring harvest and effort trends.

The MDWFP began using a new computer summary program (XtraNet) in 2004 – 2005. This is the first report compiled using XtraNet. Data from

2001 – 2006 was analyzed using XtraNet, while data prior to 2001 was analyzed using DeerTrax, the old computer summary program. This may be the cause for drastic differences in some numbers. Once all of the historic data is entered into the XtraNet system, the numbers are expected to fall along the same trend and eliminate the drastic drop in the graphs and tables. Additionally, all DMAP summary tables and graphs now include harvest reports from WMAs that collect deer harvest data.

Sample methods were unchanged for the following data sets:

- Hunter effort and harvest information collected on state-operated WMAs
- Employee observations of deer mortality due to motor vehicle collisions
- · Enforcement Division monitoring of deer hunting-related citations
- Deer research projects conducted in cooperation with Mississippi State University Forest and Wildlife Research Center

MDWFP wildlife biologists continued to inform and educate sportsmen relative to deer management needs and issues. Our goals are to provide insight into current deer management needs while providing the leadership to identify and guide future issues. All known media sources were utilized in this process. In addition, public presentations were made to hunting, civic, and conservation groups throughout the state. This report captures a portion of the informational and educational efforts.



Regional Biologist Scott Edwards assists a youth hunter sight in his rifle at The Palmer Home Youth Hunt.

# Wildlife Technical Staff Directory

Administrative and Office Staff



netzero.net

WILDLIFE

# Wildlife Management Areas 2005-2006

Asummary of Wildlife Management Area (WMA) deer harvest and hunter activity is presented in Figure 1. The majority of data was collected from self-service permit stations. Mandatory check-in and harvest reporting is required from all hunters on all WMAs.

Throughout the year, conservation officers monitor compliance of hunters checking-in on WMAs. Differences in compliance rates among WMAs are seen each year. These differences are mainly due to the degree of hunter acceptance of the check-in system. Some conservation officers assigned to WMAs have informed hunters of the importance of accurate check-in more than officers on other areas. Also, some officers have enforced the mandatory check-in regulation more diligently. The size of a WMA and control of hunter access also affects compliance rates.

Some WMAs provide very restrictive hunting opportunities due to area size, habitat type, and management objectives. The location and soil region in which a WMA lays impacts deer productivity. Because of these factors, as well as other unique differences between areas, caution should be exercised in comparing data between WMAs (Table 1 on page 5).

Hunter man-days for the 2005 – 2006 season declined by almost 15,000. The previous four seasons show a decline in hunter effort from average as depicted in Figure 1. Reasons for this decrease vary. Hurricane Katrina certainly decreased hunter activity, as did the increase in fuel prices that followed the hurricane. Hunter opportunity has generally remained stable or increased on most WMAs; therefore, opportunity is not likely a causative factor of this decrease. Conservation officers report an apparent statewide decline in hunter numbers as well as hunter time spent in the field. This perceived trend seems to be applicable on private and public hunting acreage.

However, while hunter effort decreased, the total harvest actually increased (see Figure 1). The 2005 – 2006 season was the second and third season that many WMAs had a minimum inside spread restriction for legal bucks. WMAs with spread restrictions are noted on Table 1 by an \*.

The harvest should continue to increase for a few years before leveling off. However, an increase in harvest can only be expected if hunter effort remains constant or increases.

Average success rate also increased across WMAs. Therefore, the increased harvest may in addition be partially attributed to increased deer populations on the WMA system. Other behavioral changes within the deer herd are also likely culprits in the increased harvest.

Figure 2 illustrates the location of WMAs in the state. For a list of WMAs in the state see the Wildlife Management Area Information table on page 4.



WMA DATA

Figure 2

20.8

16 2

NONLEES

LEAK

# Wildlife Management Area Information 2005-2006

3

Wildlife Management Area	Acreage	Nearest Town	Contact Person	Phone Number
1. Bienville		Morton	Clayton Lott	601-469-5993
2. Black Prairie	5,673	Brooksville	Charles Sanders	
3. Calhoun County		Calhoun City	Donnie Cain	
4. Canal Section		-		
5. Caney Creek	,			
6. Caston Creek				
7. Chickasaw	,			
8. Chickasawhay			-	
9. Choctaw	,			
10. Copiah County			-	
11. Divide Section				
12. Graham Lake Waterfowl				
13. Hamer				
14. Hell Creek				
15. John Bell Williams				
16. John W Starr				
17. Lake George				
18. Leaf River				
19. Leroy Percy				
<ol> <li>20. Little Biloxi</li> <li>21. Mahannah</li> </ol>		-	-	
22. Malmaison				
23. Marion County				
24. Mason Creek				
25. Muscadine Farms				
26. Nanih Waiya				
27. Okatibbee			-	
28. O'Keefe				
29. Old River				
30. Pascagoula River				
			Michael Everett	
31. Pearl River				
32. Red Creek				
33. Sandy Creek				
34. Sardis Waterfowl	,			
35. Shipland		•		
36. Stoneville				
37. Sunflower	,	Ū	2	
38. Tallahala				
39 Trim Cane				
40. Tuscumbia				
41. Twin Oaks	5,675	Rolling Fork	Jackie Fleeman	662-873-2495
42. Upper Sardis	42,274	Oxford	Bobby Young	662-234-6125
43. Ward Bayou		Moss Point	Lynn McCoy	
44. Wolf River				
45. Yockanookany		•	-	

# Table 1. Wildlife Management Area Harvest Informationfor the 2005-2006 Season

0

Wildlife		Total		Buok		Dee		Tatal	Mondovo/	Mondovo/
Management Area	Acreage	Total Harvest	Acres/Deer	Buck Harvest	Acres/Buck	Doe Harvest	Acres/Doe	Total Mandays	Mandays/ Deer	Mandays/ Acre
Bienville*	25,300	87	291	51	496	33	767	1,806	21	0.07
Black Prairie	5,825	54	108	13	448	41	142	377	7	0.06
Calhoun County*	9,888	57	173	36	275	21	471	1,406	25	0.14
Canal/John Bell	32,500	67	485	42	774	25	1,300	3,140	47	0.10
Caney Creek*	30,900	79	391	43	719	32	966	2,371	30	0.08
Caston Creek*	27,785	65	427	36	772	25	1,111	2,693	41	0.10
Chickasaw*	28,319	151	188	87	326	64	442	5,732	38	0.20
Chickasawhay*	35,000	102	343	38	921	28	1,250	3,474	34	0.10
Choctaw*	24,314	107	227	71	342	36	675	2,926	27	0.12
Copiah County*	6,583	80	82	35	188	45	146	1,102	14	0.17
Divide Section*	15,336	55	279	10	1,534	45	341	2,389	43	0.16
Hamer*	3,909	98	40	53	74	45	87	1,388	14	0.36
Hell Creek	2,500	16	156	6	417	10	250	180	11	0.07
John Starr*	8,244	88	94	34	242	54	153	1,273	14	0.15
Lake George*	8,383	14	599	7	1,198	7	1,198	286	20	0.03
Leaf River*	41,411	41	1,010	20	2,071	21	1,972	6,881	168	0.17
Leroy Percy*	2,200	12	183	5	440	7	314	472	39	0.21
Little Biloxi*	14,980	6	2,497	6	2,497	0		662	110	0.04
Lower Pascagoula*	18,735	11	1,703	5	3,747	6	3,123	1,559	142	0.08
Mahannah*	12,675	126	101	75	169	51	249	1,766	14	0.14
Malmaison*	10,016	89	113	30	334	74	135	2,394	27	0.24
Marion County*	7,200	49	147	12	600	37	195	1,388	28	0.19
Mason Creek*	27,346	19	1,439	16	1,709	3	9,115	1,744	92	0.06
Nanih Waiya	7,655	52	147	14	547	38	201	854	16	0.11
Okatibbee	6,883	14	492	1	6,883	13	529	451	32	0.07
0'Keefe*	6,100	60	102	42	145	22	277	1,615	27	0.26
Old River*	15,042	5	3,008	3	5,014	2	7,521	410	82	0.03
Pearl River	6,000	13	462	7	857	0		715	55	0.12
Red Creek*	83,345	9	9,261	5	16,669	4	20,836	3,933	437	0.05
Sandy Creek*	16,407	37	443	24	684	13	1,262	2,012	54	0.12
Shipland*	3,642	20	182	7	520	13	280	628	31	0.17
Stoneville*	2,000	13	154	8	250	5	400	721	55	0.36
Sunflower*	60,115	146	412	85	707	61	985	5,123	35	0.09
Tallahala*	28,000	57	491	27	1,037	30	933	2,227	39	0.08
Tuscumbia	2,600	0		0		0		61		0.02
Twin Oaks*	5,675	57	100	23	247	34	167	1,206	21	0.21
Upper Pascagoula*	20,482	0		0		0		341		0.02
Upper Sardis*	42,000	212	198	109	385	103	408	6,726	32	0.16
Ward Bayou*	13,234	3	4,411	2	6,617	1	13,234	1,000	333	0.08
Wolf River*	10,301	52	198	24	429	28	368	2,400	46	0.23
Yockanookany*	2,483	12	207	7	355	5	497	189	16	0.08
TOTAL	731,313	2235		1,119		1,082		78,021		
AVERAGE	17,412	55	759	27	1,495	26	1,751	1,903	56	0.13

 $^{\ast}$  WMA with minimum inside spread criteria for legal bucks.

2005-2006 Mississippi Deer Program Report

#### Wildlife Management Area Directory :00



DOUG EPPS WILDLIFE SUPERVISOR



TIM BRINKLEY WILDLIFE SUPERVISOR



WMA DIRECT

JOHN TAYLOR CONSERVATION OFFICER Сностаж



JIMMY SARTIN CONSERVATION OFFICER CANAL SECTION/JOHN BELL WILLIAMS



CHARLES SANDERS WILDLIFE MANAGER BLACK PRARIE



STEVE COLEMAN CONSERVATION OFFICER Hell Creek



CLARK ADAMS **CONSERVATION OFFICER** DIVIDE SECTION



CHRIS DAVENPORT WILDLIFE MANAGER BLACK PRARIE



Jack Griffin WILDLIFE MANAGER Hell Creek



DAVID OVERBY **CONSERVATION OFFICER** DIVIDE SECTION



MATT GRAY **CONSERVATION OFFICER** CHICKASAW



WAYNE GORDON WILDLIFE MANAGER JOHN STARR FOREST



TIM RYAN CONSERVATION OFFICER DIVIDE SECTION



Doug Swords WILDLIFE MANAGER CHICKASAW



JIMMY DREWERY WILDLIFE MANAGER TUSCUMBIA



BLAKE PALMER WILDLIFE SUPERVISOR



DONNIE CAIN **CONSERVATION OFFICER** CALHOUN COUNTY



ROBBIE KIIHNL CONSERVATION OFFICER **O'KEEFE** 



VICK THEOBALD CONSERVATION OFFICER SARDIS WATERFOWL



BOBBY YOUNG **CONSERVATION OFFICER** UPPER SARDIS



Walt Hardy CONSERVATION OFFICER HAMER





CONSERVATION OFFICER MALMAISON

# Wildlife Management Area Directory



DWIGHT MORROW WILDLIFE SUPERVISOR



RONNIE HURST CONSERVATION OFFICER CHICKASAWHAY



PATRICK RUSH CONSERVATION OFFICER OLD RIVER



JAY LANDRUM WILDLIFE MANAGER CHICKASAWHAY



RUSSELL WHITTINGTON CONSERVATION OFFICER Red Creek



MICHAEL EVERETTE CONSERVATION OFFICER LOWER PASCAGOULA RIVER



BEN HARE WILDLIFE MANAGER UPPER PASCAGOULA RIVER







RICKY MCDANIEL **CONSERVATION OFFICER** WOLF RIVER



SCOTTIE JONES CONSERVATION OFFICER Lake George



PAUL WINDHAM WILDLIFE SUPERVISOR

LARRY WADDELL

CONSERVATION OFFICER

NANIH WAIYA



Eric Clark ACTING WILDLIFE SUPERVISOR



RANDY AKINS CONSERVATION OFFICER **O**KATIBBEE



CLAYTON LOTT CONSERVATION OFFICER BEINVILLE



ART BRADSHAW CONSERVATION OFFICER CANEY CREEK



AJ SMITH CONSERVATION OFFICER CASTON CREEK





JASON KERR CONSERVATION OFFICER SUNFLOWER



GAYLON BRADSHAW CONSERVATION OFFICER TALLAHALA



ALLEN PATRICK CONSERVATION OFFICER COPIAH COUNTY





WMA DIRECTORY

BOBBY HODNETT CONSERVATION OFFICER SUNFLOWER



Brian Gordon WILDLIFE MANAGER TALLAHALA



DANNY STRINGER CONSERVATION OFFICER MARION COUNTY

7

2005-2006 Mississippi Deer Program Report





MIKE THOMPSON **CONSERVATION OFFICER** 



Ralph Diaz

WILDLIFE MANAGER



#### Bienville WMA Written by: Chad M. Dacus

Bienville WMA is a 31,000 acre area within the Bienville National Forest located north of Morton. For the second year bucks must have 4 or more antler points and an inside spread of 12 inches or more to be legal for harvest and antlerless deer had to weigh at least 65 pounds live weight. The 2005 – 2006

season was the first year where antierless deer were legal for harvest during gun season. Antierless deer were legal on the Saturday and Sunday following Thanksgiving. Hunter effort was up for the weekend; however hunters did not turn in all of the deer harvested on that weekend.

Deer harvest numbers consisted of 51 bucks and 33 does. Total harvest increased by 45% from last year but hunter effort decreased by 38%. This decrease in hunter effort is most likely due to the effects of Hurricane Katrina. Hunter success was much higher than last year (48.8 man-days/deer in 2004 -2005 and 20.75 man-days/deer in 2005 – 2006).

Habitat conditions on Bienville WMA improved over the years due to management for the Red-cockaded woodpecker, which is an endangered species that resides on the WMA. However, Hurricane Katrina damaged much of the hardwoods along creeks across the area. The MDWFP has proposed new openings in timber thinning/harvest areas which will provide additional food sources for wildlife.

As deer populations continue to grow in response to habitat improvements on the area, it will become necessary to increase antlerless hunting opportunities. Currently, antlerless hunting opportunities on Bienville WMA are limited to archery season, primitive weapon season, and statewide either sex days (Dec. 16-17, 2006).

#### Black Prairie WMA Written by: Scott Edwards

Black Prairie WMA offers a lottery draw hunt that has provided a very high success rate during the past several years. Hunter effort and harvest was similar to previous years, with a harvest this year of 13 bucks and 41 does. Doe body weights and lactation rates were very similar to years

past, indicating a healthy and productive population. Buck harvest was also similar to previous years where 50% of bucks harvested were 31/2 + years old. Hunters who desire a quality buck are passing up young bucks and waiting for an opportunity to harvest a mature buck; therefore, fewer yearling bucks are being harvested. The result is an increase in buck quality because bucks are allowed to grow older and larger. Habitat conditions continue to be good by keeping the deer population below carrying capacity and planting supplemental food plots as well as planting summer agriculture crops on approximately 1,600 acres.

#### Calhoun County WMA Written by: Brad Holder

Hunters are finding hunting conditions to be a little less than favorable in the aging pine stands on Calhoun County WMA. The canopy closure occurring in the mid-rotation pine stands on most of the WMA is making it harder to encounter deer in the usual locations, even though food plot

acreage increased. These effects probably counteracted the thinning and harvesting impacts that created openings in some areas of the WMA. However, hunters experienced greater returns on invested time in the field as more deer were harvested in a shorter period of time. This may have been attributed to the attraction of deer to greener food plots later in the season.

Small hardwood lots and creek bottom hardwood stands produced a fairly decent mast crop. Winter food plots suffered early due to drought conditions but came on strong during the latter part of hunting season.

The harvest rate for the WMA is usually heavily skewed towards bucks. This year proved to be similar. We would like to see more does than bucks harvested during future seasons.

#### **Canal Section and John Bell Williams WMAs** Written by: Jerry Hazlewood

Canal Section WMA (32,500 ac.) and John Bell Williams WMA (3,000 ac.) share common boundaries and harvest data is combined. Both areas together stretch over approximately 54 linear miles along the west side of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway from MS Hwy. 4 at Bay Springs Lake to 5 miles south of MS Hwy. 45 at Aberdeen. These WMAs lie in Tishomingo. Prentise, Itawar

Lake to 5 miles south of MS Hwy. 45 at Aberdeen. These WMAs lie in Tishomingo, Prentiss, Itawamba, and Monroe counties.

During the past gun and primitive weapon seasons, a total of 3,140 man-days were recorded for deer hunting with a harvest of 67 deer (42 bucks and 25 does). The man-day decrease was only 1%, but buck harvest decreased 46% and doe harvest decreased 42%. From the data and from speaking to deer hunters, it appears that the deer population on this area is down. Most hunters reported fewer deer observations and less deer sign. There was also a decrease in hog sightings with only 38 hogs reported harvested, compared to 98 last year.

The winter food plots on the area did not do well due to lack of rainfall before and after planting. Acorn production throughout the WMA was very good.

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004		2,707
2004-2005	60	2,931
2005-2006	87	1,806

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	42	
2004-2005	53	373
2005-2006	54	

Harvest

Man-davs

Season

Season	Harvest	Man-days
		2,499
2004-2005	133	
2005-2006	67	3,140

#### **Caney Creek WMA** Written by: Chad M. Dacus

Caney Creek WMA is a 31,000 acre area within the Bienville National Forest located near Forest. For the second year bucks must have 4 or more antler points and an inside spread of 12 inches or more to be legal for harvest and antierless deer had to weigh at least 65 pounds live weight.

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	204	5,541
2004-2005	111	
2005-2006	79	2,371

The 2005 – 2006 season was the first year that antlerless deer were legal for harvest during gun season. Antlerless deer were legal on the Saturday and Sunday following Thanksgiving. Hunter effort was up for the weekend: however hunters did not turn in all of the deer harvested on that weekend.

Deer harvest numbers consisted of 43 bucks and 32 does. Total harvest decreased by 28% from last year and hunter effort decreased by 29%. This is the third year in a row that reported hunter effort has decreased. This could be attributed to an actual decrease in effort due to the effects of Hurricane Katrina or hunters are becoming more apathetic in regards to filling out permit cards when hunting on the area. Hunter apathy can also account for the reduction in reported deer harvested.

Historically, antierless harvest was by permit only during the gun seasons and during archery and primitive weapon seasons. This year antierless harvest opportunity was during archery and primitive weapon seasons and on the Saturday and Sunday following Thanksgiving. Hunter effort during the 2-day antierless hunt accounted for 48% of the man-days for the entire month of November, however there were only 14 antierless deer reported for this hunt.

During the 2006 – 2007 season, the antierless opportunity during gun season will be available during statewide either-sex days (Dec. 16-17) along with antlerless opportunity during archery and primitive weapon seasons.

Measures are being taken to improve habitat conditions on the area. The U.S. Forest Service conducted timber harvest operations on Caney Creek WMA and continue spring prescribed burns, which should increase available browse for deer and other wildlife. As a result of the timber harvest operation, the MDWFP will be allowed to maintain several areas as permanent wildlife openings, which will improve habitat conditions on the area for years to come.

#### **Caston Creek WMA** Written by: Chris McDonald

Caston Creek WMA is a 27,785 acre area located within the Homochitto National Forest. Total reported deer harvest decreased 6% from last year, with 61 deer harvested (36 bucks and 25 does). Total reported man-days for deer hunting decreased by 39% compared to the previous

season. The decrease in man-days was most likely due to Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. These hurricanes caused private property damage, which caused many hunters to stay home and make repairs. A 12-inch minimum inside spread regulation has been in effect on Caston Creek WMA for two hunting seasons. The buck harvest remained stable with the 2004 – 2005 buck harvest. Biological data was collected from 46% of all harvested deer.

#### **Chickasaw WMA** Written by: Scott Edwards

Deer hunting activity decreased compared to last year's hunting season; however, harvest increased to 87 bucks and 64 does. Hunters seemed to be very pleased this year and supportive of the new WMA User Permit. Hunters and WMA personnel reported seeing more fawns this year

than in years past, which indicates a productive population and promises harvest opportunity in years to come. The WMA had an crop this year. Fall food plot planting was slightly later than normal due to the eight-week drought that most of Mississippi experienced; however, the Mississippi Complete mixture germinated very well and food plots were very successful. Food plots were fertilized in the spring to promote clover growth. Sportsmen seem optimistic about next season, which will be the third season of the 12-inch inside spread restriction on bucks, realizing that it will protect most of the yearling bucks and allow them to grow larger antlers as two-year-olds.

#### **Chickasawhay WMA** Written by: Kathy Shelton

Due to the affects of Hurricane Katrina, reported man-days on Chickasawhay WMA decreased by 47%. There was a 41% decrease in reported harvests. There were 22 bucks and 17 antlerless deer checked in during the 2005-2006 season. Estimated harvest for the entire area was 117

deer, a significant drop from the estimated 198 deer harvested during the 2004-2005 season. Access to roads and food plots were limited due to damage from Hurricane Katrina and this kept most hunters away for this season. U.S. Forest Service and MDWFP personnel are working to open roads on the area.

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004		3,489
2004-2005	65 .	4,436
2005-2006	65 .	2,693
		,

Season

Season

	60
	<b>.</b>
	_
	<b>~</b>
	_

Man-days

Man-davs

to come The	WMA had an e	exceptional acorn
		6,317 5,732
		,
2003-2004		4,459

Harvest

2004-2005 ......198 ......12,159

Harvest

#### **Choctaw WMA** Written by: Scott Edwards

The 2005-2006 deer season was very successful on Choctaw WMA. Hunter effort was slightly down from last season although harvest remained very similar. Interestingly, more bucks were harvested this year than does, finishing the season at 71 bucks and 36 does. Habitat quality on

the WMA will continue to improve following timber management by the U.S. Forest Service and their prescribed burning program. The hard mast crop was excellent this year with acorns still being abundant during January. All food plots were planted with the Mississippi Complete seed mix but were slow to start growing due to the eight-week drought. Clovers began growing well during late winter and will be beneficial to deer and turkeys during the spring. The food plot maintenance program includes spring fertilization, summer bush-hogging, fall disking, and fall planting. Quail Unlimited and National Wild Turkey Federation chapters continue to donate seed and fertilizer. The Tombigbee Ranger District of the U.S. Forest Service also donates seed, fertilizer, and bulldozer and tractor work when requested. With the support of these organizations, the future looks bright for Choctaw WMA.

#### **Copiah County WMA** Written by: Chris McDonald

Copiah County WMA is comprised of 6,583 acres owned by the State of Mississippi.

Total reported man-days for deer hunting decreased 45% compared to the previous season. Reported man-days have been declining over the last 3 seasons. The decrease in man-days may

be explained by the area manager not living on the area. For the past two hunting seasons, no personnel lived on the area, and hunter check-in compliance was lower than previous years. Daily use permits were not turned in, not properly completed, or only half of the card was turned in. In past years when personnel lived on the area, hunter check-in compliance was greater.

Total reported deer harvest increased by 8 deer for the 2005 – 2006 deer hunting season compared to the previous season. A total of 80 harvested deer were reported (35 bucks and 45 does). Buck harvest was stable compared to the previous season. A 12-inch minimum inside spread regulation has been in effect on Copiah County WMA since the 2004 - 2005 hunting season. The purpose of this regulation is to protect 11/2 year old bucks from harvest. The regulation has been successful. Young bucks have been protected, hunters have reported more buck observations, and age of harvested bucks has increased. A drawing was also held for sub 4-point tags. Thirty tags were issued to hunters, but only one tag was reported as used.

#### **Divide Section WMA** Written by: Jerry Hazlewood

Divide Section WMA (15.300 ac.) lies along both sides of the Tennessee-Tombiobee Waterway from the northwest side of Bay Springs Lake northward to MS Hwy. 25 near Pickwick Lake. A small

portion of the area is in Prentiss County and the remainder in Tishomingo County. The WMA is a well maintained area for hunter use including the conservation of habitat for wildlife management. The WMA has approximately 100 winter food plots and 100 summer food plots. The food plots range in size from a half acre to an acre. Approximately one-third of the WMA is spoil area, which is material excavated during the construction of the Tennessee-Tombigbee Waterway. This acreage is very poor soil still in early stages of plant succession.

Divide Section WMA is a primitive weapons only area for deer with a season bag limit of two antlerless deer and one legal antlered buck. Regulations state that a buck must have 4 or more antler points and an inside spread of 12 inches or more to be legal for harvest, and antlerless deer had to weigh at least 65 pounds live weight.

The buck harvest was 10 in 2005-2006, which was a decrease of 2 from the 2004-2005 season. The antlerless harvest decreased by 3 from last season. Man-days for deer hunting during the 2005-2006 season were 2,389, a decrease of 4% compared to 2,479 in the 2004-2005 season.

Food plots were only fair this year due to lack of rainfall before and after planting. Acorn production on the area was very good.

#### **Hamer WMA** Written by: Brad Holder

Deer hunting began on Hamer WMA during the 2004-2005 season. Hunting was allowed by permit only for a portion of the 2005-2006 season. Hunting was well received and productive.

Habitat conditions were good particularly during the latter part of deer season when food plots were rejuvenated with the arrival of more favorable weather conditions. Red oaks on the WMA produced a fair crop of acorns. White oaks produced minimally.

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	128	3,614
2004-2005		
2005-2006	107	2,926

Season Harvest Man-day	
2003-2004	4
2004-2005	0
2005-2006	2

Harvest

2004-2005......60 ......2,479

Harvest

2004-2005 ......14 .....N/A

Man-days

Man-days

Season

Season

#### Hell Creek WMA Written by: Dave Godwin

Deer hunting activity on Hell Creek WMA increased compared to recent hunting seasons. Deer hunting on this area is limited to permit holders only, and while permit numbers have been held constant, the number of days hunted by the permit holders has increased. Deer harvest remains

relatively low on Hell Creek WMA, although the 2005-2006 harvest was slightly higher than recent years. The largest buck ever harvested on this WMA was checked in during the 2005-2006 season – a 200 pound 3½ year-old 10 point with 24-inch main beams and good tine length. Body weights were average for this area during 2005-2006. Habitat management efforts to improve 400 acres of mid-rotation pine plantations for wildlife habitat should be beneficial to white-tailed deer on Hell Creek WMA. Relative drought conditions during the early summer of 2006 have limited production of soybeans and corn and could impact the availability of deer foods on Hell Creek WMA.

#### John Starr Forest WMA Written by: Scott Edwards

The 2005-2006 deer season on John Starr WMA was very successful with a harvest of 34 bucks and 54 does. Deer season started slowly mostly due to effects of Hurricane Katrina, which decreased the number of Gulf Coast hunters who normally hunt during the archery season. The food plot program included planting the Mississippi Complete mix along with corn and maintaining

existing clover plots. Food plots were slow to get started as well due to the eight-week drought, but began to grow well when temperatures cooled and rainfall increased. Harvested deer were healthy this year with increased body weights indicating the effectiveness of the fall and summer food plots. By continuing the antler regulations of a minimum of 4 points and a 12-inch inside spread, we foresee abundant deer with larger antlers on John Starr WMA.

#### Lake George WMA Written by: Lann Wilf

Lake George WMA is an 8,383 acre tract consisting primarily of 15 year-old replanted bottomland hardwood timber. The 2005 – 2006 season was the third year requiring a legal bucks to have a 15-inch minimum inside spread. This was also the third year that, for research purposes, hunters could apply for a

tag that would allow them to harvest a buck with at least one unforked antler. Both of these regulations appear to have the support of the majority of the deer hunters in the area. Fifteen of these special buck tags were given out for use on Lake George WMA, and none were turned in as being used. Deer hunting mandays increased from 222 in 2004 – 2005 to 286 in 2005 – 2006. Buck harvest remained stable at 7, and doe harvest increased from 3 to 7. Body weights were excellent on bucks and does, and antler indices were outstanding as well. Buck harvest consisted of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  year-old bucks.

Rainfall was consistent until late summer and early fall, which resulted in high browse availability. Mast crop production was good where available, but most of the trees were not old enough to produce mast. Warmer weather and abundant food limited deer movement, which worked with challenging habitat conditions to cause a reduction in deer sightings. This area has a fairly low deer density, and the herd is growing in numbers and in buck quality, which is due to excellent deer habitat.

#### Leaf River WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported man-days for Leaf River WMA dropped by 45% this season due to Hurricane Katrina. Damage from the storm limited access to many roads and food plots on the area and made deer retrieval almost impossible. Fortunately the damage was somewhat scattered so there were still

some areas suitable for hunting. As expected, harvests were down on the area also. Reported buck harvests dropped from 56 last year to 21 this year. Antierless harvests dropped from 55 to 21. Total harvests dropped by 62%. The U.S. Forest Service and MDWFP personnel are working hard to get all the roads on the area open for next season.

#### Leroy Percy WMA Written by: Jackie Fleeman

Leroy Percy WMA is located about 5 miles west of Hollandale on MS Hwy 12. Only primitive weapons and archery equipment are allowed for deer hunting. Deer harvest consisted of 5 bucks and 7 does, which is slightly up from 3 bucks and 5 does harvested during the 2004 – 2005 season. This was the

third year under the regulations that required legal bucks to have a 15-inch spread. This was also the third year that, for research purposes hunters could apply for a tag that would allow them to harvest a buck with at least one unforked antler. One tag was turned in as being used. Hunting pressure was 472 mandays which are down slightly from the 488 man-days last season. Deer body weights remained stable. Lactation rates for 3½+ year-old does were low at 33%; however, this sample size was small. Buck indices remained good but are based on a small sample size. Average rainfall during summer and fall resulted in good browse conditions. The amount of browse is diminishing due to shading caused by canopy closure. Some timber harvest in the form of thinning is needed. Acorn production was poor. The warm weather resulted in limited deer movement which caused a reduction in deer sightings.

2000 2000		
2005-2006	88	1 273
2004-2005		1,515

Harvest

Harvest

2003-2004......13.......85

2004-2005......10......108

2005-2006......16......180

Man-days

Man-davs

814

Season

Season

2003-2004...

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004 2004-2005 2005-2006	10	

Season		Man-days
2003-2004	61	6,317
2004-2005		6,881
2005-2006	42	

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	14	
2004-2005	8	488
2005-2006	12	472

WMA NARRATIVES	
VMA	3
VMA	m
VMA	
VMA	
VMA	
VMA	-
VMA	
<b>WM</b>	
WM	
MM	
Μ	
5	

#### Little Biloxi WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported man-days on Little Biloxi WMA dropped 75% to just 662 for the entire 2005-2006 deer season. Most of this can be attributed to Hurricane Katrina. Not only was the area heavily affected, but many of the hunters that use this WMA are from coastal Mississippi and nearby areas damaged

by the hurricane. Only six deer were reported harvested this year, all bucks. This is down from 14 bucks and 5 does reported in the 2004-2005 season. U.S Forest Service and MDWFP personnel are working hard to get the roads open and food plots ready for next season.

#### Mahannah WMA Written by: Jackie Fleeman

Mahannah WMA is a 12,675 acre area located approximately 12 miles north of Vicksburg. Deer hunting is by permit only except for the January archery hunt which is open to the public. This was the third year under the regulations that required legal bucks to have a 15-inch inside spread. This was also the third

year that, for research purposes, hunters could apply for a tag that would allow them to harvest a buck with at least one unforked antler. Eighty-eight of these special buck tags were issued on Mahannah WMA and three were turned in as being used. Both of these new regulations appeared to have the approval of the majority of deer hunters on the area. Deer man-days increased to 1,766 in 2005 - 2006 from 1,459 in 2004 - 2005. Deer harvest increased to 126 from 87 deer. Doe harvest decreased to 51 from 76 due to hunters not being required to harvest a doe before harvesting a buck. Options should be considered to increase doe harvest. Buck harvest increased to 75 from 48. Buck condition indices remained good with weights decreasing slightly and antler measurements remaining stable. Lactation rates were good at 74% for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  year-old does, but decreased to 28% in  $2\frac{1}{2}$  year-old does. Doe body weights remained stable at 128 pounds for  $3\frac{1}{2}$  year-old does. The percent of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  year-old does in the harvest remained high at 49%. Below normal rainfall for much of the summer and fall resulted in fair browse conditions. Acorn production was poor. The warm weather in late December resulted in limited deer movement which caused a reduction in deer sightings in the later hunts.

#### Malmaison WMA Written by: Brad Holder

Malmaison WMA, like most of north Mississippi, experienced fairly good acorn crops again this year from red oaks with white oaks producing minimally. Food plots did well and were utilized by deer to a fairly large extent, particularly during late winter. Deer density appears to be fairly high as indicated by summer browse pressure on native vegetation and food plots.

Overall, hunters were pleased to report numerous buck observations on the WMA, and a 3-year trend indicates harvest remains heavily skewed towards does. We would like to see this trend continue. Overall harvest was down slightly from last year but so were the number of man-days.

#### Marion County WMA Written by: Chris McDonald

Marion County WMA is comprised of 7,200 acres owned by the State of Mississippi. Total reported deer harvest decreased 23% from last season, with 49 deer harvested (12 bucks and 37 does). Biological data was collected from 92% of all harvested deer. Compared to the 2004 –

2005 season, buck harvest decreased by 16 bucks; however, doe harvest was stable. The decrease in buck harvest is largely due to the 12-inch minimum inside spread regulation implemented for the first time during the 2005 - 2006 hunting season. This protected many  $1\frac{1}{2}$  year old bucks that normally would have been harvested under the old 4-point regulation. This protection is the goal of using the 12-inch regulation. The 12-inch regulation will be in effect again during the 2006 - 2007 hunting season.

Total reported man-days for deer hunting decreased by 28% compared to the previous season. The decrease in man-days was most likely due to Hurricane Katrina. Katrina caused private property damage, which made many hunters stay home to make repairs. Also, Katrina caused extensive timber damage on Marion County WMA. Due to downed timber, hunting was physically challenging. This may have prevented some people from hunting.

#### Mason Creek WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported man-days for Mason Creek WMA increased this year. This is most likely due to the presence of a full time area manager. Man-days increased by 28% to 1,744. Reported harvest dropped by 2 to 19 this season. There were 16 bucks and 3 does harvested. There is no check-

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004		2,357
2004-2005		1,360
2005-2006		1,744

in station on Mason Creek so no data was collected on the deer. Hunters are required to record harvests on the daily permit card. With the addition of a full time area manager, compliance to regulations should increase. In addition, food plot programs are being planned and instituted on the area.

2003-2004 2004-2005 2005-2006	19	2,713
icks and 5 does re		2004-2005

Harvest

Harvest

20

Man-days

Man-davs

0 001

Season

2002 2004

Season

Season

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004		1,930
2004-2005		
2005-2006		2,394

Harvest

2003-2004 ......62 ......2,166 2004-2005 ......64 .....1,931

Man-days

#### Nanih Waiya WMA Written by: Jeff Mangrum

Man-days of deer hunting effort were down 16% from the previous year's numbers with a total of 854 days. Total deer harvest was 52, which included 14 bucks and 38 does. This total was an 11% increase over the previous year's harvest. Average buck weights were lower in the  $1\frac{1}{2}$  and

 $2\frac{1}{2}$  year olds by 20 and 14 pounds, respectively. Buck weights were higher, however, for the  $3\frac{1}{2}$  year olds by 22 pounds. Doe weights increased in the  $2\frac{1}{2}$  year olds, but decreased in the fawn,  $1\frac{1}{2}$ , and  $3\frac{1}{2}$ + year olds. Minimum weight limits for legal harvest were implemented in the 2004 – 2005 season and continue to be effective at limiting the number of fawns harvested. The lactation rate for  $2\frac{1}{2}$ + year-old does was 52%, which was down 5% from the previous year's rate.

Deer hunting opportunity on the WMA is largely dependent upon rainfall and water levels in the Pearl River. The dry fall and winter experienced during the deer season usually would have allowed for good hunter access throughout the WMA. Winds from Hurricane Katrina, however, downed timber throughout the area. Portions of the WMA which had stands of mature hardwood timber and large trees along the river received significant damage. The primary road system on the WMA was opened before the beginning of deer season, but the northeastern half of the area remained inaccessible to hunters. Likewise, timber blockages along the length of the Pearl River, within the bounds of the WMA, precluded the use of boats for access. The decrease in man-days was likely attributable to the difficulty of hunter access.

After six hunting seasons on this WMA, deer hunting potential remains largely untapped, particularly in the more remote areas throughout the WMA. The early successional habitat which comprises most of the WMA has provided an abundant food supply for deer. Populations continue to remain at higher levels than when mature hardwood timber was dominant on the area. The early successional habitat which provides abundant deer forage, however, is quickly changing and will be reaching a closed-canopy stage in 3 – 6 years over most of the WMA. The openings created by Hurricane Katrina in areas with mature hardwoods will provide a short-term increase in the amount of deer browse available. In an effort to manage deer populations for the future condition of the WMA, doe harvest opportunity extends throughout the entire length of the deer season.

#### Okatibbee WMA Written by: Jeff Mangrum

Man-days were down 26% from the previous year with a total of 451 days. Total deer harvest was 14, which included 13 does and 1 buck. This total is a 27% increase from the previous year's harvest. Harvest data indicated that doe weights across all age classes were slightly lower than

those of the previous year. The lactation rate for 21/2+ year-old does was 67%, compared to last year's rate of 60%.

Hurricane Katrina had a lasting impact on the WMA. Timber damage from sustained, hurricane-force winds ranged from 5% to 75% of the standing timber. High winds damaged stands of mature, bottomland hardwood more than upland stands of mixed pine and hardwood. Downed timber from the hurricane was scattered throughout much of the WMA, and hunters were unable to traverse large portions of the area. The decrease in mandays was directly attributable to the difficulty of hunter access.

Abundant rainfall during the previous spring and early summer produced some quality browse in areas which receive adequate sunlight. Browse pressure on summer food plots was only moderate due to adequate native browse. Winter flood plots, however, yielded low returns because of an exceptionally dry fall and winter. Although the mast crop was impacted by the hurricane's winds in the late summer, acorn production was better than expected throughout the winter months. Short-term reductions in mast production will be offset by a proliferation in browse growth.

Timber management practices were being implemented to increase production of deer browse. Most of the mature, upland pine stands have been thinned and burned. Timber management efforts have shifted to salvage damaged timber. The mature, closed-canopy bottomland hardwood stands which dominated most of the area have had the ecological equivalent of a timber thin. Although such areas will be difficult for hunters to access, the amount of deer browse generated will contribute to an increased carrying capacity for deer on the WMA.

#### O'Keefe WMA Written by: Brad Holder

O'Keefe WMA experienced excellent red oak acorn production. Food plots did much better during the latter part of winter due to adequate rainfall and were utilized by deer to a fair extent.

The harvest for the WMA was heavily skewed towards bucks this past season and ended a three year trend of slightly greater doe harvest. Hunters were pleased because of greater buck sightings during hunts and capitalized on the situation.

#### Old River WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported man-days on Old River WMA dropped by 50% this season. It was surprising that it wasn't more considering the substantial damage received from Hurricane Katrina. It is estimated that 70% or more of the timber in this area was damaged or destroyed. It will take decades, if not

longer, for the area to return to pre-storm conditions. Surprisingly enough, harvest this year was exactly the same as last season with 3 bucks and 2 does reported. These numbers were down significantly from the 2003-2004 season when 14 bucks and 3 does were reported harvested.

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	64	1,126
2004-2005	47	1,017
2005-2006	52	

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	11	542
2004-2005	11	609
2005-2006	14	451

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	17	630
2004-2005	5	410
2005-2006	5	207

Harvest

Man-days

Season

#### Lower Pascagoula River WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported man-days for deer hunting on Lower Pascagoula River WMA dropped by 40% to 1,559. This decrease can be attributed to Hurricane Katrina and the impacts to the forest. Access to the area was limited due to downed trees blocking roads, trails, and water access points. Reported

deer harvest on the area dropped 52% to just 11 deer. There were 5 bucks and 6 antlerless deer reported this year. Efforts are underway to clear the roads and improve access for next season.

#### **Upper Pascagoula River WMA** Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported man-days on Upper Pascagoula River WMA showed the most dramatic decrease of any area in south Mississippi with a decline of over 80%. Only 341 man-days were recorded for deer

hunting during the 2005-2006 season. While Hurricane Katrina affected the area it does not account for this dramatic decrease. The lack of law enforcement personnel on the area is probably the largest contributing factor to this decline. Hunters are disobeying regulations and not filling out permit cards or reporting harvested animals. There will be an effort to increase the law enforcement presence on the area for the upcoming season.

#### **Pearl River WMA** Written by: Chad M. Dacus

Pearl River WMA is a 6,000 acre area along the Ross Barnett Reservoir north of Hwy. 43 near Canton. There is a 1,500 acre Youth and Handicap Only area within the waterfowl refuge. Regulations state that a buck must have 4 or more antler points to be legal for harvest and antlerless deer had to weigh at least 65 pounds live weight. Reported deer harvest consisted of 13 deer. This was the third year in a row with a decrease in reported man-days and reported harvest. This could be due to no personnel on the WMA.

Habitat conditions on the WMA were favorable for deer with good browse. Damage from Hurricane Katrina was minimal. In the Youth Area many hardwood trees were destroyed and the acorn crop suffered from the wind damage. During the spring, the upland pine areas were burned which should increase the available browse.

#### Sandy Creek WMA Written by: Chris McDonald

Sandy Creek WMA is a 16,407 acre WMA located within the Homochitto National Forest. The area manager position on this WMA has remained vacant for the past three years. Only 37 harvested deer were reported during the 2005 - 2006 hunting season on Sandy Creek WMA (24 bucks and 13 does). This is a decrease of 69% compared to the 2002 - 2003 hunting season (the

last year an area manager was present). Reported deer harvest has decreased the last three years with less than 100 deer harvested each year. Total reported man-days were down 22% compared to the 2004 – 2005 deer hunting season. Reported deer harvest and man-days are expected to remain low until the area manager position is filled on Sandy Creek WMA.

#### Sardis Waterfowl WMA Written by: Brad Holder

The four-day youth hunt on Sardis Waterfowl WMA once again afforded several youth with the unique opportunity to harvest deer on an unpressured area. Even though harvest was down, hunter attitude was still positive toward the experience.

A lack of lactation, particularly in older does harvested, insinuates herd health may not be what

it should and could be due to overpopulation. Low harvest could have been attributed to poor food plot production early in the season and decent mast crop production off of the area.

#### **Shipland WMA** Written by: Jackie Fleeman

Shipland WMA is the only state-owned land in the Batture. The west boundary is the Mississippi River. Only primitive weapons and archery equipment are allowed for deer hunting. The WMA consists of bottomland hardwood and an approximately 100-acre sandfield. In fall 2001, a 220-acre block was

thinned, leaving all the pecan, oak, and persimmon. This thinning, along with other recent timber harvests, has greatly increased the browse and escape cover on the WMA. This was the third year under the regulations that required legal bucks to have a 15-inch inside spread. This was also the third year that, for research purposes, hunters could apply for a tag that would allow them to harvest a buck with at least one unforked antier. Ten of these special buck tags were issued on Shipland WMA and none were turned in as being used. Both of these new regulations appeared to have the approval of the majority of deer hunters

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	71	3,612
2004-2005	30	2,589
2005-2006	11	1,559

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	19	1,320
2004-2005		2,081
2005-2006	0	

<b>Season</b> 2003-2004		Man-days
2004-2005		
2005-2006	13	715

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	86	2,970
2004-2005	32	2,571
2005-2006	37	2,012

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	42	76
2004-2005	42	112
2005-2006	20	78

Season 2003-2004		Man-days 653
2004-2005 2005-2006	10	622

# 2005-2006 Mississippi Deer Program Report

## **2005-2006 WMA Deer Harvest Narratives**

on the WMA. Hunting pressure increased slightly to 628 man-days in 2005 - 2006 from 622 man-days in 2004 - 2005. Harvest included 7 bucks and 13 does, which was up from 5 bucks and 5 does last season. The harvest consisted of 86% 21/2 + year-old bucks. Antler condition indices remained good. Body weights of bucks and does remained stable or increased slightly. Lactation rate of 21/2 + year-old does was 100%. Mast production on pecan trees was poor. Below normal rainfall during the summer and fall resulted in fair browse conditions. The warm weather in late December resulted in limited deer movement which caused a reduction in deer sightings during the later deer seasons.

#### Stoneville WMA Written by: Jackie Fleeman

Stoneville WMA is located about 4 miles north of Leland, MS. Most of the area was cut-over in the mid to late 1990's. This WMA has abundant browse and escape cover. Only primitive weapons

and archery equipment are allowed for deer hunting. This was the third year under the regulations that required legal bucks to have a 15-inch inside spread. This was also the third year that, for research purposes, hunters could apply for a tag that would allow them to harvest a buck with at least one unforked antler. Ten of these special buck tags were given out for use on Stoneville WMA and none were turned in as being used. Both of these new regulations appeared to have the approval of the majority of deer hunters on the area. Hunting pressure increased to 721 man-days in 2005 – 2006 from 542 man-days in 2004 – 2005. Deer harvest increased to 13 from 7. This harvest included 8 bucks and 5 does. No other scientific data was collected because no personnel are assigned to this WMA. Normal rainfall during summer and fall resulted in good browse conditions. Acorn production was poor. The warm weather in late December resulted in limited deer movement which caused a reduction in deer sightings.

#### Sunflower WMA Written by: Jackie Fleeman

Sunflower WMA is a 60,000 acre U.S. Forest Service area in Sharkey County.

This was the third year under the regulations that required legal bucks to have a 15-inch inside spread. This was also the third year that, for research purposes, hunters could apply for a tag that

would allow them to harvest a buck with at least one unforked antler. Eighty of these special buck tags were issued on Sunflower WMA and one was turned in as being used. Both of these new regulations appeared to have the approval of the majority of deer hunters on the area. Most deer condition indices, such as body weight and antler measurements, remained stable. Below normal rainfall during summer and fall resulted in fair browse conditions. Warm weather in December resulted in limited deer movement which caused a reduction in deer sightings during the later deer seasons. Acorn production was spotty. Flooding was not a factor in November and December, as it commonly is. Buck harvest increased to 85 in 2005 - 2006 from 70 in 2004 – 2005. Doe harvest increased to 61 from 49. Man-days were down slightly from 5,267 to 5,123.

#### Tallahala WMA Written by: Chad M. Dacus

Tallahala WMA is a 28,120 acre area within the Bienville National Forest located near Montrose. For the second year bucks must have 4 or more antler points and an inside spread of 12 inches or more to be legal for harvest and antlerless deer had to weigh at least 65 pounds live weight.

The 2005 – 2006 season was the first year that antlerless deer were legal for harvest during gun season. Antlerless deer were legal on the Saturday and Sunday following Thanksgiving.

Deer harvest consisted of 27 bucks and 30 does. Total harvest decreased 41% from last year and buck harvest decreased by 35%, which was expected due to the antler restriction. Deer hunters accounted for 2,227 man-days which were down slightly from last year. This decrease in mandays could be due to Hurricane Katrina and/or hunter's reluctance to turn in permit cards at WMA permit stations.

During the 2006 – 2007 season, the antlerless opportunity during gun season will be available during statewide either-sex days (Dec. 16-17) along with antlerless opportunity during archery and primitive weapon seasons.

The U.S. Forest Service continues to conduct spring prescribed burns on the WMA. This helps to encourage browse production during the spring and fall.

#### Tuscumbia WMA Written by: Jerry Hazlewood

Tuscumbia WMA, located in Alcorn County, is a relatively new WMA. The area comprises 2,600 acres and consists primarily of abandoned agricultural fields and beaver slash. The area is comprised of two separate units where the northern unit is mainly permanent water and slash

which is not easily accessed nor very good deer habitat. The southern unit has mostly abandoned agricultural fields and six newly constructed waterfowl impoundments. Both units experience frequent flooding in the winter months.

As part of a waterfowl management strategy, the southern unit (Unit 2) of the area was closed to all hunting for the 2005-2006 season. Deer hunting effort changed little at 61 man-days compared to 60 last season. Harvest decreased this season from three deer last year to 0 in 2005-2006. Effort and harvest numbers are low due to the relatively small size of the area and limited deer habitat and public access.

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	10	726
2004-2005	7	542
2005-2006	13	721

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	137	6,947
2004-2005	119	5,276
2005-2006	146	

		Man-days
2003-2004	165	4,924
2004-2005	97	2,930
2005-2006	57	2,227

Harvest

Season

Man-days

#### Upper Sardis WMA Written by: Brad Holder

Hunters found deer easier to come by this past season on Upper Sardis WMA. Harvest ratios have been relatively even during the past 3 years suggesting good buck fawn crops and a relatively healthy herd. The harvest consisted of 109 bucks and 103 does.

Mast crop was fair in areas of the WMA and food plots did better in late winter with adequate rainfall. Hunters are finding hunting conditions to be a little less than favorable in aging pine stands on the WMA. However, these habitats are somewhat improved by fall burns conducted by the U.S. Forest Service.

#### Twin Oaks WMA Written by: Jackie Fleeman

Twin Oaks WMA is a 5,675 acre bottomland hardwood area 5 miles southeast of Rolling Fork. Deer hunting is restricted to archery and primitive weapon and is by permit only except for the January archery hunt which is open to the public. This was the third year under the regulations

that required legal bucks to have a 15-inch inside spread. This was also the third year that, for research purposes, hunters could apply for a tag that would allow them to harvest a buck with at least one unforked antler. Both of these new regulations appeared to have the approval of the majority of deer hunters on the WMA. Eighty-eight of these special buck tags were issued on Twin Oaks WMA and four were turned in as being used. Hunter effort decreased to 1,206 man-days in 2005 – 2006 from 1,515 man-days in 2004 – 2005. Buck harvest increased to 23 from 16. Doe harvest increased to 34 from 22. Buck weights increased in  $1\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  year-olds and decreased in  $3\frac{1}{2}$  year-olds. Antler indices were mixed but were basically unchanged from last year. Doe weights were down slightly in  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  + year-olds. Lactation rates increased to 73% in  $2\frac{1}{2}$  + year-olds. Below normal rainfall during summer and fall resulted in fair browse conditions. Acorn production was poor. The warm weather in late December limited deer movement which caused a reduction in deer sightings during the late season deer hunts.

#### Red Creek WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Red Creek WMA is the only area in southern Mississippi that showed an increase in deer hunting man-days. Reported man-days on the area rose 25% to 3933 in the 2005-2006 season. Despite this increase reported deer harvest decreased by 72%. A total of 9 deer were reported harvested

on the area with 5 bucks and 4 antlerless deer. While some of this decrease is associated with Hurricane Katrina, part of the decrease is probably due to the decrease in law enforcement personnel on the area. With close to 100,000 acres of land Red Creek can not be adequately covered with the present number of officers. Knowing this, hunters are not checking in deer that are harvested before leaving the area.

#### Ward Bayou WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported deer hunting man-days decreased on Ward Bayou WMA by 43% to just over 1000. The decrease in the reported deer harvest was double with a decrease of 86%. There were only 2 bucks and 1 antierless deer reported harvested on the area, although rumors of several more were

heard. Last year 22 deer were harvested with 9 bucks and 13 does. Most of this decrease is due to Hurricane Katrina. Many of the hunters that use the area come from south Mississippi and were too busy dealing with clean up efforts to spend time hunting. MDWFP personnel are working hard to get the roads open and the food plots ready for next season.

#### Wolf River WMA Written by: Kathy Shelton

Reported deer hunting man-days on Wolf River WMA decreased by 26% this year to just over 2400. The reported deer harvest drop was similar with a decrease of 25%. There were 52 total deer harvested this season with 30 bucks and 27 antlerless deer. Last years harvest was 69, with

42 bucks and 27 antierless deer. This decrease is expected with the damage from Hurricane Katrina. Many roads on the area were closed at least temporarily. Also, many Wolf River hunters come from Hancock and Pearl River counties which were very hard hit during the storm. MDWFP personnel are working hard to get the area ready for the next season.

Season	Man-days
2003-2004 2004-2005	
2005-2006	

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004.	40	1,109
2004-2005.		1,515
2005-2006 .	57	1,206

Season		Man-days
2003-2004	77	7,651
2004-2005	35	2,950
2005-2006	9	3,933

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004	16	3,760
2004-2005	22	1,881
2005-2006		

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2003-2004		2,634
2004-2005		3,250
2005-2006	57	2,484

#### Yockanookany WMA Written by: Lann M. Wilf

Yockanookany WMA is a 2,600 acre area located in Attala County approximately 12 miles east of Kosciusko. This WMA consists of bottomland hardwoods of varying ages. A large amount of quality deer habitat is found throughout the area. The most prominent problem on the WMA is inadequate deer harvest.

This was the second year of legal hunting on this WMA. The lack of hunting on this WMA in the past is the main reason for the habitat stress and overpopulation of deer. An intense antlerless harvest is needed on the area to balance the number of deer with the available habitat. The hunts on this area are restricted to draw hunts for archery, primitive weapon, and rifle. In order to increase the antlerless harvest, two draw only rifle hunts and four primitive weapon hunts have been added to the 2006 – 2007 season.

The mast crop on Yockanookany was heavily impacted by Hurricane Katrina, which removed a large majority of the mast crop early. The warmer temperatures and inability to pattern deer made hunting a greater challenge than usual. Another problem hunters faced was extended periods of high water throughout the primitive weapon season. This area is extremely flood prone, which can prevent hunters from accessing over half of the area.

Deer hunting man-days increased from 91 in 2004 - 2005 to 189 in 2005 - 2006. The harvest consisted of seven bucks and five does. Five special buck tags were used removing  $1\frac{1}{2}$  and  $2\frac{1}{2}$  year-old spikes. The other harvested bucks were of intermediate quality and were  $3\frac{1}{2}$  and  $4\frac{1}{2}$  years old. Despite lack of trophy deer being harvested, some nice deer were observed. The antlerless harvest was not adequate. Two of the twelve deer harvested showed signs of HD exposure, and lactation was extremely low. Both are indicative of an overpopulated and stressed deer herd. The overall harvest was lower than expected, which can be attributed to less than favorable hunting conditions. Hopefully, next season will provide more quality hunting opportunities on this area resulting in a greater overall deer harvest.



Alec Dacus harvested his first deer on a DMAP club in Holmes County.

Season	Harvest	Man-days
2004-2005		
2005-2006	12	189

### 2005-2006 Regional Narratives

#### Northeast Written by: Jerry Hazlewood and Scott Edwards

The 2005 – 2006 deer season for northeast Mississippi was very successful for many hunters. Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP) clubs in these 15 counties reported a harvest of 2,339 deer, with 43% bucks and 57% does. Hunters harvested ~300 more deer this year than during the 2004 – 2005 season, although the percentages of bucks and does harvested were exactly the same. Deer harvest was very similar to previous years on public areas as well. Most hunters reported good success on both private and public lands.

Weather conditions during much of the hunting season were much cooler than last year, although the eight-week drought that most of Mississippi experienced certainly impacted hunting. The opening weekend of gun season, weather-wise, was one of the best we've had in many years, encouraging lots of hunters to take to the woods.

A fair amount of rain occured during late summer and many clubs reported an abundance of browse, which is important for does rearing fawns and bucks growing antlers. The mast crop was excellent this year and many areas still had acorns on the ground during January. Many clubs experienced food plot failure due to the eight-week drought most of Mississippi experienced, although late winter rains and cooler temperatures encouraged clover growth into the spring. The abundance of acorns during the fall and winter months decreased food plot usage, thus reducing the number of deer sightings by hunters who mostly hunt food plots.

Numerous samples were collected from harvested deer to be tested for Chronic Wasting Disease (CWD) as part of our ongoing, statewide monitoring program. To date, some samples are still being analyzed but there have been no positive cases in any samples. There was very little evidence of EHD (blue tongue disease) and deer body weights continue to look good – all indicating a healthy deer herd.

As in the past few years, more clubs are interested in quality deer management and are intensively harvesting does, passing younger bucks, and anticipating more older bucks with larger antlers in future years. These clubs meet success in many instances, but some become discouraged by hunters on adjacent properties shooting all legal bucks. We continually encourage neighboring clubs and landowners to unite in cooperatives with common management goals.

#### West Central Written by: Lann M. Wilf and Jackie Fleeman

The 2005-2006 deer season was about average when considering past seasons. Colder weather was erratic throughout the deer season, which hindered hunter success.

Mast crops this year were intermediate, since Hurricane Katrina removed most of the acorns early in the year. Warm weather and regular rainfall kept deer browse in good shape until September. After which, rainfall was scarce.

Some over-population problems may be decreased slightly next year, because many clubs on DMAP in this part of the state met their antierless harvest quota. Overall, deer hunting was not bad, when the weather was cooperative. Many bucks were aged at 3.5 years and older, and a few trophy deer were harvested.

Overall, food plots struggled this year, because of limited rainfall other than what resulted from Hurricanes Katrina and Rita. The pressure on food plots was high this year, since the deer had low availability of mast.

Reports of intense rutting activity were spotty this year. However, a few places with close buck: doe ratios observed a strong rut, especially in the north Delta. Most observed rutting activity occurred from mid-December to early January, which coincides with average conception dates in the west-central portion of the state. For the most part, the 05-06 deer season was fairly successful, with some sound three to five year old bucks being taken on private clubs and Wildlife Management Areas.

#### East-Central Written by: Chad M. Dacus

Harvest reports from DMAP clubs and WMAs were down from last year. Reported harvest decreased by 13% compared to last year. This decline in deer harvest may be a direct result of Hurricane Katrina. Timber was damaged on most properties south of Interstate 20. Even the properties without habitat and timber damage had reduced hunter effort due to the situations surrounding Katrina.

On most lands hunters are seeing just as many deer, if not more, that they have ever seen. So over-harvest is not an issue on most properties. There is still a concern of poor reporting of harvest on WMAs. Man-days have decreased, but this is not the reason for the decreased harvest. WMA hunters have become apathetic in regards to checking in deer and reporting their harvest. Also, due to decrease man-power on this region's WMAs, hunters do not feel the need to report/check-in deer at check stations.

Complaints from crop depredation increased slightly this year. Depredation permits were issued in 6 counties (Madison, Hinds, Lauderdale, Simpson, Smith, and Scott). Complaints from sub-divisions and small towns increased this year. With new sub-division being constructed in the Jackson Metro area, these complaints will continue to rise. As municipalities outlaw bow hunting within city limits, these complaints will be harder to deal with in the future.

Reports of HD/Bluetongue was down significantly from last year. HD/Bluetongue was found in 2 counties in east-central Mississippi. Samples were taken from hunter harvested and road killed deer for chronic wasting disease testing. No occurrence of the disease was found.

# 2005-2006 Regional Narratives

#### Southwest Written by: Chris McDonald

The 2005-2006 deer hunting season was effected by two environmental factors: hurricanes and drought. Two hurricanes passed through during the summer of 2005, Katrina during August and Rita during September. Katrina, by far, caused the most damage to timber and hard mast. Timber damage was substantial in the eastern portion of ths Region due to Hurricane Katrina. Hunting was physically challenging in areas where trees were down. The western portion of this Region suffered timber damage due to Katrina and Rita. However, in most cases, there was not enough damage to bring logging crews in to salvage downed timber.

Prior to the hurricanes, the acorn crop was good for both red and white oaks. Hurricane winds broke off many branches early, decreasing the amount of mature acorns available to hunt. The acorn crop was wiped out in many areas in the eastern portion of this Region due to Hurricane Katrina. The acorn crop was not damaged severely in the western portion of the Region.

Once the hurricanes passed, a large portion of this Region dodged a big bullet. Then drought set in. No measurable amount of rainfall was seen for approximately 2 months after the hurricanes. This affected both hard mast and food plots. The drought delayed the casting of acorns in a lot of areas. The drought caused some acorns to be smaller in size. Due to hurricanes and drought, the acorn crop for red and white oaks were considered fair.

Most food plots suffered due to drought. Many food plots received just enough moisture for germination. Bare ground was visible in most plots through November. Food plots did not grow well until January and February. Because of poor food plots, food plot hunters were not very successful.

Total deer harvest appeared to be lower for the 2005-2006 season compared to the 2004-2005 season. Hunters reported fewer deer observations due to poor food plots. DMAP clubs reported a 10% decrease in harvest. The percentage of 3.5+ year old bucks harvested by DMAP clubs during the 2005-2006 hunting season was 70%, consistent with the previous season.

Reports of hemorrhagic disease throughout the district were few in number once again. Samples were collected from hunter-harvested deer for chronic wasting disease testing, with no positive samples.

#### Southeast

#### Written by: Kathy Shelton and Russ Walsh

Thanks to Hurricane Katrina, the deer season in Southeast Mississippi was unusually slow in the 2005-2006 season. There was a 42% reduction in the overall harvest from last season. This included a 28% drop in buck harvest and a 53% drop in the antlerless harvest. This is a significant drop considering last years total harvest was down also. If you compare the 2005 harvest to the 2001 harvest, there was a 67% drop in harvest, with a 67% drop in bucks and a 68% drop in does.

Reported mandays for WMA's decreased by 35% this season. This was to be expected with the tremendous amount of damage caused by the storm. Many WMA's were virtually inaccessible due to downed trees. There was a 61% drop in the total deer harvested this year, with a 62% drop in bucks and a 60% drop in does. This is especially significant since last season's harvest was down due to the 12 inside spread rule adopted in Southeast Mississippi. When you compare the 2005 harvest to 2001, there was an 85% drop in buck harvest and a 78% drop in harvest of does. There was an 82% drop in the total harvest from 2001 to 2005. With the institution of the 12 inch inside spread rule in 2004 the % of harvested bucks 2.5 years or younger has dropped from 64% to 25%.

There were 33 clubs enrolled in DMAP this year, which was 7 less than last year and 15 less than the 2003 season. Part of this drop was most likely due to the reduction in the amount of land available to lease for hunting. Large landowners, like International Paper, sold off most, if not all, of their land in south Mississippi. Of the 33 clubs, 25 reported in this year. Three of those clubs reported no harvest at all due to the storms affects on their members or damage to the club lands. There was a 32% drop in the total harvest on DMAP clubs, with a 6% drop in bucks and a 50% drop in does. It was somewhat surprising that the drop in bucks was not more significant considering the change in harvest regulations this year.

This was the first year that Mississippi had 2 deer zones, with south Mississippi having a different season framework and different harvest restrictions. Most hunters liked the extended season in February which allowed them to hunt during more of the rut. No one seemed to mind giving up the first weeks of October since it's so hot and very little hunting took place then anyway. In addition to the change in season framework, a 10 inch inside spread or 13 inch minimum main beam length restriction was added to the 4 point rule already in place. This will help protect the majority of younger bucks. Despite the poor harvest this year it seems to be working. In 2001 76% of the bucks harvested were 2.5 years or younger. This season only 60% were 2.5 or younger. With time hunters should get better at estimating these limits and the number of younger bucks harvested will grow smaller.

The 2006 deer season should be a great improvement over this year. Most of the access issues should be solved so hunters can get in the woods, and can retrieve deer when they are harvested. The increased vegetation from all the timber harvest will really improve the nutrition available to the deer and the decreased harvest from this season means there will be more deer out there to harvest. While Katrina was devastating to the area, the future for deer hunters in south Mississippi looks bright.

# **Road Kill Survey Report** 2005-2006

DWFP personnel have monitored statewide deer road kill since January 1997. All dead deer Mobserved on or adjacent to roads and highways are recorded during the personnel's regular course of travel from October 1 - January 31. The cause of death of these animals is assumed to be a vehicle collision. The specific location by county is recorded for every deer observed. Personnel also record their monthly mileage. In the past these data were analyzed, and the average number of deer observed per 10,000 miles was calculated by district. However, with changing district lines and MDWFP personnel routinely traveling outside their home district we have changed this to a statewide average and not district averages.

Graphical monthly district summaries of these data are presented in Figure 3 and Table 2. The precise value and accuracy of this method of data collection have not been critically evaluated. No evaluation has been made to determine if number of vehicles on the highways has increased, decreased, or remained constant. Therefore, any inferences or interpretation of these data should be approached cautiously. Every effort has been made to standardize sampling protocol.

When these data are examined graphically, fluctuations over time are apparent. Certain assumptions may be logical. For example, an increase in observed deer vehicular related mortality is a result of an increase in deer activity. Data are currently collected from October – January. Activity peaked during the fall and winter around breeding seasons.

A second assumption is if deer numbers are fluctuating yearly and the number of deer observed is density dependent, then in lower population years, fewer deer will be observed. Conversely, during high population years, a greater number of deer will be observed. If this assumption is correct, deer populations increased during the 2005 -2006 season.

We also collect road-kill data from two outside sources: State Farm Insurance Company and The Mississippi Office of Highway Safety. According to State Farm's estimates there were 10,199 deer-vehicle collisions in 2004 - 2005 and 12,146 in 2005 - 2006. These estimates fit that same increasing trend from the MDWFP personnel's road-kill observations.

The data from State Farm has been projected for the whole insurance industry, based on State Farm's known auto insurance market share within each state. This data is based on actual comprehensive and collision claims, and as such, would not include deer-vehicle collisions where the policy

#### Road Kill Data By Month (In Deer Per 10k Miles) 2000-2006



Figure 4

6

holder had only liability insurance coverage (which is typically carried on older vehicles in some states).

Figure 4 shows GPS Data from Mississippi Uniform Crash Report Forms. Using the Kernel Density Function within the Spatial Analyst extension (ArcMap-ArcInfo) with data provided by the Mississippi Highway Patrol, we were able to show the high concentrations of deervehicle collisions throughout the state of Mississippi. The darker colors represent the areas of higher concentrations.

#### Table 2. Road Kill Data By Month (In Deer Per 10k Miles) 2000-2006

Month	2000-2001	2001-2002	2002-2003	2003-2004	2004-2005	2005-2006	Avg. all Years
October	7.2	6.7	6.3	5.9	6.6	6.5	6.5
November	6.4	6.4	8.1	8.6	7.3	9.2	7.6
December	6.8	7.6	5.9	10.4	10.1	13.0	8.5
January	7.6	8.1	8.3	8.3	9.5	11.2	8.7
Season Average	7.0	7.2	7.1	8.3	8.4	9.9	

# **Depredation By Deer**

**C**onservation officers annually deal with agricultural depredation by deer. Landowners who experience deer depredation problems are required to apply for a permit before any action is taken to harass or remove problem animals. The process for permit issuance includes an on-site evaluation by an MDWFP officer to verify the occurrence of depredation. Permits are issued primarily for agricultural damage, but ornamental vegetation is included. Miscellaneous problems such as deer on airport runways also occur and are handled on a case-by-case basis. Property owners should know that permits are not issued in every situation.

A total of 67 depredation permits were issued in 30 counties during 2005, which increased from 29 counties during 2004 (Figure 5). This increase can be attributed to rising deer populations in most of the state. Counties with the most depredation problems are the same counties with the most rapidly expanding deer populations. Cases of deer depredation included damage to soybeans, corn, cotton, peas, sweet potatoes, watermelons, turnip greens, peanuts, lettuce, numerous gardens and truck crops, flowers, pecan trees, pine seedlings, and interference on airports.

The preferred method of controlling deer depredation problems is adequate hunter harvest. This lowers the deer population to levels that are in balance with the environmental carrying capacity of the habitat. Normally this involves cooperation with adjoining landowners and hunting clubs.

Alternative direct methods used to solve depredation problems include scare or harassment tactics, assorted chemical applications, electric fencing, and traditional fencing at a height that eliminates deer access. High fencing around gardens and small problem areas is costly but provides assured control on a long-term basis with little or no maintenance.

In some instances, after other control measures have been exhausted, deer will be removed. This process seldom provides a long-term solution but is used in some problem situations.

Depredation problems will continue to occur in Mississippi as long as abundant deer populations exist. Extensive problems with agricultural depredation can be controlled with adequate antlerless harvest. Instances of urban depredation are increasing due to escalating deer numbers and urban sprawl. Urban deer problems are magnified in cities where bowhunting has been banned.



DEPREDATION

### **Chronic Wasting Disease**

Chronic wasting disease (CWD) is a progressively degenerative fatal disease that attacks the central nervous system of members of the deer family. To date it has been diagnosed in elk, mule deer, black-tailed deer, and white-tailed deer. CWD is one of a group of diseases known as transmissible spongiform encephalopathies (TSEs). These diseases are characterized as transmissible because they can be transmitted from one infected animal to another. They are further classified as spongiform due to the "spongy-like" areas which form in the brain of the infected animal, hence the encephalopathy portion of the name.

The scientific community generally accepts that the infectious agents of CWD are prions. Prions are abnormal proteins that seem to have the ability to alter the structure of normal proteins found in the body of the animal they enter. Logical natural methods of prion transmission include, but may not be limited to, secretions and excretions from infected animals. A new study conducted this past year at Colorado State University found that CWD can be transmitted experimentally from saliva and blood. Also, human activity contributes to environmental prion contamination. Prions are hideously durable and impervious to most disinfectants and natural conditions, remaining in the environment for years.

Animals suffering from CWD typically behave abnormally by separating themselves from their usual social group. They often stand alone, with a drooped posture, and may not respond to human presence. As the disease progresses they will appear very skinny on close examination and will salivate, drink, and urinate excessively.

The goal for the 2005 – 2006 monitoring period was to test approximately 1,500 deer statewide. Routine testing involved Mississippi hunters in this disease monitoring effort. Hunters throughout the state were asked to voluntarily submit the heads of harvested deer for CWD testing. Additionally samples were obtained from taxidermists and deer processing facilities. Most of these samples came from wildlife management areas, national wildlife refuges, and Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP) cooperators.

A total of 937 samples were taken from free-ranging white-tailed deer in Mississispipi during 2005 – 2006. Samples were obtained from hunter harvested animals, spring herd health evaluations, target animal surveillance, and road-killed animals. Samples were obtained from 69 counties (Figure 6). The samples were submitted to the Southeastern Cooperative Wildlife Disease Study at the University of Georgia following the 2005 – 2006 hunting season and 920 of those samples were tested for evidence of the CWD agent using immunohistochemistry. The remaining 17 samples were not tested because the containers did not contain testable specimens. Evidence of CWD was not detected in 918 of the tested samples and the remaining 2 results cannot be considered official test results, because the correct specimens for testing were not available.

The MDWFP, in cooperation with the Mississippi Board of Animal Health and the U.S. Department of Agriculture/Veterinary Services will continue target animal surveillance. A target profile animal is any adult cervid that is emaciated and shows some neurological disorder. These target animals should be reported to the local county conservation officer who has been trained to properly handle them and coordinate their transport to the appropriate laboratory for CWD testing. Most deer exhibiting symptoms of CWD are actually suffering from other conditions or diseases common to white-tailed deer in Mississippi. Malnutrition, hemorrhagic disease, brain abscesses, and other conditions may cause some of the same symptoms. However, due to the seriousness of CWD and the importance of early detection and control, it is necessary to test target animals for infection. The ability to diagnose disease is dependent on quick reporting because deer carcasses deteriorate rapidly in Mississippi's climate. In 1967 CWD was first recognized at a captive mule deer research facility in Colorado. A Wyoming research facility documented the disease in deer and elk in 1978. CWD was then documented in free-ranging deer in Colorado and Wyoming in the 1980s. Further testing from 1996 through the end of 2001 found additional positive animals (either captive or wild elk or deer) in Kansas, Nebraska, Montana, Oklahoma, South Dakota, and the Canadian provinces of Saskatchewan and Alberta. Then in February 2002 the first case was confirmed east of the Mississippi River in Wisconsin, in wild white-tailed deer. In 2004, CWD was found in New York and West Virginia. As of September 1, 2006, there are 11 states with CWD infected wild populations (Colorado, Illinois, Kansas, Nebraska, New Mexico, New York, South Dakota, Utah, Wisconsin, West Virginia, and Wyoming) and two Canadian provinces (Alberta and Saskatchewan). Additionally, CWD has been found in captive cervid populations in all of the above states as well as Minnesota, Montana, and Oklahoma.

All public health officials maintain that venison is safe for human consumption. However, hunters who wish to take additional steps to avoid potential unnecessary contact with prions or environmental contamination can do the following:

- Avoid shooting, handling, or consuming any animal that appears sick. Contact the MDWFP at 601-432-2400 if you see or harvest an animal that appears sick.
- Wear latex gloves when field dressing or processing deer.
- Avoid eating or contact with brain, spinal cord, spleen, lymph nodes, or eyes.
- Cut through the spinal cord only when removing the head. Use a knife designated solely for this purpose.
- Bone out meat to avoid cutting into or through bones. Remove all fat and connective tissue to avoid lymph nodes.
- Dispose of all carcass material, including the head, in a landfill or pit dug for carcass disposal purposes.
- Either process your animal individually or request that it be processed without adding meat from other animals.
- Disinfect knives and other processing equipment in a 50% bleach solution for a minimum of one hour.
- Discontinue baiting and feeding which unnaturally concentrate deer.

#### Deer With Chronic Wasting Disease from Wisconsin



2005-2006 Mississippi Deer Program Report

# **Chronic Wasting Disease**



# **Epizootic Hemorrhagic Disease**

emorrhagic Disease (HD), sometimes referred to as Epizootic Hemorrhagic Disease (EHD) or Bluetongue (BT), is considered the most important viral disease of white-tailed deer in the United States. Different subtypes of two closely related viruses cause HD: EHD and BT. Technically, there are five subtypes of the BT virus and two subtypes of the EHD virus. A distinguishable difference does not visually exist between these diseases, so wildlife managers normally group the symptoms into one category and refer to the condition as HD.

Biting midges of the genus Culicoides transmit HD; therefore the disease is seasonal, based on the abundance of the midge vectors. Normal occurrence of HD is late summer through fall (approximately late July – November). Deer that become infected with the HD virus may exhibit a variety of outward symptoms. Some mildly infected deer will exhibit few symptoms. Others which contract a more potent form of the virus will appear depressed, become feverish, have swollen areas around the head or neck, and may have trouble breathing. Still others, which become infected with a particularly potent form of the virus, can die within 1 to 3 days. Normal mortality rates from HD are usually less than 25 percent. However, rates greater than 50 percent of the population have been documented. On a brighter note, HD has destroyed no freeranging deer population.

HD is first suspected when unexplained deer mortality is observed in late summer or early fall. Typically, archery hunters who are scouting during late September are the first to observe carcasses in the woods. On some occasions HD deer are found dead during the late summer in or adjacent to water. The fever produced by the disease causes the sick deer to seek water. These deer subsequently succumb to the disease in creeks and ponds.

Hunters will most frequently encounter the evidence of HD while observing harvested deer during the winter months. During the high fever produced by HD, an interruption in hoof growth occurs. This growth interruption causes a distinctive ring around the hoof, which is readily identifiable on close examination. Hoof injury, as well as bacterial or fungal infection can cause a "damaged" appearance on a single hoof. HD is not considered unless involvement is noticed on two or more feet.

Fortunately, people are not at risk by HD. Handling infected deer or eating the venison from infected deer is not a public health factor. Even being bitten by the biting midge that is a carrier of the virus is not a cause of concern for humans. Deer, which develop bacterial infections or abscesses secondary to HD may not be suitable for consumption.

The case is not as clear regarding domestic livestock. A small percentage of BT infected cattle can become lame, have reproductive problems or develop sore mouths. Variations exist between BT and EHD virus infection in cattle and domestic sheep. Sheep are usually unaffected by EHD but can develop serious disease symptoms with the BT virus.

Occasionally overpopulation of the deer herd has been blamed for outbreaks of HD. Abnormally high deer populations are expected to have greater mortality rates simply because the deer are in sub-optimal condition. The spread of the virus would be expected to be greater in dense deer herds. However, an outbreak of HD cannot be directly attributed to an overpopulated deer herd.

HD can be diagnosed several ways. A reliable tentative diagnosis can be made after necropsy by a trained biologist or veterinarian. A confirmed diagnosis can only be made by isolating one of the viruses from refrigerated whole blood, spleen, lymph node, or lung from fresh a carcass.

MDWFP biologists have been monitoring the presence of HD in Mississippi by several methods: sudden, unexplained high deer mortality during late summer and early fall, necropsy diagnosis, isolation of EHD or BT virus, and the observation of hoof lesions on hunter-harvested deer. HD or previous HD exposure is always present in Mississippi deer herds. Previous HD exposure is good. Exposure yields antibodies to future outbreaks of the disease. Without the antibody presence significant mortality would occur.

The 2005 – 2006 season produced an extremely low HD occurrence. Evidence of HD was reported in only 19 counties during the 2005 – 2006 hunting season (Figure 7). Researchers have documented a distinctive 2 - 3 year cycle in HD outbreaks. Assuming that these cyclic outbreaks occur, we can expect a high occurrence of HD during the 2006 - 2007 hunting season.





Hoof Sloughing from EHD

# **Epizootic Hemorrhagic Disease**



# Mail Survey Data 2004-2005

#### **Resident Hunter Survey Results**

**S**urvey methods changed for the 2003 - 2004 season. All data Collected after this change, which includes the 2004 - 2005 data, must be looked at carefully. Total resident deer hunters by user group (gun, archery, and primitive weapons) are shown in Figure 8. An increase is apparent in archery and primitive weapon hunter numbers. These increases were considerably more than the decrease shown in gun hunter numbers, resulting in an increase in total hunter numbers by more than 1,800. More hunters persued white-tailed deer during the 2004 - 2005 season compared to the 2003 - 2004 season.

Deer hunting man-days by user group are shown in Figure 9. A longterm evaluation of hunter man-days reveals a declining trend that began in the mid 1980s. However, total man-days for gun, primitive, and archery hunters increased during the 2004 – 2005 season. These increases, along with the increase in total hunters, are a welcome change. Primitive weapons hunter man-days have followed an increasing trend since 1998. The combination of increased opportunity, the modernization of the in-line muzzleloader, and the ability to utilize magnified optics can likely explain this increasing trend in man-days. Archery man-days also show an increasing trend. Hunter numbers have remained constant for the past 2 years, but the remaining hunters are spending more days hunting, and many are choosing to hunt with methods other than modern firearms.

Total resident deer harvest for the 2004 - 2005 season is depicted in Figure 10. This graph includes the harvest of bucks and does from archery, primitive, and gun deer seasons. Total resident deer harvest increased by more than 6,700 compared to the 2003 - 2004 season. A balanced buck to doe harvest, also exhibited in Figure 10, can be directly attributed to continued antlerless opportunity offered on private lands.

Total resident harvest by method is shown in Figure 12. Archery and primitive weapon deer hunters harvested 28% of the total deer harvested and 36% of total does harvested. Archery and primitive weapon hunters harvested more does than bucks. Overall, a practically equal buck:doe harvest ratio occurred (Figure 11).

The percent of successful hunters increased for primitive weapon and gun hunters, but decreased for archery hunters. Additionally, the average seasonal harvest increased from 1.94 to 1.97 deer per hunter. The average hunter is harvesting about 2 deer annually. Fewer hunters are harvesting more deer, with less time expended. This would suggest an increasing deer population statewide.

#### **Non-Resident Hunter Survey Results**

 $N_{numbers}$  remained relatively stable compared to the 2003 - 2004 survey.

Non-resident harvest information is presented in Figure 14. Both buck and doe harvest decreased. Non-resident man-days by method are shown in Figure 15. Man-days decreased substantially for gun hunters, but increased slightly for archery and primitive weapon hunters. The decrease in harvest is a result of the decrease in man-days.

#### 2004-2005 Summary (Resident and Non-Resident Combined)

The total number of deer harvested increased by about 5,000 from the 2003 – 2004 season. A total of 147,876 deer hunters spent 3,024,123 man-days deer hunting and harvested 138,648 bucks and 143,803 does,

for a total of 282,450 deer. It took an average of 10.7 man-days per deer harvested. Hunters spent an average of 20 man-days hunting during the season.

#### Table 3. Mail Survey Summary for 2004-2005 Season

	Total Harvest		Total Numbers		Average Seasonal Harvest		Total Mandays		Percent Successful Hunters				
	Resident	Non- Resident	Total	Resident	Non- Resident	Total	Resident	Non- Resident	Resident	Non- Resident	Total	Resident	Non- Resident
Total Deer	255,732	26,718	282,450	129,780	18,096	147,876	1.97	1.48	2,759,020	265,103	3,024,123	72.1	67.2
Buck	125,750	12,898	138,648				0.97	0.71				54.2	48.1
Doe	129,982	13,821	143,803				1.00	0.76				50.6	45.3
Archery Total	30,632	3,336	33,968	35,871	4,542	40,413	0.85	0.73	404,947	39,816	444,763	50.0	50.8
Buck	9,472	763	10,235				0.26	0.17				19.7	15.2
Doe	21,160	2,572	23,732				0.59	0.57				41.0	41.8
Primitive Total	42,119	3,992	46,111	50,582	5,341	55,923	0.83	0.75	382,599	32,526	415,125	55.0	58.5
Buck	15,921	1,526	17,447				0.31	0.29				28.7	25.6
Doe	26,198	2,466	28,664				0.52	0.46				38.6	40.2
Gun Total	182,982	19,391	202,373	121,115	16,198	137,313	1.50	1.20	1,893,840	185,610	2,079,450	69.9	64.5
Buck	100,358	10,610	110,968				0.83	0.65				52.3	47.5
Doe	82,624	8,782	91,406				0.68	0.54				43.1	37.7

# Mail Survey Data 2004-2005



Mail Survey

#### Management Buck Tags

In 2003 – 2004, the first time since 1995, sub – 4 point bucks were legal for harvest during with sub – 4 point tags issued by biologists to DMAP cooperators on a limited basis for management purposes. In 2005 – 2006 this was expanded to include management bucks. Management buck tags were issued to DMAP cooperators which allowed the harvest of sub-optimal bucks. The management buck harvest criteria were for an individual property and were determined by the DMAP biologist. A written management justification issued by the MDWFP must accompany any request for such a permit. Management bucks harvested under this permit must be identified with a tag immediately upon possession. Antlered deer taken by permit are not subject to the annual bag limit on antlered deer.

Permits were issued to the following WMAs for the 2005 – 2006 season: Calhoun County, Copiah County, Hamer, Lake George, Leroy Percy, Mahannah, Malmaison, O'Keefe, Shipland, Stoneville, Sunflower, Twin Oaks, Upper Sardis, and Yockanookany. A total of 1,113 permits were issued to these WMAs and 41 of these permits were used.

Permits were issued to the following DMAP clubs for the 2004-2005 season: Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge, Coahoma County Conservation League, Ashbrook, Bledsoe, Riverside Farms, Casey Jones, Moore Farms, Big Black Wildlife, LLC, Clifton Plantation, Cameron Farms, Big River Farms, Box B, TCP, Deviney, Togo Island, Catfish Point, Black River, Burke, Ward Lake, Outback, Yates, Bozeman, Breakwater, Itta Bena, Horseshoe Lake, Pruitt, Wilkins Creek, Halifax, Red Gate, Gaddis Farms, Providence 2, Providence 1, White Oak, Spell, Barefoot, Deerfield Ass'n, Infolab, Crosscreek, Dancin Coyote, Woodstock, Atwood, Merigold, Deer Creek Timber, Canemount, Bush Bottom, Montgomery Farms, Triple Creek Game Club, Miller Point, Woodburn, Fairview, Black Bear, Jackson Point, Millpoint, Hartwood, Lockhardt Dalewood, Lake Forest Ranch, Duck Lake, Burl Branch, Arkabutla Lake, Brierfield, Paradise, Homewood, Palmyra, Rosedale, Chiefs, Goat Hill, Bellweather Plantation, Goose Valley Ranch, Melrose, Delta Wildlife, Choctaw, Willow Oak, A&B, Clanton Farms, Pinhook, Solitude, Palmer Farms, Walker Farms. A total of 1,149 permits were issued to these clubs and 561 of these permits were used.

The 2003 Noxubee National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) experiment suggested the 4-point law is negatively affecting Mississippi's deer herd. All deer, except spotted fawns, were legal for harvest on Noxubee NWR during the 2003-2004 season. Hunters were asked to restrain from harvesting yearling bucks with 4 or more points. Each hunter received a brochure describing how to identify yearling bucks with their permit.

# Table 4. Buck harvest resultsfor the 2003 Noxubee NationalWildlife Refuge experiment.

Buck Harvest			% Sub	0-4 pt	% <u>&gt;</u> 8 pts		
Buck Age	Avg. 1990-94	2003	Avg. 13 1990-94 2003		Avg. 1990-94	2003	
1.5	155.4	221	72	80	0	0	
2.5	48.0	54	9	15	38	25	
3.5	8.8	36	0	6	81	47	

This was the first chance at evaluating the long-term effects from the 4point law.

The harvest results for the 2003-2004 season are compared in Table 4 against the average harvest from 5 years before the 4-point law was in effect. Caution should be used when comparing these results because this is one year's data compared to a five-year average.

Some hunters refrained from harvesting yearling bucks with 4 or more points, but others did not. The number of yearling bucks with 4 or more points harvested during the 2003-2004 season was approximately equal to the previous years' yearling buck harvest. More harvested  $2\frac{1}{2}$  and  $3\frac{1}{2}$  year old bucks were 3 points or less during the 2003-2004 season compared to the 5-year average before the 4-point law. These deer were not reaching legal buck criteria under the 4-point law. The most alarming difference is the number of  $3\frac{1}{2}$  year old bucks with 8 points or more harvested in the 2003-2004 season. The percentage has significantly reduced, as more low quality yearling bucks were protected from harvest.

#### Fee Management Assistance Program

The Fee Management Assistance Program (FMAP) was implemented during the 1989-1990 season. It began as a pilot program in two north-central counties at the request of local conservation officers, in response to "We have too many does, how do we get a hold on them. Current season either-sex opportunity does not allow enough time to harvest our does." Under this program, doe tags were purchased for \$10 each at a rate of one per 50 acres. The landowner or club was required to show proof of ownership or hunting control. FMAP allowed the permittee to harvest antlerless deer in addition to the state bag limit. This program was accepted and quickly spread statewide. Sportsmen realized they could properly harvest does and still maintain a huntable number of deer.

Initially, a large number of permits were sold. However, liberalization of antlerless opportunity has occurred throughout the state. This has decreased the need for permits in most areas to the point of considering termination of the program. There were only 75 permits sold during the 2005-2006 hunting season.

Continuation of the program is recommended because it provides an opportunity to harvest antlerless deer in excess of the season bag limit on specific areas that are in excess of the environmental carrying capacity. This program is predominately used in portions of the state where antlerless harvest opportunity is limited.

#### **DMAP Antierless Tags**

The Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries, and Parks issues antlerless tags to DMAP clubs. This allows the harvest of antlerless deer in excess of the daily and seasonal bag limits. These tags have been issued since the implementation of DMAP. When antlerless seasons were liberalized statewide, the need for antlerless tags was reduced. However, some landowners and managers still have the need for more antlerless harvest than state bag limits allow.

Antlerless tags are issued by the Wildlife Technical Staff, based on an individual landowner's or manager's need. The tags can only be used on antlerless deer on the property to which they were issued.

The MDWFP technical staff issued 2,940 tags to 89 DMAP clubs in 2005-2006.

# **Antler Regulations**



### **Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP)**

hrough a cooperative research program with Mississippi State University in 1976, the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks gained information which provided biologists with the ability to evaluate population density relative to carrying capacity, using condition indicators rather than population estimates or browse surveys. This Cooperative Deer Management Assistance Program (DMAP) directly involved hunters in management through ( the collection of biological data. The interpretation of these data, in consultation with a biologist, is the guiding principle of DMAP. From a twocounty pilot project in its first year, DMAP grew steadily until participation peaked in 1994 at almost 1,200 cooperators with over 3.25 million acres under management.

Liberalized season structure and bag limits during the mid-1990's allowed land managers the flexibility to meet harvest objectives outside DMAP guidelines, which resulted in a decline in DMAP participation (Figure 18). This decline reduced both total acreage and number of cooperators in DMAP. Current enrollment includes 652 cooperators with 2.2 million acres. Total DMAP harvest has declined proportionally with the decline in cooperators and acreage in DMAP (Figure 19).

The ability to collect and analyze DMAP data has been exceptional. Hundreds of thousands of deer are now part of the statewide DMAP database. In excess of 10,000 deer have annually been available for comparative purposes since 1983. Analysis of these data over time captured the obvious trends and subtle changes in deer herd condition and structure. These trends and changes would have gone undocumented and possibly undetected without DMAP. and landowners Clubs participating in DMAP may or may not be representative of hunter goals and objectives on a statewide basis. Therefore, deer condition and herd structure on DMAP lands may not reflect herds on un-managed lands. However, a data source DMAP Cooperatives by County representing over 3 million acres is credible and can be used to examine trend data. The extensive statewide coverage of DMAP at the county level can be seen in Table 5.

All DMAP data are evaluated

based on soil region. These summaries allow individual DMAP cooperators to compare their data to soil region averages. In these tables are two sets of averages as well. The first is an average from 1991 - 1994

0

11

- 12

13 - 18

19 - 85

and the second is of the last five years (2001 - 2005). The 1991 – 1994 average is the four years prior to the 4-point law. Significant differences are obvious when comparing these averages.

SPECIAL NOTE: Beginning with the 2001 data, the MDWFP began using a new computer summary program (XtraNet). This may be the cause for drastic differences in some numbers. Once all of the historic data is entered into the XtraNet system the numbers are expected to fall along the same trend, thus eliminating the drastic drop currently observed in the graphs and tables. Additionally, all DMAP summary tables and graphs now include harvest reports from WMA's that collect deer harvest data.

ALCORN

LEE

ALDERDA R

PONTOTOC

NESHOR

JONES.

A significant trend in DMAP data is obvious. The average age of all harvested bucks has increased from 2.1 years old in 1991 to 3.0 years old in 2005 (Figure 21). In addition, these older age class bucks are being produced and harvested on a declining acreage base (Figure 22). Apparently, this acreage decline is stabilizing between 375 and 475 acres per harvested 31/2+ year old bucks. One possible reason for the drop in acres per  $3^{1/2}$  year old bucks between 2004 and 2005 is the more liberalized use of management buck tags which allowed DMAP properties to harvest sub-optimal adult bucks. In addition, the average spread, number of points, beam length, and circumference on all harvested bucks has increased proportionally.

The percentage of harvested bucks in the older age classes (41/2+) has increased as well (Figure 23). This increase is the result of a shift in buck selection by hunters from vounger age class bucks (11/2) vear olds) to older animals. Notice in the same graph, the corresponding decline in the percentage of younger age class bucks, which occur in the annual harvest. These are very evident when comparing the past 10 years to the 1991 - 1994 average.

Statewide condition data are presented in Table 8. This table presents trend data on various antler parameters such as spread, length, circumference, and points. Other information, such as weight and lactation data are also provided in this table.

Soil region condition data are presented in Tables 9-19. These tables also present trend data on various antler parameters such as spread, length, circumference, and

points. Other information, such as weight and lactation data are provided in these tables as well.

Figure 17
### **Mississippi DMAP Data**



Figure 19: DMAP Deer Harvest







Figure 22: Acres/3.5+ Bucks



### Figure 23: Percent Bucks by Age Class



DMAP

# Table 5. DMAP Participation and Harvest by CountyDuring 2005-2006

3

	s		ŀ	IARVES	Т		S		H	ARVES	T
COUNTY	<b>COOPERATORS</b>	ACRES	BUCKS	DOES	TOTAL	COUNTY	COOPERATORS	ACRES	BUCKS	DOES	TOTAL
Adams	20	71,703	415	366	781	Lincoln	1	3,642	16	24	40
Amite	6	24,179	120	181	301	Lowndes	10	24,248	77	143	220
Attala	10	37,078	226	213	439	Madison	13	38,888	190	492	682
Bolivar	9	45,040	252	378	630	Marion	6	32,169	79	167	246
Calhoun	2	12,288	59	43	102	Marshall	2	5,200	24	68	92
Carroll	18	50,404	300	382	682	Monroe	21	61,777	211	413	624
Chickasaw	1	28,000	16	22	38	Montgomery	9	27,685	204	190	394
Choctaw	5	31,800	47	63	110	Newton	6	12,998	35	64	99
Claiborne	54	91,769	811	1,051	1,862	Noxubee	18	57,566	273	414	687
Clarke	8	28,440	69	113	182	Oktibbeha	4	12,494	24	46	70
Clay	9	28,459	114	141	255	Panola	7	13,340	133	203	336
Coahoma	9	45,150	192	319	511	Pearl River	9	45,463	68	48	116
Copiah	10	29,778	134	225	359	Perry	5	49,300	45	29	74
Desoto	1	5,000	18	15	33	Prentiss	1	6,250	18	10	28
Franklin	4	32,585	50	57	107	Quitman	2	12,214	51	43	94
George	4	23,979	9	11	20	Rankin	4	8,498	37	50	87
Greene	4	10,652	23	23	46	Scott	7	40,477	42	89	131
Grenada	5	15,000	47	108	155	Sharkey	4	67,464	121	106	227
Hancock	1	5,880	3	0	3	Simpson	4	15,300	48	64	112
Harrison	1	1,400	0	0	0	Smith	2	9,175	53	38	91
Hinds	14	27,513	220	335	555	Stone	7	121,442	34	33	67
Holmes	15	26,174	122	202	324	Sunflower	2	4,085	3	13	16
Humphries	1	1,100	2	5	7	Tallahatchie	2	3,515	3	17	20
Issaquena	45	93,607	665	904	1,569	Tippah	5	21,430	98	138	236
Itawamba	4	37,000	114	93	207	Tishomingo	6	21,847	99	140	239
Jackson	4	35,510	22	25	47	Tunica	4	13,904	48	134	182
Jasper	9	43,078	87	124	211	Union	5	20,460	58	53	111
Jefferson	18	50,184	249	444	693	Walthall	2	9,510	30	24	54
Jeff Davis	1	2,000	6	12	18	Warren	85	139,216	1,024	1,250	2,274
Jones	1	35,000	8	7	15	Washington	8	34,868	239	347	586
Kemper	13	39,824	153	209	362	Wayne	1	11,500	2	1	3
Lafayette	7	57,741	179	319	498	Webster	1	7,000	31	30	61
Lamar	5	14,374	32	32	64	Wilkinson	14	38,584	209	261	470
Lauderdale	6	20,352	43	65	108	Winston	6	16,700	83	101	184
Lawrence	4	13,501	72	66	138	Yalobusha	1	4,872	23	32	55
Leake	4	8,035	33	61	94	Yazoo	26	59,324	317	471	788
Leflore	10	13,187	55	144	199	TOTAL	652	2,209,169	9,017	12,504	21,521

\* Counties not listed had no DMAP participation.

**Mississippi DMAP Data** Table 6. Harvest Summary of Bucks by Age Class

Season	Sample	0.5 Bu	cks	1.5 Bud	cks	2.5 Bu	cks	3.5 Bu	cks	4.5+ Bi	ucks	Ave. Age	Total	Acres/
3692011	Sample	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	ALL Bks	3.5+ Bks	3.5+ Bks
1991	17,850	1,250	7	8,392	47	5,280	30	2,200	12	677	4	2.1	2,877	960
1992	17,631	1,410	8	8,025	46	5,154	29	2,255	13	831	5	2.1	3,086	847
1993	18,585	1,301	7	8,527	46	5,488	30	2,489	13	852	5	2.1	3,341	740
1994	19,128	1,530	8	7,063	37	6,529	34	3,020	16	1,045	5	2.2	4,065	685
*1995*	14,650	1,172	8	3,391	23	5,503	38	3,367	23	1,187	8	2.5	4,554	560
1996	16,350	1,308	8	3,246	20	6,489	40	3,601	22	1,697	10	2.3	5,298	500
1997	14,405	1,296	9	2,737	19	5,474	38	3,601	25	1,585	11	2.4	5,186	456
1998	13,278	1,062	8	2,257	17	4,913	37	3,452	26	1,859	14	2.5	5,311	410
1999	12,336	864	7	1,727	14	4,441	36	3,577	29	1,850	15	2.5	5,428	393
+2000+	11,329	680	6	1,586	14	3,965	35	3,285	29	1,813	16	2.6	5,098	379
2001	10,639	426	4	1,277	12	3,511	33	3,192	30	2,021	19	2.7	5,213	457
2002	11,258	450	4	1,351	12	3,377	30	3,490	31	2,477	22	2.8	5,967	434
2003	10,729	429	4	1,502	14	2,897	27	3,326	31	2,468	23	2.8	5,794	449
2004	9,973	299	3	1,097	11	2,792	28	3,291	33	2,394	24	2.9	5,685	450
2005	9,017	361	4	1,082	12	2,074	23	3,066	34	2,344	26	3.0	5,410	389

 Table 7. Harvest Summary of Antierless Deer by Age Class

Season	Sample	0.5 Buc	ks	0.5 Do	es	1.5 Do	es	2.5 Do	es	3.5+ D	oes	Ave. Age
36a5011	Sample	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	#	%	ALL Does
1991	16,995	1,301	8	1,828	11	3,392	20	3,913	23	5,922	35	2.4
1992	16,870	1,366	8	1,897	11	3,634	22	3,434	20	6,539	39	2.4
1993	20,481	1,218	6	1,827	9	4,756	23	4,352	21	8,328	41	2.4
1994	23,330	1,470	6	2,339	10	4,769	20	5,353	23	9,399	40	2.5
*1995*	25,997	1,187	5	2,691	10	5,903	23	5,599	22	10,619	41	2.4
1996	23,410	1,171	5	2,341	10	5,150	22	5,150	22	9,598	41	2.5
1997	21,763	1,088	5	2,176	10	4,788	22	4,570	21	9,140	42	2.5
1998	17,601	704	4	1,584	9	3,872	22	3,696	21	7,744	44	2.6
1999	16,288	652	4	1,466	9	3,420	21	3,746	23	7,004	43	2.6
+2000+	15,228	457	3	1,066	7	3,350	22	3,350	22	7,005	46	2.7
2001	13,451	390	3	713	5	3,040	23	3,242	24	5,959	44	2.7
2002	14,305	386	3	916	6	3,018	21	3,448	24	6,723	47	2.7
2003	15,034	361	2	917	6	3,398	23	3,623	24	7,021	47	2.8
2004	14,536	334	2	974	7	3,096	21	3,503	24	6,628	46	2.7
2005	12,505	375	3	875	7	2,376	19	2,751	22	6,127	49	2.8

\*1995\* Four points or better law initiated and bag limit changed from 5 bucks and 3 antlerless to 3 bucks and 5 antlerless with DMAP and FMAP participants exempt from the annual bag limit - 2 additional antlerless may be taken with archery equipment Bag limit changed to 3 bucks and 3 antlerless with DMAP and FMAP participants exempt from the annual bag limit, 2 additional antlerless may be

+2000+ taken with archery equipment. Four points or better law remain in effect.

### Table 8. Statewide Compiled DMAP Data

100

						3	1	5				
					Sea	ason					Ave	rage
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	2,209,169	2,449,023	2,495,724	2,451,528	2,297,401	2,602,586	2,662,032	2,748,231	2,857,272	2,862,720	3,105,186	2,381,167
Total Deer	21,522	24,509	25,763	25,563	24,090	26,557	28,624	30,879		39,760	39,138	24,289
Bucks	9,017	9,973	10,729			-	12,336				,	,
Does	12,505	14,536	15,034	14,305			16,288		21,763			
Acres/Deer	103	100	97	96			93				79.5	
Bucks	245	246	233	218			216		198	175		
Does	177	168	166		171		163	156		122	160	
Avg Age ALL Bucks	3.0	2.9	2.8	2.8			2.9	2.9		2.6		
Avg Points ALL Bucks	7.2	7.2	7.1	7.3			6.6	6.3		6.0	4.8	
Avg Length ALL Bucks Avg Spread ALL Bucks	16.5	16.4	16.0 13.0	16.0			14.2 11.6	13.5		12.9		
Avg Spread ALL Bucks Acres/3.5+ Bucks	13.5 389	13.4 450	449	13.0 434			393	11.0 410				
% 0.5 Yr Bucks	309	450	449				595	410		8		
Weight*	4 76	4	71	75		-	63	64	62	63	63	
%1.5 Yr.	12	11	14	12								
Weight*	115	112	111	118			118	115			115	
Points	3.1	3.4	3.6			4.4	4.5	4.1	4.3		3.2	
Circumf.	2.2	2.3	2.3	2.5			2.5	2.4		2.4	2.2	
Length	6.7	7.2	7.4	9.0			8.7	8.2		8.4	6.8	
Spread	6.4	6.7	6.6				7.4	7.2		7.1	6.0	
%2.5 Yr.	23	28	27	30	34	35	36	36	37	40	31	
Weight*	149	149	148	150	145	147	149	146	149	149	148	148
Points	6.9	6.8	6.8	7.0	6.9	6.9	7.0	6.8	7.0	6.8	6.6	6.9
Circumf.	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4
Length	14.6	14.5	14.4	14.7	14.3		14.5	14.1	14.4	14.2	14.0	
Spread	11.9	12.0	11.7	11.9			11.9	11.5		11.5		
%3.5 Yr.	34	33	31	31	30		28	26		22	14	
Weight*	170	169	172	169			170	165			163	
Points	7.7	7.7	7.8				7.9	7.8				
Circumf.	4.0	4.0	4.0				4.0	3.9			3.9	
Length	17.5	17.3										
Spread	14.1 26	14.0 24		13.9 22			14.2 14					
%4.5+ Yr. Weight*	26 184	24 185					14					
Points	8.4	8.3									8.1	8.3
Circumf.	4.5	4.5	4.5				4.5					
Length	19.6	4.3	4.3	19.5								
Spread	15.6	15.7	15.6									
#4.5 Yr.	1551	1459	1511				1183					
Weight*	181	183	184				182	176				
Points	8.3	8.2	8.2			1				8.0		
Circumf.	4.4	4.4	4.4	4.4		1	4.4	4.3				
Length	19.2	19.4						18.7				
Spread	15.4	15.6										

State-wide DMAP

Charles .

9:

			1999		Sea	son					Ave	rage
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
#5.5 Yr.	590	530	576	579	467	395	372	339	334	289	151	548
Weight*	187	189	190	186	185	186	185	181	180	178	174	186
Points	8.5	8.5	8.4	8.5	8.5	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.3	8.2	7.9	8.5
Circumf.	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.4	4.6
Length	20.2	20.2	20.2	20.0	20.1	19.9	20.1	19.6	19.7	19.3	18.9	20.1
Spread	16.0	16.0	16.0	15.9	15.9	15.9	15.8	15.4	15.9	15.3	15.1	15.9
#6.5 Yr.	212	194	202	146	159	125	112	118	85	93	44	183
Weight*	190	192	191	191	187	186	187	182	178	176	176	188
Points	8.5	8.2	8.4	8.4	8.3	8.6	8.5	8.7	8.5	8.2	8.3	8.4
Circumf.	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.7
Length	20.7	20.4	20.5	20.6	20.6	20.4	19.9	20.1	19.9	19.3	19.4	20.4
Spread	16.3	16.1	15.9	16.4	16.3	16.1	16.0	15.7	15.9	15.6	15.2	16.1
#7.5 Yr.	74	67	71	45	63	39	48	35	35	25	18	
Weight*	191	189	190	192	183	187	189	185	170	186	168	187
Points	8.4	8.7	8.3	8.6	9.0	8.1	8.6	8.5	8.2	7.8	7.4	8.4
Circumf.	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	4.9	4.3	4.5	4.7	4.4	4.7
Length	20.4	20.8	20.5	20.2	20.0	20.6	19.8	20.2	19.2	19.5	18.3	20.3
Spread	15.9	16.6	16.6	15.3	15.8	16.2	15.8	15.8	15.2	15.2	15.0	16.0
#8.5+ Yr.	44 195	27 183	36 186	44 180	36 190	29 183	23 179	13 191	18 173	17 177	11 171	37 184
Weight* Points	7.9	8.0	8.1	8.0	8.4	7.4	9.1	10.5	8.5	8.0	7.5	8.2
Circumf.	4.4	4.5	4.7	4.6	0.4 4.7	4.5	9.1	5.3	4.6	4.5	4.3	4.6
Length	19.8	18.6	19.3	20.1	19.5	19.6	20.4	21.5	19.5	18.4	18.5	19.6
Spread	15.5	15.0	15.2	15.7	15.2	16.5	16.4	16.8	16.2	14.8	14.4	15.6
Doe Age Classes	10.0	10.0	10.2	10.1	10.2	10.0	10.1	10.0	10.2	1110		10.0
%0.5 Yr	7	7	6	6	5	7	10	10	11	11	13	6
%1.5 Yr	20	22	23	21	23	23	22	23	23	23	59	22
%2.5 Yr	22	24	22	23	25	23	24	22	23	23	66	23
%3.5+ Yr	51	46	47	47	45	47	45	45	44	43	70	47
Doe Weights												
*Weight 0.5 Yr	66	64	67	66	64	63	62	63	61	61	11	63
*Weight 1.5 Yr	97	96	96	99	97	96	96	95	95	96	23	96
*Weight 2.5 Yr	111	109	108	110	108	107	108	107	107	108	24	
*Weight 3.5+ Yr	117	115	116	116	117	114	115	113	113	114	42	115
% Doe Lactation												
1.5 Yr	13	11	10	12	10	12	13	12	13	14	60	13
2.5 Yr	57	56	56	58	58	61	64	59	58	60	96	
2.5+ Yr	66	63	64	65	66	68	71	68	67	67	108	67
3.5+ Yr	70	67	68	69	70	72	75	73	71	70	115	71
All Antierless H'vst	0	0	0	0	0	3	4	4	5	5	7	0
%0.5 Yr Bk Fawns	3	2	2	3	3 5	3	4	4	5	5	10	3
%0.5 Yr Doe Fawns	19	21	23	0 21	5 23	22	9 21	9 22	22	22	22	21
%1.5 Yr Does %2.5 Yr Does	22	21	23	21	23	22	21	22	22	22	22	21
%2.5 Yr Does %3.5+ Yr Does	49	24 46	47	47	24 44	46	23 43	44	42	41	39	
700.0+ 11 DUUS	49	40	4/	47	44	40	43	44	42	41	39	4/

3



Figure 24

### Table 9. Batture Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data** 185

0

				- D	Sea	son					Δνε	rage
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	230,732	220,393	216,833	225,577	207,187	178,239	171,795	173,182	156,481	164,791	172,527	220,144
Total Deer	3,989	3,909	4,369	4,543	4,073	3,191	2,950	2,933	2,752	2,777	2,906	4,177
Bucks	1,603	1,502	1,790	1,850	1,530	1,300	1,308	1,444	1,288	1,340	1,449	1,655
Does	2,386	2,407	2,579	2,693	2,543	1,891	1,642	1,489	1,464	1,437	1,457	2,522
Acres/Deer	58	56	50	50	51	56	58	59	57	59	60	53
Bucks	144	147	121	122	135	137	131	120	121	123	119	134
3.5+ Bucks	183	193	161	183	215	232	239	240	283	362	693	187
Does	97	92	84	84	81	94	105	116	107	115	120	88
Avg Age ALL Bucks	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.2	3.1	3.3	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	3.3
%0.5 Yr Bucks	2	3	4	3	4	7	5	5	5	5	6	3.1
Weight*	68	72	84	77	65	70	70	74	67	71	73	73
%1.5 Yr	6	5	5	5	9	7	6	9	8	9	28	6
Weight*	115	117	112	119	9 115	130	129	127	123	131	134	116
Points	2.2	2.4	2.6	3.2	2.9	4.4	4.4	4.0	3.4	4.7	3.9	2.7
Circumf.	2.2	2.4	2.0	2.4	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.5	2.4	2.8	2.4	2.7
Length	5.0	5.7	5.8	6.2	6.8	9.2	<u>2.0</u> 9.5	2.5	6.6	<u>2.0</u> 9.8	8.2	5.9
Spread	5.4	6.0	6.1	6.4	7.1	8.7	8.6	7.9	7.1	8.4	7.1	6.2
%2.5 Yr.	16	15	14	21	24	27	34	36	44	52	49	18
Weight*	160	165	14	166	164	168	167	165	44 166	168	169	164
Points	7.3	7.4	7.8	7.7	7.7	7.7	7.8	7.6	7.7	7.7	7.5	7.6
Circumf.	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.5	3.7
Length	16.4	16.8	16.8	16.5	16.4	16.7	16.8	16.2	16.1	16.3	15.5	16.6
Spread	13.3	13.7	13.7	13.6	13.4	13.7	13.7	13.4	13.5	13.2	13.0	13.6
%3.5 Yr.	35	35	39	38	36	35	36	32	30	23	13.0	37
Weight*	184	185	187	30 184	183	188	189	185	187	190	187	185
Points	8.2	8.2	8.3	8.3	8.3	8.5	8.5		8.3		8.2	8.2
Circumf.	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.2	<u> </u>	4.3	8.4 4.3	<u> </u>	8.5 4.3	4.2	4.3
Length	19.7	19.5	19.5	19.0	19.0	19.9	19.9	19.3	18.8	19.6	18.7	19.4
Spread	15.7	15.8	15.6	15.3	15.4	16.2	16.1	19.5	15.5	15.7	15.4	15.6
%4.5+ Yr.	40	42	37	32	27	24	19	18	13.3	11	13.4	35
Weight*	191	193	195	194	192	24	19	193	198	200	198	193
Points	8.5	8.4	8.5	8.5	8.4	8.5	8.6	8.7	8.5	8.5	8.5	8.5
Circumf.	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.6
Length	21.1	20.9	20.8	20.5		21.4	20.9	21.0	20.6	20.9	20.8	20.8
Spread	16.5	16.7	16.6	16.4	16.4	17.1	17.0	16.8	16.7	16.6	16.8	16.5
% Doe Lactation	10.0	10.7	10.0	10.4	10.4	17.1	17.0	10.0	10.7	10.0	10.0	10.0
1.5 Yr	7	7	11	6	8	10	11	10	11	12	14	8
2.5 Yr	50	59	55	47	57	63	70	51	48	60	58	54
3.5+ Yr	67	68	63	59	65	77	70	63	65	68	68	64
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	6	6	8	6	6	9	11	10	9	10	11	6
%1.5 Yr	19	22	18	21	24	24	18	19	21	21	20	21
%2.5 Yr	27	25	27	31	30	25	28	27	28	32	30	28
%3.5+ Yr	48	47	47	42	40	42	43	44	42	37	39	45
Doe Weights*												
0.5 Yr	67	66	68	69	64	67	68	67	66	66	68	67
1.5 Yr	98	98	101	100	98	104	106	101	104	104	108	99
2.5 Yr	114	112	112	115	114	115	114	115	118	118	121	113
3.5+ Yr	121	119	122	122	121	123	124	122	125	125	126	121

### Table 10. Delta Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data**

123

						0.00						
					Sea						Ave	
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	272,679	307,042	278,865	279,421	240,653	178,239	269,772	256,237	240,360	264,939	254,153	275,732
Total Deer	2,297	2,778	3,052	2,928	2,652	3,476	3,503	3,393	3,632	4,827	3,909	2,741
Bucks	1,008	1,146	1,237	1,341	1,096	1,360	1,469	1,467	1,364	1,793	1,830	1,166
Does	1,289	1,632	1,815	1,587	1,556	2,116	2,034	1,926	2,268	3,034	1,457	1,576
Acres/Deer	119	111	91	95	91	84	77	76	66	55	66	101
Bucks	271	268	225	208	220	215	184	175	176	148	140	238
3.5+ Bucks	328	426	375	395	432	243	375	416	503	568	962	391
Does	212	188	154	176	155	138	133	133	106	87	124	177
Avg Age ALL Bucks	3.2	3.2	3.1	3.0	2.9	3.1	3.0	2.9	2.7	2.5	2.1	3.1
%0.5 Yr Bucks	3	3	4	3	5	5	5	5	7	9	8	3.6
Weight*	77	73	68	75	67	69	73	65	66	68	70	71.8
%1.5 Yr	8	5	8	5	8	9	12	13	12	14	41	7
Weight*	123	127	123	133	120	134	135	131	126	129	134	125
Points	2.4	3.4	3.3	4.2	3.8	4.1	5.0	4.2	4.3	3.9	3.5	3.4
Circumf.	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.6	2.3	2.4	2.7	2.5	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.4
Length	5.1	7.1	7.9	9.0	6.5	8.1	9.2	8.8	7.8	7.1	7.3	7.1
Spread	5.3	7.0	6.9	8.3	7.8	7.8	7.9	7.6	7.2	6.5	6.4	7.1
%2.5 Yr.	16	24	23	28	28	32	34	40	46	51	36	24
Weight*	170	174	174	170	164	167	168	167	163	167	169	170
Points	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.3	7.4	7.4	7.8	7.5	7.2	7.4	7.3	7.5
Circumf.	3.6	3.8	3.8	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.5	3.6
Length	16.6	16.9	16.5	15.7	15.6	15.6	15.8	15.3	14.8	15.1	15.1	16.3
Spread	13.6	14.2	13.5	13.0	12.9	13.1	13.2	13.0	12.7	12.6	12.8	13.5
%3.5 Yr.	38	35	36	37	33	36	33	28	26	20	12	36
Weight*	188	189	190	186	183	191	191	187	184	190	187	187
Points	8.1	8.3	8.2	7.9	8.1	8.2	8.2	8.3	8.2	8.2	8.1	8.1
Circumf.	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.0	4.0	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.2
Length	18.9	19.0	18.9	18.2	18.4	19.0	18.6	18.4	18.2	18.7	18.0	18.7
Spread	15.5	15.6	15.1	14.8	14.8	15.6	15.5	15.2	14.8	15.1	14.9	15.2
%4.5+ Yr.	34	32	30	26	25	18	16	14	9	6	4	29
Weight*	198	197	199	196	198	204	202	200	197	203	197	198
Points	8.6	8.6	8.4	8.3	8.4	8.5	8.8	8.4	8.9	8.5	8.4	8.5
Circumf.	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.4	4.6	4.6	4.4	4.5	4.6	4.4	4.5
Length	20.7	20.9	20.3	20.0	20.2	21.0		20.2	20.3	20.3	19.5	20.4
Spread	16.6	16.7	15.9	16.1	16.0	17.0	16.6	16.1	16.3	16.2	15.8	16.3
% Doe Lactation				-								
1.5 Yr	14	12	10	12	13	20	18	14	13	17	16	12
2.5 Yr	59	59	57	59	57	68	70	59	59	64	58	58
3.5+ Yr	68	65	68	68	68	76	78	70	69	73	71	67
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	7	9	7	6	6	8	10	9	9	10	12	7
%1.5 Yr	18	21	24	21	23	22	20	22	22	21	21	21
%2.5 Yr	25	26	23	25	25	23	23	25	29	29	27	25
%3.5+ Yr	50	43	44	46	45	47	47	44	40	40	41	46
Doe Weights*												
0.5 Yr	71	66	72	73	70	70	69	67	68	66	66	70
1.5 Yr	104	103	105	106	103	107	107	103	104	105	109	104
2.5 Yr	119	116	119	119	116	117	117	116	117	120	121	118
3.5+ Yr	125	124	126	126	124	124	123	121	125	127	129	125

### Table 11. Upper Thick Loess Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data 100.7

0

				20	Sea	son					Δνε	rage
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	256,412	244,106	255,043	245,085	236,886	196,733	234,944	245,798	268,894	243,570	210,775	247,506
Total Deer	4,251	3,879	4,009	3,635	3,680	2,909	3,722	3,596	4,268	4,024	2,732	3,891
Bucks	1,664	1,519	1,529	1,441	1,404	1,142	1,509	1,466	4,200	1,519	1,443	1,511
Does	2,587	2,360	2,480	2,194	2,276	1,767	2,213	2,130	2,577	2,505	1,443	2,379
Acres/Deer	2,387	2,300	2,460	2,194	2,270	68	63	2,130	2,377	2,505	78	2,379
Bucks	154	161	167	170	169	172	155	168	159	160	146	164
3.5+ Bucks	275	282	296	315	344	392	399	493	468	594	140	302
Does	99	103	103	112	104	111	106	493	104	97	169	104
Avg Age ALL Bucks												
%0.5 Yr Bucks	2.8 6	2.8	2.9 5	2.8 5	2.8 6	2.9 6	3.2 8	3.1 9	2.9 8	2.8 9	2.4 7	2.8 5.1
Weight*	69	70	75	69	70	69	69	68	68	72	72	70.6
-												
%1.5 Yr	16	15	12	10	11	12	17	17	20	24	53	13
Weight*	117	114	113	125	120	121	128	129	131	131	132	118
Points	2.5	2.6	2.8	4.4	3.6	4.2	4.4	4.4	4.5	4.8	3.9	3.2
Circumf.	2.1	2.0	2.2	2.5	2.3	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.2
Length	5.5	5.7	6.0	8.5	7.5	8.2	8.8	8.6	9.1	9.3	8.1	6.7
Spread	5.4	5.4	5.9	7.3	7.3	7.6	7.7	7.7	7.6	7.9	6.9	6.2
%2.5 Yr.	24	25	23	30	32	38	36	40	38	40	28	27
Weight*	156	155	154	160	154	156	161	160	161	162	163	156
Points	7.0	7.0	7.2	7.3	7.3	7.2	7.3	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.0	7.1
Circumf.	3.5	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.6	3.5	3.5	3.5
Length	15.2	14.8	15.0	15.2	14.8	14.8	15.1	14.7	15.1	14.9	14.9	15.0
Spread	12.4	12.5	12.6	12.5	12.2	12.2	12.6	12.3	12.6	12.4	12.5	12.4
%3.5 Yr.	33	33	34	33	31	31	28	27	25	21	11	33
Weight*	178	176	179	176	173	179	186	185	186	182	190	176
Points	8.0	7.8	8.0	8.0	7.9	8.2	8.3	8.1	8.2	7.9	8.1	7.9
Circumf.	4.3	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.3	4.1
Length	18.0	17.8	18.1	17.6	17.4	17.9	18.2	18.6	18.6	18.1	18.6	17.8
Spread	14.7	14.3	14.7	14.4	14.2	14.5	14.9	15.0	15.2	14.9	15.3	14.5
%4.5+ Yr.	21	22	25	22	20	13	11	7	9	6	2	22
Weight*	189	189	192	194	189	193	201	200	195	204	211	191
Points	8.5	8.2	8.2	8.3	8.3	8.6	8.8	8.6	8.2	8.2	8.6	8.3
Circumf.	4.6	4.6	4.7	4.6	4.5	4.6	4.8	4.7	4.7	4.8	5.0	4.6
Length	19.7	19.9	19.9	19.8	19.6	20.3	20.4	20.5	20.4	20.4	21.1	19.8
Spread	15.9	16.0	15.8	16.0	15.8	16.1	16.3	16.2	16.7	16.2	17.1	15.9
% Doe Lactation												
1.5 Yr	12	11	10	13	8	11	13	13	9	13	12	11
2.5 Yr	59	55	55	66	61	64	64	61	57	54	60	59
3.5+ Yr	73	67	66	70	70	72	77	70	67	67	66	69
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	7	7	7	7	6	6	10	11	11	13	12	7
%1.5 Yr	19	20	22	19	21	24	22	23	22	24	23	20
%2.5 Yr	22	24	20	22	22	22	25	23	21	22	25	22
%3.5+ Yr	52	49	51	51	51	48	43	43	46	41	41	51
Doe Weights*												
0.5 Yr	66	65	68	65	66	64	66	69	67	69	66	66
1.5 Yr	103	100	100	106	103	103	104	104	105	107	107	102
2.5 Yr	115	114	114	115	114	115	117	116	118	117	120	115
3.5+ Yr	122	120	122	122	123	122	125	124	126	126	128	122

### Table 12. Lower Thick Loess Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data** - 00

10

					Sea	son					Ave	rade
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	141,119	150,935	161,695	153,635	148,830	166,906	193,570	211,427	226,654	221,544	233,912	151,243
Total Deer	2,306	2,700	2,894	2,854	2,721	3,022	3,515	4,299	4,943	5,646	6,077	2,695
Bucks	1,058	1,132	1,121	1,212	1,239	1,252	1,407	1,871	1,783	2,297	2,776	1,152
Does	1,248	1,568	1,773	1,642	1,482	1,730	2,108	2,458	3,160	3,349	1,457	1,543
Acres/Deer	61	56	56	54	55	55	55	50	46	39	39	56
Bucks	133	133	144	127	120	129	138	116	127	96	84	131
3.5+ Bucks	226	207	259	221	244	284	313	276	318	268	417	231
Does	113	96	91	94	100	96	92	87	72	66	73	99
Avg Age ALL Bucks	3.1	3.1	3.0	3.0	2.8	3.0	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	3.0
%0.5 Yr Bucks	6	3	2	3	3	5	7	5	7	8	7	3.3
Weight*	109	63	65	67	70	66	61	67	58	64	63	74.9
%1.5 Yr	9	9	10	9	12	14	14	15	18	14	34	10
Weight*	111	108	113	121	113	111	119	113	116	121	117	113
Points	3.2	3.1	3.5	4.3	3.6	3.6	3.8	3.3	4.1	3.8	3.1	3.6
Circumf.	2.2	2.2	2.4	2.6	2.4	2.2	2.4	2.3	2.3	2.5	2.2	2.4
Length	6.5	6.5	7.1	9.1	7.7	6.0	7.0	6.4	7.5	8.1	6.5	7.4
Spread	6.3	6.2	6.8	7.8	7.1	6.3	6.7	6.5	6.8	7.1	6.0	6.8
%2.5 Yr.	19	23	30	28	30	34	35	39	35	42	38	26
Weight*	148	145	151	149	148	150	149	146	149	153	151	148
Points	7.2	6.8	7.2	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.0	6.8	7.0	7.1	6.9	7.1
Circumf.	3.5	3.3	3.5	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.4	3.5	3.4	3.5
Length	14.7	13.9	14.5	14.6	14.1	14.3	14.2	13.8	14.1	14.4	14.3	14.4
Spread	12.0	11.8	11.9	11.9	11.2	11.6	11.6	11.2	11.6	11.7	11.8	11.8
%3.5 Yr.	35	35	26	30	29	27	26	23	22	20	16	31
Weight*	166	165	169	168	164	170	168	166	163	166	169	166
Points	8.0	7.7	7.9	8.0	7.7	8.0	7.9	7.7	7.9	7.9	7.9	7.9
Circumf.	4.0	3.9	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.0	4.0	3.9	3.9	4.0	4.0	4.0
Length	17.3	17.2	17.3	17.1	16.8	17.3	17.2	16.8	16.8	16.8	17.1	17.1
Spread	14.0	13.6	13.8	13.7	13.6	14.0	13.7	13.5	13.7	13.4	13.8	13.7
%4.5+ Yr.	31	29	31	28	23	20	18	18	18	16	5	28
Weight*	182	182	185	184	183	184	186	181	180	181	182	183
Points	9.0	8.5	8.5	8.7	8.4	8.6	8.5	8.6	8.6	8.3	8.4	8.6
Circumf.	4.6	4.4	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.6	4.6	4.5	4.5
Length	19.3	19.3	20.0	19.6	19.2	19.9	19.5		19.6	19.1	19.5	19.5
Spread	15.2	15.3	15.5	15.5	15.4	15.6	15.5	15.1	15.7	15.2	15.4	15.4
% Doe Lactation												
1.5 Yr	8	8	6	12	10	8	11	7	11	9	9	9
2.5 Yr	61	51	59	64	58	62	62	53	56	60	60	59
3.5+ Yr	76	65	73	75	74	72	78	71	70	73	72	73
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	7	6	5	4	4	7	9	9	11	11	10	5
%1.5 Yr	20	24	25	22	23	24	21	25	23	21	24	23
%2.5 Yr	22	22	19	19	21	23	19	21	20	23	25	21
%3.5+ Yr	50	48	49	50	48	48	51	45	46	45	42	49
Doe Weights*				07			<u>.</u>					
0.5 Yr	66	62	64	67	66	63	61	64	59	60	60	65
1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr	96	94	96	101	98	96	96	96	96	100	97	97
	111	109	111	110	111	112	110	109	109	109	111	110
3.5+ Yr	117	117	117	116	117	117	116	117	116	117	118	117

### Table 13. Upper Thin Loess Soil Resource Area Summary of DMAP Data A.

0

				- 20	Sea	con					Ave	200
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	aye 01-05
Aaroo												
Acres Total Deer	89,048	186,374	188,073	193,902	171,215	181,754	187,806	211,555	206,051	216,860	221,531	165,722
Bucks	1,269	2,086	2,029	1,974	1,818	2,020	2,459	2,757	2,993	3,568	3,045	1,835
Does	528	906	860	935	890	999	1,004	1,145	1,247	1,404	1,656	824
	741 70	1,180 89	1,169	1,039 98	928 94	1,021 90	1,455	1,612	1,746	2,161	1,457	1,011
Acres/Deer Bucks	169	206	93 219	98 207	94 192	90 182	76 187	77 185	69 165	61 154	73 134	89 199
3.5+ Bucks	228	450	492	539	422	520	567	596	551	572	1365	426
Does	120	158	161	187	422	178	129	131	118	100	163	420
Avg Age ALL Bucks												
	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.4	2.6	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	2.5
%0.5 Yr Bucks Weight*	7 66	3 62	4 66	7 97	3 66	4	6 62	9 63	9 63	10 63	7 63	4.9
-						58						71.3
%1.5 Yr	19	15	21	23	15	15	16	23	21	21	52	19
Weight*	116	115	118	121	117	116	118	116	116	117	112	117
Points Circumf.	3.5	3.8	4.1	4.6	4.1	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.3	3.2	4.0
Length	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.5	2.3	2.5	2.3	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.4
Spread	7.3	7.3	8.3	9.2	7.9	8.5	8.3	8.4	8.4	8.2	6.7	8.0
	6.9	6.9	7.2	7.7	7.1	7.2	7.1	7.1	7.1	7.0	5.8	7.2
%2.5 Yr.	26	31	28	30	34	47	45	37	40	42	31	30
Weight* Points	145	144	148	147	147	142	145	144	144	144	144	146
Circumf.	6.5	6.5	6.4	6.6	6.7	6.6	6.8	6.7	6.9	6.4	6.5	6.5
Length	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.4
Spread	13.9 11.2	13.7 11.1	<u>13.9</u> 11.5	14.0 11.4	14.0 11.7	13.8	14.4 11.7	13.9 11.2	14.0 11.5	13.5	13.6	13.9 11.4
%3.5 Yr.						11.3				11.1	11.0	
Weight*	31	34	30	25	28	27	26	23	25	21	9	30
Points	158 7.2	156 7.2	159 7.3	160 7.4	154 7.2	158 7.8	166 7.9	165 8.1	162 7.8	161	164 7.9	157 7.3
Circumf.	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.7	4.0	4.1	4.1	4.0	7.5 3.9	4.1	3.8
Length	15.9	15.7	15.8	16.3	15.5	16.7	17.3	17.3	4.0	16.4	17.3	15.8
Spread	13.0	12.7	12.9	13.4	12.5	13.3	14.0	17.5	13.9	13.4	14.0	12.9
%4.5+ Yr.	15.0	14	17	14	17	8	7	8	5	6	2	16
Weight*	168	170	173	171	166	171	171	173	170	171	174	170
Points	7.7	8.0	7.9	8.0	7.8	8.1	8.4	8.8	8.3	8.0	8.4	7.9
Circumf.	4.2	4.4	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.6	4.5	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.2
Length	17.9	18.3	18.0	18.2	17.8	18.7			19.3	18.0	19.3	18.1
Spread	14.3	14.4	14.4	14.7	14.2	15.0	15.2	14.9	15.4	14.8	15.4	14.4
% Doe Lactation												
1.5 Yr	22	20	10	17	11	10	13	14	13	14	9	16
2.5 Yr	59	54	56	61	51	59	59	60	57	52	54	56
3.5+ Yr	62	70	70	70	66	67	70	71	66	63	65	68
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	9	5	10	11	7	5	11	10	12	13	12	8
%1.5 Yr	21	23	26	24	24	26	23	24	22	22	24	24
%2.5 Yr	22	21	20	19	23	26	28	24	23	22	25	21
%3.5+ Yr	47	45	44	45	43	43	38	42	43	43	39	45
Doe Weights*												
	0.0	62	73	74	66	63	63	62	60	62	60	68
0.5 Yr	62											
1.5 Yr	95	93	97	98	96	89	92	94	93	94	93	96
									93 104 111	94 104 111		96 107 112

### Table 14. Lower Thin Loess Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data** 5,000

0

					Sea	son	. 6	0			Ave	aue
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	130,859	177,211	170,730	178,461	171,661	223,985	230,662	236,033	197,471	222,734	214,591	165,784
Total Deer	1,325	2,188	2,453	2,284	2,173	2,776	3,426	3,915	4,798	4,541	3,892	2,085
Bucks	487	811	891	897	836	1,043	1,157	1,379	1,502	1,663	1,705	784
Does	838	1,377	1,562	1,387	1,337	1,733	2,269	2,536	3,296	2,878	1,457	1,300
Acres/Deer	99	81	70	78	79	81	67	60	41	49	55	81
Bucks	269	219	192	199	205	216	199	171	131	134	126	217
3.5+ Bucks	306	362	394	379	419	430	391	364	313	362	578	372
Does	156	129	109	129	128	130	102	93	60	77	99	130
Avg Age ALL Bucks	3.0	3.0	2.8	2.9	2.8	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	2.9
%0.5 Yr Bucks	5	2	2.0	2.3	2.0	4	8	7	10	9	9	2.7
Weight*	83	69	74	131	71	61	60	66	57	64	62	85.7
%1.5 Yr												
Weight*	11 116	9 110	14 114	12 122	11 121	11	13 115	14 111	18 109	19	39	12 117
Points	3.6	3.0	3.7	4.4	3.9	115 3.8	4.2	3.6	4.3	113 3.6	110 2.8	3.7
Circumf.	2.3	1.8	2.4	4.4	2.5	2.2	4.2	2.3	4.3	3.0 2.4	2.0	2.3
Length	7.6	6.4	<u>2.4</u> 7.6	2.6	2.5 7.7	7.4	<u>2.2</u> 8.0	2.3	2.3	7.6	<u>2.1</u> 5.8	2.3
Spread	7.0	7.8	7.0	<u>9.0</u> 7.7	6.9	6.8	6.8	6.6	<u> </u>	6.6	5.6	7.3
%2.5 Yr.	19	22	26	27	31	35	28	32	30	35	30	25
Weight*	146	143	149	150	143	144	145	143	143	144	142	147
Points	6.5	6.5	6.6	6.7	6.7	6.9	6.8	6.7	6.8	6.5	6.3	6.6
Circumf.	3.3	3.2	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3
Length	14.0	13.5	13.7	14.1	13.9	14.1	13.7	13.9	13.9	13.4	13.6	13.8
Spread	11.4	11.1	10.9	11.3	10.9	11.3	11.1	11.0	11.2	10.6	10.7	11.1
%3.5 Yr.	37	37	31	31	29	28	27	28	27	21	16	33
Weight*	164	162	168	167	164	163	163	159	159	161	163	165
Points	7.3	7.5	7.6	7.6	7.7	7.5	7.6	7.6	7.7	7.6	7.5	7.6
Circumf.	3.9	3.7	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9
Length	16.2	16.4	16.9	17.1	16.5	17.0	16.6	16.2	16.8	16.2	16.7	16.6
Spread	12.9	13.3	13.4	13.7	13.3	13.5	13.4	12.8	13.4	13.2	13.3	13.3
%4.5+ Yr.	26	26	23	25	23	22	24	19	15	16	7	25
Weight*	177	179	181	182	179	176	177	174	173	176	176	180
Points	8.2	8.1	8.3	8.3	8.2	8.2	8.3	8.3	8.2	8.0	8.3	8.2
Circumf.	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.5	4.4	4.3	4.5	4.3	4.4	4.3	4.4	4.4
Length	18.7	18.7	19.1	19.3		18.9	18.9	18.9	19.1	18.9	19.2	19.0
Spread	14.7	14.8	14.9	15.0	15.1	15.0	14.9	14.9	15.1	15.1	15.0	14.9
% Doe Lactation												
1.5 Yr	9	10	10	12	14	9	10	9	9	8	11	11
2.5 Yr	61	63	61	61	64	60	62	57	57	60	61	62
3.5+ Yr	74	72	73	77	74	74	77	77	74	75	75	74
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	7	5	4	5	3	7	9	10	10	11	10	5
%1.5 Yr	21	24	25	23	24	24	22	24	24	21	23	23
%2.5 Yr	17	18	19	20	22	23	22	20	18	20	24	19
%3.5+ Yr	54	49	49	46	47	46	47	46	48	48	43	49
Doe Weights*												
0.5 Yr	67	63	63	73	70	61	59	62	55	60	59	67
1.5 Yr	99	96	98	101	99	95	95	94	93	95	94	99
2.5 Yr	110	107	109	110	108	107	104	106	104	105	107	109
3.5+ Yr	115	115	115	116	116	114	113	114	112	114	115	115

#### **Black Prairie Soil Resource Area** Table 15. **Summary of DMAP Data**

0

			20.	20	Sea	son					Ave	ane
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Aaroo												
Acres Total Deer	151,476	227,921	213,723	220,375	186,663	142,720	155,976	173,388	170,057	145,011	156,927	200,032
Bucks	948	1,540	1,798	1,687	1,475	1,246	1,328	1,455	1,625	1,783	1,994	1,490
Does	370	651	926	796	722	540	629	675	646	681	857	693
	578	889	872	891	753	706	699	780	979	1,102	1,457	797
Acres/Deer	160	148	119	131	127	115	117	119	105	81	79	137
Bucks	409	350	231	277	259	265	248	257	263	213	186	305
3.5+ Bucks	743	826	789	656	547	539	551	642	752	687	913	712
Does	262	256	245	247	248	203	223	222	174	132	139	252
Avg Age ALL Bucks	2.9	2.6	2.1	2.4	2.5	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	2.5
%0.5 Yr Bucks	4	6	4	5	5	7	4	6	6	7	8	4.8
Weight*	73	64	60	63	63	62	60	63	62	66	64	64.7
%1.5 Yr	10	9	37	20	17	15	17	22	23	25	49	19
Weight*	122	112	105	114	110	114	116	116	116	116	113	113
Points	3.7	4.3	3.2	5.0	4.6	5.1	4.9	4.5	4.8	4.6	3.3	4.2
Circumf.	2.7	2.4	2.1	2.6	2.5	2.7	2.6	2.6	2.5	2.6	2.2	2.5
Length	8.6	8.3	6.3	9.5	8.5	9.7	9.0	8.8	9.5	9.0	6.9	8.2
Spread	7.9	6.9	5.7	7.4	6.8	8.1	7.6	7.0	7.8	7.3	6.3	6.9
%2.5 Yr.	24	38	27	30	33	29	34	32	36	37	23	30
Weight*	146	147	136	142	130	132	142	139	143	150	143	140
Points	6.9	6.7	6.3	6.8	6.6	6.5	6.6	6.5	6.9	6.8	6.1	6.6
Circumf.	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.4	3.4	3.4	3.6	3.3	3.3
Length	14.6	14.6	13.4	13.9	13.3	13.5	14.0	13.8	14.5	14.5	13.7	14.0
Spread	12.0	11.8	10.9	11.1	10.8	10.9	11.3	11.2	11.9	11.7	10.9	11.3
%3.5 Yr.	39	32	20	30	28	28	30	27	26	24	15	30
Weight*	164	166	158	156	154	154	158	152	163	167	160	160
Points	7.5	7.7	7.4	7.5	7.7	7.8	8.0	7.8	7.6	7.7	7.3	7.5
Circumf.	4.0	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.9
Length	16.9	16.9	16.4	16.1	16.1	16.6	16.9	16.0	17.0	16.7	16.4	16.5
Spread	13.5	13.7	13.0	12.9	13.0	13.1	13.4	12.6	13.7	13.6	13.2	13.2
%4.5+ Yr.	24	14	11	14	15	21	15	13	9	7	6	16
Weight*	182	179	177	170	170	174	177	168	172	176	173	176
Points	8.2	8.0	8.1	8.1	8.6	8.3	8.6	8.3	8.3	8.1	8.0	8.2
Circumf.	4.5	4.3	4.6	4.3	4.3	4.5	4.4	4.5	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.4
Length	19.1	18.1	18.6	18.4	18.6	18.7	18.5	18.7	18.9	18.2	18.4	18.5
Spread	15.0	14.2	14.7	14.8	15.0	14.6	14.8	14.3	15.1	14.7	14.5	14.7
% Doe Lactation												
1.5 Yr	21	15	10	11	9	12	16	9	15	14	14	13
2.5 Yr	65	61	54	61	57	52	58	50	61	50	57	60
3.5+ Yr	70	70	63	71	66	66	66	62	71	62	66	68
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	8	7	4	9	7	8	10	11	14	11	12	7
%1.5 Yr	25	20	28	19	25	24	23	21	20	25	24	23
%2.5 Yr	20	30	20	20	20	18	20	20	23	23	19	22
%3.5+ Yr	47	41	44	47	45	50	47	48	43	41	47	45
Doe Weights*												
0.5 Yr	70	63	55	54	56	55	62	61	60	62	59	60
1.5 Yr	95	94	92	94	90	90	95	93	98	96	95	93
2.5 Yr	107	106	104	103	100	101	105	104	105	108	105	104
3.5+ Yr	116	113	110	110	110	109	111	110	113	116	113	112

### Table 16. Upper Coastal Plain Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data**

3

	Season											rage
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	435,198	426,144	510,396	511,330	496,206	557,521	705,830	727,380	741,776	790,030	879,440	475,855
Total Deer	3,669	3,603	3,354	3,724	3,595	4,786	5,409	5,719	7,044	8,894	8,488	3,589
Bucks	1,603	1,559	1,515	1,749	1,804	2,155	2,648	2,536	3,147	3,864	4,677	1,646
Does	2,066	2,044	1,839	1,975	1,791	2,631	2,761	3,183	3,897	5,030	1,457	1,943
Acres/Deer	119	118	152	137	138	116	130	127	105	89	105	133
Bucks	271	273	337	292	275	259	267	287	236	205	188	290
3.5+ Bucks	607	789	714	689	703	631	762	797	693	660	997	700
Does	211	208	278	259	277	212	256	229	190	157	237	247
Avg Age ALL Bucks	2.7	2.4	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.8	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	2.5
%0.5 Yr Bucks	4	5	2	3	3	4	6	7	6	8	7	3.2
Weight*	66	65	63	61	60	59	58	62	59	59	58	63
%1.5 Yr	14	15	18	20	16	20	21	24	24	25	51	17
Weight*	107	109	108	113	112	112	113	112	111	112	108	110
Points	3.8	4.1	4.4	4.7	4.6	4.7	4.7	4.6	4.4	4.3	3.2	4.3
Circumf.	2.2	2.5	2.4	2.5	2.6	2.5	2.5	2.5	2.4	2.4	2.1	2.4
Length	7.6	8.5	8.8	9.2	9.1	9.2	9.3	8.9	8.7	8.5	6.7	8.6
Spread	6.9	7.6	7.5	7.5	7.6	7.7	7.5	7.4	7.2	7.0	5.8	7.4
%2.5 Yr.	32	41	32	32	38	35	38	33	36	36	24	35
Weight*	137	140	136	139	138	137	138	137	139	137	134	138
Points	6.5	6.5	6.4	6.9	6.6	6.6	6.7	6.6	6.6	6.4	6.0	6.6
Circumf.	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.2	3.3
Length	13.2	13.8	13.4	14.1	13.7	13.7	14.0	13.7	13.9	13.5	13.2	13.7
Spread	10.8	11.1	10.7	11.3	11.1	11.1	11.3	10.9	11.2	10.7	10.5	11.0
%3.5 Yr.	32	27	30	28	28	27	25	24	25	23	14	29
Weight*	151	152	153	152	152	150	156	152	157	153	152	152
Points	7.0	7.3	7.2	7.4	7.4	7.5	7.5	7.3	7.5	7.2	7.1	7.2
Circumf.	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.7	3.8	3.9	3.8	3.8	3.7	3.6	3.7
Length	15.6	15.7	15.7	15.7	15.9	16.1	16.4	15.8	16.5	15.8	15.6	15.7
Spread	12.5	12.6	12.6	12.7	12.7	12.9	13.2	12.6	13.3	12.5	12.7	12.6
%4.5+ Yr.	19	12	16	16	14	14	10	12	9	8	5	15
Weight*	164	167	164	166	167	164	171	170	166	166	164	166
Points Circumf.	7.8	7.9	7.9	8.0	8.0	8.1	8.3	8.0	7.9	7.8	7.6	7.9
	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.3	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.2	4.3	4.1	4.1	4.2
Length Spread	17.4	17.8	17.9	18.2	18.4	18.2	18.3	17.9	18.3	17.7	17.7	18.0
% Doe Lactation	14.1	14.4	14.4	14.3	14.4	14.8	14.8	14.5	14.6	13.9	14.1	14.3
1.5 Yr	10	12	14	14	10	10	10	16	15	15	10	10
2.5 Yr	13 57	56	51	14 56	10 59	12 57	16 65	15 57	15 57	15 60	13 56	13 56
3.5+ Yr	57 68	50 67	51 69	00 68	59 71	57 67	72	57 70	57 68	65	65	69
Doe Age Classes	00	07	09	00	/1	07	12	70	00	00	05	09
%0.5 Yr	7	8	4	7	6	8	10	10	11	10	11	6
%1.5 Yr	22	21	23	22	24	23	24	24	24	25	24	22
%2.5 Yr	22	21	23	18	24	23	24	24	24	21	24	22
%3.5+ Yr	51	46	48	48	43	45	43	44	42	44	45	47
Doe Weights*		07	UT	UT	Ъ	тJ		77	72			71
0.5 Yr	62	63	60	59	60	58	57	59	58	57	58	61
1.5 Yr	89	88	87	90	89	87	89	88	89	89	89	89
2.5 Yr	99	100	97	100	100	97	99	97	99	99	99	99
3.5+ Yr	107	106	106	105	107	103		105	107	105	105	106

### Table 17. Lower Coastal Plain Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data** 100.7

0

			100	12	Sea	son					Ave	ade
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	397,543	397,659	402,461	341,192	334,038	202,709	264,521	328,344	356,712	337,585	308,965	374,579
Total Deer	1,142	1,461	1,500	1,564	1,512	1,506	1,721	2,163	2,818	2,889	2,944	1,436
Bucks	541	606	698	823	832	686	812	977	1,064	1,232	1,467	700
Does	601	855	802	741	680	820	909	1,186	1,754	1,657	1,407	736
Acres/Deer	348	272	268	218	221	135	154	1,100	1,734	1,037	1,437	265
Bucks	735	656	577	415	401	295	326	336	335	274	210	557
3.5+ Bucks	1636	1451	2064	1101	1152	672	740	820	860	761	1098	1481
Does	661	465	502	460	491	247	291	277	203	204	209	516
Avg Age ALL Bucks												
	2.7	2.6	2.3	2.5	2.4	2.9	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	2.5
%0.5 Yr Bucks	3	4	3	2	3	3	3	7	8	8	10	2.8
Weight*	68	70	60	62	61	55	58	61	57	55	56	64.4
%1.5 Yr	11	15	13	11	12	15	18	18	24	21	47	12
Weight*	109	104	110	113	111	109	108	107	108	111	102	109
Points	4.0	3.8	4.2	4.5	4.6	4.7	4.5	4.0	4.3	4.2	2.7	4.2
Circumf.	2.7	2.3	2.4	2.4	2.4	2.3	2.4	2.2	2.3	2.5	1.9	2.5
Length	8.9	7.6	8.5	8.9	8.6	8.4	8.5	7.5	8.2	8.4	5.4	8.5
Spread	7.5	6.6	7.0	7.2	7.8	7.2	6.9	6.8	7.0	7.0	5.3	7.2
%2.5 Yr.	35	33	55	46	53	38	35	34	29	35	25	45
Weight*	135	137	136	134	134	132	131	130	131	132	126	135
Points	6.8	6.6	6.5	6.7	6.7	6.9	6.4	6.4	6.6	6.2	5.2	6.6
Circumf.	3.3	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.3	3.1	3.1	3.2	3.1	2.8	3.2
Length	13.5	13.6	13.6	13.7	13.6	13.6	12.9	12.7	13.1	12.6	11.5	13.6
Spread	10.9	11.2	10.9	10.9	10.9	11.2	10.7	10.2	10.9	10.1	9.3	10.9
%3.5 Yr.	30	34	19	26	22	30	28	26	24	23	14	27
Weight*	148	149	147	142	151	152	145	145	143	145	146	148
Points	7.3	7.4	7.2	7.5	7.7	7.5	7.3	7.5	7.2	7.2	7.1	7.4
Circumf.	3.7	3.7	3.6	3.6	3.7	3.7	3.5	3.6	3.6	3.6	3.5	3.7
Length	15.0	15.5	15.5	15.2	16.2	15.5	15.3	15.3	15.3	15.2	15.0	15.5
Spread	12.6	13.0	12.5	12.4	13.0	12.8	12.5	12.3	12.5	12.3	12.1	12.7
%4.5+ Yr.	18	14	9	12	10	14	16	15	15	13	6	13
Weight*	153	154	156	155	162	158	158	153	150	158	155	156
Points	7.9	8.0	8.0	8.2	8.1	8.0	8.2	7.9	7.7	7.5	7.5	8.1
Circumf.	4.1	4.1	4.1	4.2	4.2	4.1	4.2	4.1	4.0	4.1	4.0	4.1
Length	17.2	170	17.7	17.8	18.2	17.7	17.8	17.3	17.0	17.9	17.0	17.7
<b>•</b> •		17.6										
Spread	13.9	17.6	13.9	14.5	14.8	14.5		14.1	13.7	14.2	13.8	14.3
% Doe Lactation	13.9	14.6	13.9	14.5	14.8	14.5	14.3	14.1	13.7			
% Doe Lactation 1.5 Yr	13.9 15	14.6 12	13.9 6	14.5 19	14.8 8	14.5 21	14.3 17	14.1 19	13.7 14	19	14	12
% Doe Lactation 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr	13.9 15 48	14.6 12 51	13.9 6 60	14.5 19 58	14.8 8 61	14.5 21 63	14.3 17 68	14.1 19 69	13.7 14 59	19 55	14 58	12 56
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr	13.9 15	14.6 12	13.9 6	14.5 19	14.8 8	14.5 21	14.3 17	14.1 19	13.7 14	19	14	12
% Doe Lactation 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr Doe Age Classes	13.9 15 48 68	14.6 12 51 65	13.9 6 60 64	14.5 19 58 66	14.8 8 61 71	14.5 21 63 73	14.3 17 68	14.1 19 69 73	13.7 14 59 73	19 55 72	14 58 68	12 56
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr	13.9 15 48 68 4	14.6 12 51 65 5	13.9 6 60 64 4	14.5 19 58 66 3	14.8 8 61 71 5	14.5 21 63 73 7	14.3 17 68 70 6	14.1 19 69 73 8	13.7 14 59 73 8	19 55 72 10	14 58 68 11	12 56 67 4
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr           %1.5 Yr	13.9 15 48 68 4 4 17	14.6 12 51 65 5 5 19	13.9 6 60 64 4 20	14.5 19 58 66 3 3 19	14.8 8 61 71 5 20	14.5 21 63 73 7 7 18	14.3 17 68 70 6 22	14.1 19 69 73 8 8 20	13.7 14 59 73 8 8 24	19 55 72 10 22	14 58 68 11 23	12 56 67 4 19
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr           %1.5 Yr           %2.5 Yr	13.9 15 48 68 4 17 23	14.6 12 51 65 5 19 30	13.9 6 60 64 4 20 38	14.5 19 58 66 3 19 30	14.8 8 61 71 5 20 40	14.5 21 63 73 73 7 18 25	14.3 17 68 70 6 22 24	14.1 19 69 73 8 20 22	13.7 14 59 73 8 24 19	19 55 72 10 22 20	14 58 68 11 23 21	12 56 67 4 19 32
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr           %1.5 Yr           %2.5 Yr           %3.5+ Yr	13.9 15 48 68 4 4 17	14.6 12 51 65 5 5 19	13.9 6 60 64 4 20	14.5 19 58 66 3 3 19	14.8 8 61 71 5 20	14.5 21 63 73 7 7 18	14.3 17 68 70 6 22	14.1 19 69 73 8 8 20	13.7 14 59 73 8 8 24	19 55 72 10 22	14 58 68 11 23	12 56 67 4 19
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr           %1.5 Yr           %2.5 Yr           %3.5+ Yr           Doe Weights*	13.9 15 48 68 4 17 23 56	14.6 12 51 65 5 19 30 46	13.9 6 60 64 4 20 38 37	14.5 19 58 66 3 19 30 47	14.8 8 61 71 5 5 20 40 35	14.5 21 63 73 7 7 18 25 51	14.3 17 68 70 6 22 24 24 48	14.1 19 69 73 8 20 22 50	13.7 14 59 73 73 8 8 24 19 49	19 55 72 10 22 20 48	14 58 68 11 23 21 45	12 56 67 4 19 32 44
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr           %1.5 Yr           %2.5 Yr           %3.5+ Yr           Doe Weights*           0.5 Yr	13.9 15 48 68 4 17 23 56 56	14.6 12 51 65 5 19 30 46 63	13.9 6 60 64 4 20 38 37 37 57	14.5 19 58 66 3 19 30 47 47	14.8 8 61 71 5 5 20 40 35 35	14.5 21 63 73 73 7 18 25 51	14.3 17 68 70 6 22 24 48 57	14.1 19 69 73 8 20 22 50 50	13.7 14 59 73 73 8 8 24 19 49 49 58	19 55 72 10 22 20 48 58	14 58 68 11 23 21 45 54	12 56 67 4 19 32 44 59
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr           %1.5 Yr           %2.5 Yr           %3.5+ Yr           Doe Weights*           0.5 Yr           1.5 Yr	13.9 15 48 68 4 17 23 56 	14.6 12 51 65 5 19 30 46 63 88	13.9 6 60 64 20 38 37 57 83	14.5 19 58 66 3 19 30 47 47 55 88	14.8 8 61 71 5 20 40 35 57 57 86	14.5 21 63 73 73 7 18 25 51 51 55 90	14.3 17 68 70 6 22 24 24 48 57 87	14.1 19 69 73 8 20 22 50 50 56 85	13.7 14 59 73 73 8 8 24 19 49 49 58 88	19 55 72 10 22 20 48 58 85	14 58 68 11 23 21 45 54 86	12 56 67 4 19 32 44 59 86
% Doe Lactation           1.5 Yr           2.5 Yr           3.5+ Yr           Doe Age Classes           %0.5 Yr           %1.5 Yr           %2.5 Yr           %3.5+ Yr           Doe Weights*           0.5 Yr	13.9 15 48 68 4 17 23 56 56	14.6 12 51 65 5 19 30 46 63	13.9 6 60 64 4 20 38 37 37 57	14.5 19 58 66 3 19 30 47 47	14.8 8 61 71 5 5 20 40 35 35	14.5 21 63 73 73 7 18 25 51	14.3 17 68 70 6 22 24 48 57	14.1 19 69 73 8 20 22 50 50	13.7 14 59 73 73 8 8 24 19 49 49 58	19 55 72 10 22 20 48 58	14 58 68 11 23 21 45 54	12 56 67 4 19 32 44 59

### Table 18. Coastal Flatwoods Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data** - 20-

10

					Sea	son					Ave	ade
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	47,790	63,810	55,927	55,650	55,650	51,850	52,850	51,850	59,229	59,017	46,517	55,765
Total Deer	47	67	148	156	178	202	161	202	87	163	177	119
Bucks	23	29	82	89	116	101	93	101	56	102	105	68
Does	24	38	66	67	62	101	68	101	31	61	1,457	51
Acres/Deer	1017	952	378	357	313	257	328	257	681	362	526	603
Bucks	2078	2200	682	625	480	513	568	513	1058	579	1332	1213
3.5+ Bucks	2987	4908	3728	2319	2140	960	1229	1127	1851	1475	3445	3216
Does	1991	1679	847	831	898	513	777	513	1911	967	3219	1249
Avg Age ALL Bucks	3.3	2.5	2.1	2.3	2.2	2.5	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.7	2.0	2.5
%0.5 Yr Bucks	0	0	3	0	1	1	1	2	2	0	17	0.7
Weight*	0	0	70	0	48	35	45	60	45	0	36	23.5
%1.5 Yr	9	10	11	8	6	17	8	7	6	16	31	9
Weight*	106	94	96	83	106	103	106	106	85	112	96	97
Points	2.0	4.5	4.6	4.0	4.1	3.7	3.3	3.8	2.0	4.4	2.5	3.8
Circumf.	0.0	2.9	2.3	2.3	2.1	2.3	1.9	2.3	1.9	2.8	1.4	1.9
Length	0.0	7.6	9.2	6.9	7.9	7.7	7.4	8.1	5.9	9.0	4.3	6.3
Spread	0.0	5.5	7.1	5.6	6.6	7.9	7.6	7.0	5.0	7.5	5.7	5.0
%2.5 Yr.	18	48	68	64	72	31	39	42	32	26	29	54
Weight*	114	128	130	125	122	126	120	123	118	128	120	124
Points	4.8	5.8	5.9	6.2	5.9	5.8	5.8	5.7	5.1	5.6	4.9	5.7
Circumf.	2.9	3.3	2.9	2.9	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.8	2.5	2.8	2.4	3.0
Length	13.3	12.8	12.1	12.6	12.3	12.1	11.4	11.9	10.6	11.8	10.0	12.6
Spread	10.3	11.2	9.7	9.9	9.8	10.0	9.5	9.7	8.7	9.3	7.8	10.2
%3.5 Yr.	32	29	16	19	16	41	35	32	36	38	16	22
Weight*	146	130	134	132	139	132	136	131	122	124	115	136
Points	7.6	7.0	6.5	7.3	7.2	6.4	6.6	5.8	5.7	6.3	5.1	7.1
Circumf.	3.9	3.6	3.4	3.5	3.8	2.9	3.2	2.9	2.8	2.6	2.5	3.7
Length	16.7	15.5	14.5	15.2	15.6	13.3	13.6	12.0	12.4	12.8	10.7	15.5
Spread	13.5	12.3	12.2	13.2	12.3	11.1	10.9	9.7	10.4	10.2	8.9	12.7
%4.5+ Yr.	41	13	3	9	5	11	17	17	25	20	6	14
Weight*	160	132	141	155	165	163	155	136	138	123	116	151
Points	7.9	8.3	6.0	7.9	8.5	7.5	7.5	7.3	7.2	5.7	5.1	7.7
Circumf.	4.3	3.9	3.3	4.2	4.1	3.9	3.8	3.6	3.2	2.8	2.8	3.9
Length	17.9	16.4	11.9	16.5	18.9	16.6	16.9	15.4	14.7	13.4	11.5	16.3
Spread	13.9	12.7	9.1	13.2	14.8	13.6	13.0	11.9	11.8	11.8	9.6	12.7
% Doe Lactation												
1.5 Yr	0	43	22	7	18	18	0	25	40	20	6	18
2.5 Yr	60	33	77	50	50	54	80	63	50	50	65	54
3.5+ Yr	56	45	43	65	47	65	56	68	78	53	67	51
Doe Age Classes												
%0.5 Yr	14	18	3	8	8	8	5	7	10	3	0	10
%1.5 Yr	19	21	30	22	22	19	13	13	17	19	10	22
%2.5 Yr	24	18	38	35	41	29	25	27	27	26	23	31
%3.5+ Yr	43	44	30	35	30	45	57	53	47	52	67	36
Doe Weights*												
0.5 Yr	44	48	70	68	61	52	57	58	47	54	0	58
1.5 Yr	89	81	83	77	84	81	76	86	77	77	41	83
2.5 Yr	79	92	92	85	86	90	84	81	78	78	69	87
3.5+ Yr	98	92	96	89	90	94	93	92	95	89	90	93

### Table 19. Interior Flatwoods Soil Resource Area **Summary of DMAP Data** A.

0

			100	100	Sea	son					Ave	aue
	05	04	03	02	01	00+	99	98	97	96	91-94	01-05
Acres	84,140	67,160	58,460	60,400		40,870	38,770	36,270	41,867	45,235	69,015	67,274
Total Deer	603	453		385	66,210 514	40,870	429	30,270	41,007	40,230 674		
Bucks			293								1,107	450
Does	259	188	133	201	265	179	199	135	180	297	517	209
	344	265	160	184	249	218	230	238	239	377	1,457	240
Acres/Deer	140	148	200	157	129	103	90	97	100	67	63	155
Bucks	325	357	440	300	250	228	195	269	233	152	135	334
3.5+ Bucks	623	781	1169	671	534	486	487	548	646	544	642	756
Does	245	253	365	328	266	188	169	152	175	120	120	291
Avg Age ALL Bucks	2.7	2.7	2.4	2.7	2.7	3.2	3.2	3.1	2.9	2.8	2.4	2.7
%0.5 Yr Bucks	4	7	5	3	2	4	9	12	15	9	9	4
Weight*	64	62	61	59	61	59	64	67	69	63	63	61.4
%1.5 Yr	17	15	19	9	10	15	18	16	16	28	45	14
Weight*	126	106	110	116	122	117	119	114	123	113	111	116
Points	2.4	3.0	3.8	4.9	5.6	5.4	4.4	3.8	4.8	3.9	3.0	3.9
Circumf.	1.9	1.9	2.4	2.7	2.7	2.9	2.4	2.1	2.4	2.4	2.2	2.3
Length	5.6	6.4	8.8	9.7	11.2	11.9	9.0	7.3	9.2	8.3	6.5	8.3
Spread	6.6	7.2	7.2	7.1	8.3	9.0	7.9	7.3	7.3	7.2	6.0	7.3
%2.5 Yr.	22	32	33	35	33	34	33	23	33	35	25	31
Weight*	144	151	134	142	143	145	144	138	140	141	137	143
Points	6.3	6.9	5.9	6.9	6.7	6.6	6.7	6.4	7.0	6.6	5.7	6.6
Circumf.	3.2	3.3	3.2	3.5	3.3	3.3	3.4	3.1	3.4	3.4	3.1	3.3
Length	14.0	14.0	12.7	14.9	14.2	14.4	14.0	13.8	15.0	14.0	13.0	14.0
Spread	11.1	12.4	9.9	11.2	11.7	11.4	12.0	11.5	12.0	11.3	10.1	11.3
%3.5 Yr.	35	24	23	32	35	30	25	35	27	23	16	30
Weight*	155	161	166	161	159	160	164	152	154	159	153	161
Points	8.1	7.3	7.3	7.7	7.8	8.2	7.3	7.3	7.2	7.6	7.1	7.6
Circumf.	3.6	3.6	3.9	3.9	3.9	3.8	3.9	3.7	3.6	3.7	3.6	3.8
Length	15.7	15.8	14.9	16.6	16.5	16.6	15.0	15.5	15.7	16.0	15.6	15.9
Spread	12.4	13.0	12.1	12.8	13.4	13.5	12.5	12.3	13.1	13.0	12.5	12.7
%4.5+ Yr.	22											
Weight*		23	15	17	18	17	15	14	9	5	5	19
		23 185	15 158	17 185	18 176	17 179	15 179	14 171	9 163	5 171	5 176	19 178
Points	186	185	158	185	176	179	179	171	163	171	176	178
		185 8.3			176 9.0	179 8.0	179 8.6	171 7.9		171 9.5	176 8.5	178 8.2
Points	186 7.9 4.2	185 8.3 4.1	158 7.3 3.8	185 8.7 4.7	176 9.0 4.3	179 8.0 4.4	179 8.6 4.5	171 7.9 4.0	163 8.1 4.1	171 9.5 4.4	176 8.5 4.3	178 8.2 4.2
Points Circumf.	186 7.9	185 8.3	158 7.3	185 8.7	176 9.0	179 8.0	179 8.6	171 7.9	163 8.1	171 9.5	176 8.5	178 8.2
Points Circumf. Length	186 7.9 4.2 17.9	185 8.3 4.1 18.7	158 7.3 3.8 16.8	185 8.7 4.7 19.6	176 9.0 4.3 18.8	179 8.0 4.4 19.4	179 8.6 4.5 18.8	171 7.9 4.0 18.0	163 8.1 4.1 19.0	171 9.5 4.4 20.5	176 8.5 4.3 18.5	178 8.2 4.2 18.4
Points Circumf. Length Spread	186 7.9 4.2 17.9	185 8.3 4.1 18.7	158 7.3 3.8 16.8	185 8.7 4.7 19.6	176 9.0 4.3 18.8	179 8.0 4.4 19.4	179 8.6 4.5 18.8	171 7.9 4.0 18.0	163 8.1 4.1 19.0	171 9.5 4.4 20.5	176 8.5 4.3 18.5	178 8.2 4.2 18.4
Points Circumf. Length Spread % Doe Lactation	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6
Points Circumf. Length Spread <b>% Doe Lactation</b> 1.5 Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17.9 14.2	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15.0	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13
Points Circumf. Length Spread <b>% Doe Lactation</b> 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17.9 14.2 17 52	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 8 51	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15.0 15 53	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52
Points Circumf. Length Spread <b>% Doe Lactation</b> 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17.9 14.2 17 52	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 51	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15.0 15 53	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52
Points Circumf. Length Spread % Doe Lactation 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr Doe Age Classes	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17 52 69	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47 63	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58 70	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48 73	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55 67	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69 66	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 51 67	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67 75	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54 66	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56 62	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15 53 65	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52 68
Points Circumf. Length Spread % Doe Lactation 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr Doe Age Classes %0.5 Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17 52 69 69	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47 63 47 63	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58 70 6	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48 73 3	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55 67 4 1	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69 66 66	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 51 67 5	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67 75 75 17	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54 66 15	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56 62 11	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15 53 65 65	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52 68 55
Points Circumf. Length Spread % Doe Lactation 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr Doe Age Classes %0.5 Yr %1.5 Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17 52 69 69 6 19	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47 63 47 63 11 21	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58 70 6 23	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48 73 3 3 16	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55 67 7 1 1	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69 66 66 27	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 51 67 5 27	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67 75 75 17 17 21	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54 66 66 15 15 17	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56 62 11 11 25	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15 53 65 	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52 68 5 5 20
Points Circumf. Length Spread <b>% Doe Lactation</b> 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr <b>Doe Age Classes</b> %0.5 Yr %1.5 Yr %2.5 Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17 52 69 6 9 6 19 19	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47 63 47 63 11 21 27	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58 70 6 23 20	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48 73 3 3 16 20	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55 67 1 19 27	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69 66 66 27 26	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 51 67 5 27 26	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67 75 75 17 21 19	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54 66 15 15 17 25	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56 62 11 25 22	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15 53 65 65 11 28 20	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52 68 5 20 23
Points Circumf. Length Spread <b>% Doe Lactation</b> 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr <b>Doe Age Classes</b> %0.5 Yr %1.5 Yr %2.5 Yr %3.5+ Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17 52 69 6 9 6 19 19	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47 63 47 63 11 21 27	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58 70 6 23 20	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48 73 3 3 16 20	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55 67 1 19 27	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69 66 66 27 26	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 51 67 5 27 26	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67 75 75 17 21 19	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54 66 15 15 17 25	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56 62 11 25 22	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15 53 65 65 11 28 20	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52 68 5 20 23
Points Circumf. Length Spread <b>% Doe Lactation</b> 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr <b>Doe Age Classes</b> %0.5 Yr %1.5 Yr %2.5 Yr %3.5+ Yr <b>Doe Weights*</b>	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17 52 69 69 6 19 19 19 56	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47 63 (11) 21 27 41	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58 70 6 23 20 46	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48 73 3 3 16 20 54	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55 67 1 1 19 27 49	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69 66 6 27 26 41	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 5 5 5 27 26 42	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67 75 75 17 21 19 43	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54 66 15 17 25 43	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56 62 11 11 25 22 42	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15 53 65 11 11 28 20 42	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 13 52 68 5 5 20 23 49
Points Circumf. Length Spread <b>% Doe Lactation</b> 1.5 Yr 2.5 Yr 3.5+ Yr <b>Doe Age Classes</b> %0.5 Yr %1.5 Yr %3.5+ Yr <b>Doe Weights*</b> 0.5 Yr	186 7.9 4.2 17.9 14.2 17 52 69 69 69 69 69 19 19 19 56 57	185 8.3 4.1 18.7 14.8 13 47 63 47 63 11 21 27 41 60	158 7.3 3.8 16.8 13.7 11 58 70 6 23 20 46 60	185 8.7 4.7 19.6 15.4 14 48 73 3 3 16 20 54 56	176 9.0 4.3 18.8 15.1 11 55 67 1 1 19 27 49 68	179 8.0 4.4 19.4 14.7 12 69 66 6 27 26 41 56	179 8.6 4.5 18.8 16.0 8 51 67 5 27 26 42 42 58	171 7.9 4.0 18.0 14.3 18 67 75 75 17 21 19 43 65	163 8.1 4.1 19.0 14.8 10 54 66 15 15 17 25 43 63	171 9.5 4.4 20.5 15.4 17 56 62 11 11 25 22 42 42 64	176 8.5 4.3 18.5 15.0 15 53 65 (11) 28 20 42 (20) 42 (60)	178 8.2 4.2 18.4 14.6 7 5 68 5 5 20 23 49 60

## Enforcement of Deer Hunting-Related Citations 2005 - 2006

The Law Enforcement Bureau began monitoring all statewide citations at the district and county levels during the 1996 – 1997 deer season. The eight most common deer hunting citations from October 1 – January 31 were extracted from the database and summarized. Citation totals by county are shown on Table 21. Yearly trends in various citations show some variability.

A total of 2,256 citations were written during the 2005 - 2006 deer hunting season. This is a decrease of 974 citations from the previous season. This is the second year in a row total citations have decreased and the lowest since 1996 - 1997 (Table 20 and Figure 25). The drop in citations can be attributed to a number of things: violations actually decreased, fewer hunters in the woods, Hurricane Katrina, and new or no officers in an area.

It is logical to assume that if fewer citations were written for a specific violation, then a decreased incidence of that violation occurred. There were notable decreases in all recorded violations from

the 2005 – 2006 season except No License-Resident and Trespassing. Some violations are still occurring at dangerously high levels. Failure to wear hunter orange is a good example. Many hunters still refuse to wear their hunter orange. This law is in place to protect the hunters. Trespassing also still occurs at a high rate, indicating that anyone could be on the land without a hunter's knowledge. Trespassing citations were at an all time high last season.

The number of licensed hunters continues to decline. This could be another reason for the overall decrease in citations. With fewer hunters taking to the field, the number of violations should decrease. However, many hunters are ignoring license requirements and taking their chances. The number of baiting citations for the 2005 - 2006 season was the lowest since the 1998 - 1999 season. However, hunter acceptance of baiting continues to increase. Bait is readily available and a big seller. When a citation is written and a conviction obtained, the minimal fine assessed the violator is hardly a deterrent to prevent future baiting.

With more hunters managing their land for bigger deer, many poachers are trying to take advantage of the results that managers have created. More large-antlered bucks on roadsides equal more temptations. Many would-be hunters are giving in and turning to poaching. This is evidenced by the number of trespassing and headlighting citations written each year.

Our officers are doing a good job across the state, but they need the help of sportsmen. Hunters can assist our officers by reporting wildlife violations by calling 1-800-BE-SMART. Most counties have only 2 officers, but with concerned sportsmen, they have eyes and ears all over the county.



## Table 20. Statewide Citations Summary By Most FrequentViolations During Deer Seasons

	Huntin	g From	No Hunter	No Li	cense		Tress-	Head-	Total
Season Totals	Motor Vehicle	Public Road	Orange	Resident	Non- Resident	Baiting	passing	Lighting	Citations
2005-2006	57	528	271	445	68	365	343	179	2256
2004-2005	104	725	652	391	125	689	283	261	3230
2003-2004	136	914	700	482	159	724	330	363	3808
2002-2003	99	867	658	491	184	569	240	282	3390
2001-2002	120	840	702	491	179	781	275	227	3615
2000-2001	236	1137	612	505	118	519	297	332	3756
1999-2000	238	938	415	422	87	449	318	299	3166
1998-1999	433	1037	409	378	152	356	290	260	3315
1997-1998	476	1063	403	335	112	313	278	282	3262
1996-1997	282	920	312	348	150	208	281	172	2673

CITATIONS

# Table 21. Citation Summary of Most Frequent Violations for2005-2006 Deer Season - By County

0

County	Hunt From Motor Vehicle	Hunt From Public Road	No Hunter Orange	No License Resident	No License Non-Resident	Baiting	Trespassing	Headlighting	Total Citations	County	Hunt From Motor Vehicle	Hunt From Public Road	No Hunter Orange	No License Resident	No License Non-Resident	Baiting	Trespassing	Headlighting	Total Citations
Adams	0	0	0	1	0	2	6	0	9	Leflore	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	2	4
Alcorn	1	9	0	4	1	0	7	0	22	Lincoln	0	1	0	3	0	1	1	0	6
Amite	0	0	4	2	3	11	0	0	20	Lowndes	0	2	8	2	0	3	2	0	17
Attala	1	10	6	5	0	20	2	1	45	Madison	0	1	2	5	1	1	5	1	16
Benton	0	21	3	7	1	10	2	2	46	Marion	2	5	6	3	1	10	3	3	33
Bolivar	1	3	1	2	0	2	1	3	13	Marshall	0	12	1	2	5	1	2	5	28
Calhoun	0	7	0	1	0	0	1	1	10	Monroe	1	41	4	8	0	14	19	5	92
Carroll	5	6	4	3	0	8	6	5	37	Montgomery	1	1	6	5	0	20	1	1	35
Chickasaw	0	14	0	10	0	2	2	0	28	Neshoba	0	2	1	4	0	4	2	6	19
Choctaw	0	11	2	1	2	3	1	7	27	Newton	0	13	3	2	0	10	1	6	35
Claiborne	0	2	4	2	1	0	1	0	10	Noxubee	0	12	0	0	1	0	3	0	16
Clarke	0	8	11	11	0	29	0	0	59	Oktibbeha	0	3	1	5	1	5	2	0	17
Clay	1	5	0	7	0	1	1	0	15	Panola	0	23	16	16	2	22	24	8	111
Coahoma	0	2	0	0	0	0	0	0	2	Pearl River	0	3	4	1	4	0	1	4	17
Copiah	0	4	0	3	1	1	0	2	11	Perry	0	18	4	13	0	5	1	0	41
Covington	0	2	5	1	1	7	1	0	17	Pike	0	0	1	0	1	1	0	0	3
Desoto	0	8	5	3	10	3	3	2	34	Pontotoc	0	5	3	4	0	1	11	10	34
Forrest	0	11	2	1	0	0	2	5	21	Prentiss	0	14	2	3	0	3	3	6	31
Franklin	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	3	Quitman	1	6	0	2	0	2	6	0	17
George	0	13	2	5	2	2	4	6	34	Rankin	0	0	2	14	0	0	2	0	18
Greene	0	7	18	10	0	18	2	5	60	Scott	1	5	5	26	0	5	4	0	46
Grenada	0	4	0	12	0	1	1	0	18	Sharkey	0	3	5	2	3	2	0	0	15
Hancock	0	1	3	4	1	2	5	0	16	Simpson	0	9	1	3	0	3	2	6	24
Harrison	0	8	0	1	0	0	2	3	14	Smith	0	2	0	1	0	0	0	0	3
Hinds	0	0	8	6	0	0	1	3	18	Stone	0	6	1	2	0	0	1	2	12
Holmes	4	4	0	5	0	7	3	4	27	Sunflower	1	4	2	4	0	0	5	1	17
Humphreys	7	8	2	7	1	0	2	0	27	Tallahatchie	0	4	2	3	0	0	8	0	17
Issaquena	6	8	6	2	2	0	4	0	28	Tate	0	4	6	4	4	2	4	5	29
Itawamba	0	19	13	17	2	7	3	2	63	Tippah	0	22	0	5	0	0	1	14	42
Jackson	0	2	1	43	0	0	78	1	125	Tishomingo	0	3	2	2	0	0	8	0	15
Jasper	0	0	9	9	3	21	3	0	45	Tunica	0	1	1	1	1	3	5	0	12
Jeff Davis	0	1	3	1	0	1	0	0	6	Union	0	7	7	14	0	14	5	5	52
Jefferson	0	0	3	0	1	11	1	0	16	Walthall	0	0	2	8	1	7	0	0	18
Jones	5	10	5	14	0	9	11	6	60	Warren	0	6	3	6	3	0	2	4	24
Kemper	0	7	2	2	0	10	2	2	25	Washington	4	10	1	7	0	0	1	0	23
Lafayette	1	10	7	5	1	10	7	3	44	Wayne	5	6	8	7	2	4	3	5	40
Lamar	0	5	5	5	0	3	2	1	21	Webster	3	7	9	9	1	5	10	3	47
Lauderdale	0	2	4	10	1	6	3	1	27	Wilkinson	0	2	3	1	1	0	3	0	10
Lawrence	4	4	0	0	0	1	0	1	10	Winston	0	6	3	2	0	4	0	0	15
Leake	1	1	0	3	0	0	5	0	10	Yalobusha	0	12	1	9	0	0	6	0	28
Lee	0	6	3	4	1	1	0	11	26	Yazoo	1	3	3	6	1	3	11	0	28

## 2005 - 2006 Hunting Incident/Accident Summary

Adjusting accident/incident is one in which a person is injured by the discharge of a hunting firearm, bow and arrow, or a fall from a hunting tree stand arising from the activity of hunting.

There were 16 total hunting related incident/accidents investigated in Mississippi during the 2005-2006 hunting season, a decrease from last season. Of these, 5 were firearm/bow related with 2 fatalities and 11 were tree stand related with 1 fatality. All but one of these incidents occurred while hunting deer.

The firearm accidents directly involved shooters between the ages of 11 - 26. The majority of victims of all accidents were between the ages of 20 - 49 (Figure 27).

The majority of accidents involved tree stands. Other causes of hunting accidents included accidental discharge of a firearm, mistaken for game, ricochet, and slip and fall (Figure 28). This was the second year in a row where tree stand related accidents were higher than firearm related accidents; however, since 2000 total hunting accidents have been on a steady decline (Figure 29).

Sportsmen, Hunter Education Instructors, and Conservation Officers in Mississippi should be commended for keeping hunting among the safest of sports. Volunteer instructors and Conservation Officers certified 10,622 sportsmen in Hunter Education during the 2005 – 2006 season (Figure 26). Hunting accidents in Mississippi average about one injury for every 13,000 licensed hunters: an average of around seven injuries per 100,000 participants. When compared to other sports such as football, which averages around 3,500 injuries per 100,000 participants, hunting is a very safe sport.

Hunter education regulations will change slightly for the 2006 - 2007 season as an effort to increase hunter recruitment. Youths 12 - 15 years of age must complete a Hunter Education course in order to hunt unsupervised. Youths 12 - 15 years of age may hunt without a Hunter Education certificate if under the direct supervision of a licensed adult 21 years of age and older. Youths under 12 years of age must still be under adult supervision while hunting. Apprentice license has been created. The apprentice license is for residents over the age of 15 which do not have the required certificate of hunter education. This apprentice license may be purchased only one time by a resident and the apprentice hunting licensee must be accompanied by a licensed or exempt resident hunter at least twenty-one (21) years of age when hunting. With these new hunter education requirements, we are confident accident numbers will continue to decline.



Youth hunters with their harvest at the Palmer Home Youth Hunt.

## 2005 - 2006 Hunting Incident/Accident Data

Figure 26: Students Trained by Year

Figure 27: Victims by Age





HUNTER ACCIDENTS

Figure 28: Causes for Hunting Accidents

Figure 29: Hunting incidents





Trey Bozeman harvested this buck with his muzzleloader in Madison County.

## **Magnolia Records Program**

### **By: Rick Dillard**

The year 2006 marks the 6th year of the Magnolia Records Program. Since the beginning, over 3,700 deer have been scored and over 2,500 met the minimum requirements (125 inches for typical and 155 inches for non-typical). Counties bordering the Mississippi River and the Big Black River continue to stand out as the top contributors of bucks to Magnolia Records.

Over 440 deer with inside spreads greater than or equal to 20" have been entered. The widest deer on record was harvested by Johnny Ridout in Neshoba County with an inside spread of 25 2/8 inches.

A total of 146 bucks in Magnolia Records have been harvested on public land (WMAs, National Wildlife Refuges, U.S. Forest Service, U.S. Army Corps of Engineers). Ray Barrett harvested the largest non-typical from public land with a 201 3/8 inch buck.

During the 2005 – 2006 hunting season, several bucks worthy of being recognized were harvested. The largest typical buck scored 175 and was taken by Kyle Gordon in Madison County. The largest non-typical buck scored 212 5/8 and was taken by Stephen McBrayer in Pontotoc County. Lastly, Adam McCurdy's 177 5/8 non-typical buck from Holmes County was the largest taken by archery.

Many outstanding bucks, too numerous to list here, are being entered in Magnolia Records each year. To view all entries and their photos visit www.mdwfp.com and look for Magnolia Records.





## Pope and Young Deer Taken in Mississippi

 Table 22. Non-Typical Trophies (Minimum Score 155)

RANK	SCORE	STATUS	TAKEN BY	SEASON	COUNTY
1**	236 1/8	1	Tracy Laird	2003-04	Adams
2	204	1	Denver Eshee	1996-97	Webster
3	195 5/8	1	Damon C. Saik	2000-01	Madison
4	177 3/8	2	Adam McCurdy	2005-06	Warren
5	173 3/4	1	Jimmy Riley	2000-01	Adams
6	165 5/8	1	James Goss, Jr.	1987-88	Washington

### Table 23. Top 10 Typical Trophies (Minimum Score 125)

RANK	SCORE	STATUS	TAKEN BY	SEASON	COUNTY
1	165 6/8	2	Carl Taylor	2004-05	Issaquena
2	164 7/8	1	James House	1999-00	Issaquena
3	160 1/8	1	Odis Hill, Jr.	1989-90	Washington
4	159 6/8	1	Steve Nichols	1986-87	Washington
5	158 4/8	1	John Harvey	1989-90	Adams
6	157	1	James Morris	1998-99	Tunica
7	156 7/8	2	Allen Henry	1993-94	Simpson
8	156 2/8	1	Chris Cordell	1996-97	DeSoto
9+	155 7/8	1	Charles Neely	1993-94	Coahoma
9+	155 7/8	1	John Windham	1997-98	Jefferson
10	155 2/8	1	Marty Hendrix	2000-01	Claiborne
11	155 1/8	1	Jim Agent	1997-98	Jefferson

\*\* OFFICIAL STATE RECORD

1 - IN BOWHUNTING RECORDS OF NORTH AMERICAN WHITETAIL DEER

2 - OFFICIALLY SCORED AND ACCEPTED

+ TIES

3 - OFFICIALLY SCORED AND PENDING

4 - OFFICIALLY SCORED BUT NOT ENTERED

## Boone and Crockett Deer Taken in Mississippi Table 24. Non-Typical Trophies (Minimum Score 195)

RANK	SCORE	STATUS	TAKEN BY	SEASON	COUNTY
1 **	295 6/8	1	Tony Fulton	1994-95	Winston
2	225	1	Richard Herring	1988-89	Lowndes
3	221 2/8	1	Milton Parrish	1972-73	Holmes
4	220 3/8	1	Dean Jones	1976-77	Oktibbeha
5	219 2/8	1	Matt Woods	1997-98	Hinds
6	217 5/8	1	Mark Hathcock	1977-78	Carroll
7	216 5/8	4	(Pick up) Matthew Freeny	1989-99	Winston
8	212 5/8	2	Stephen McBrayer	2005-06	Pontotoc
9	212	1	Wayne Parker	1999-00	Madison
10	210	4	(Pick up) Chip Haynes	2000-01	Madison
11	209 6/8	1	Ronnie Strickland	1981-82	Franklin
12	207 3/8	1	Larry Reece	2001-02	Madison
13	205 6/8	1	Joe Shurden	1976-77	Lowndes
14	205	1	(Pick up) Tommy Yateman	1959	Lowndes
15	204	1	Denver Eshee	1996-97	Webster
16	202 5/8	1	George Galey	1960'S	Carroll
17	202 4/8	1	William Westmoreland	2001-02	Pontotoc
18	202 1/8	1	Oliver Lindig	1983-84	Oktibbeha
19	202 1/8	4	Bobby Smith	1992-93	Tate
20	201 6/8	1	Jimmy Ashley	1985-86	Wilkinson
21	201 3/8	1	Ray Barrett	2002-03	Washington
22	200 7/8	4	Don Williams	1997-98	Jefferson
23	200 6/8	1	Pamela Reid-Rhoades	1993-94	Oktibbeha
24	199 3/8	2	John E. Hayes	1976-77	Holmes
25	199 1/8	4	Jay Leggette	1999-00	Hinds
26	198 5/8	1	Timothy Watson	1997-98	Oktibbeha
27	198 4/8	1	John T. Campbell	2001-02	Issaquena
28	197 2/8	1	Arthur Halfacre	1997-98	Noxubee
29	196 7/8	1	Eddie Alias, Jr.	1989-90	Yazoo
30	196 5/8	1	Robert Sullivan	1981-82	Wilkinson
31	195 7/8	1	Ken Dye	1986-87	Monroe
32	195 6/8	4	Mark Kinard	1978-79	Oktibbeha
33 +	195 5/8	1	Kathleen McGehee	1981-82	Adams
33 +	195 5/8	1	Damon C. Saik	2000-01	Madison
34 +	195 2/8	1	Leland N. Dye, Jr.	2001-02	Tunica
34 +	195 2/8	1	Bill Kimble	1995-96	Copiah

\*\* OFFICIAL STATE RECORD

1 - IN RECORDS OF NORTH AMERICAN BIG GAME

2 - OFFICIALLY SCORED AND ACCEPTED

+ TIES

3 - OFFICIALLY SCORED AND PENDING

4 - OFFICIALLY SCORED BUT NOT ENTERED

## Boone and Crockett Deer Taken in Mississippi Table 25. Typical Trophies (Minimum Score 170)

0

RANK	SCORE	STATUS	TAKEN BY	SEASON	COUNTY
1 **	182 7/8	1	Glen Jourdan	1986-87	Noxubee
2	182 2/8	1	R. L. Bobo	1955-56	Claiborne
3	181 5/8	1	Ronnie Whitaker	1980-81	Wilkinson
4	180 4/8	1	W. F. Smith	1968-69	Leflore
5	180 2/8	1	Steve Greer	1995-96	Madison
6	179 2/8	1	Marlon Stokes	1988-89	Hinds
7	178 5/8	1	Grady Robertson	1951-52	Bolivar
8	176 5/8	1	Sidney Sessions	1952-53	Bolivar
9	176 1/8	1	J.D. Hood	1972-73	Monroe
10 +	175 2/8	1	Johnnie Leake, Jr.	1977-78	Wilkinson
10 +	175 2/8	1	Charlie G. Wilson, II	2001-02	Neshoba
11	175	3	Kyle Gordon	2005-06	Madison
12 +	174 6/8	1	0. P. Gilbert	1960-61	Coahoma
12 +	174 6/8	1	Jeremy Boelte	1997-98	Adams
13 +	174 1/8	2	William Ladd	1999-00	Noxubee
13 +	174 1/8	4	Mike Shell, current owner	1940	Warren
13 +	174 1/8	1	Bill Walters	1995-96	Coahoma
14	173 5/8	1	Geraline Holliman	1982-83	Lowndes
15	173 3/8	1	Richard Powell	1994-95	Coahoma
16	172 5/8	1	Adrian Stallone	1983-84	Adams
17 +	172	1	Barry Barnes	2003-04	Yazoo
17 +	172	1	Nan Foster New	1977-78	Adams
18 +	171 6/8	3	Patrick Cenac	2005-06	Adams
18 +	171 6/8	1	Delton Davis	1990-91	Tunica
19	171 4/8	1	Ricky Lee	1999-00	Tallahatchie
20	170 7/8	1	W. A. Miller	1920	Issaquena
21	170 4/8	4	Joe Reed Perry	Unknown	Sharkey
22	170 2/8	1	David G. McAdory	1994-95	Madison
23	170 1/8	4	Joe W. Martin	1994-95	Madison

\*\* OFFICIAL STATE RECORD

1 - IN RECORDS OF NORTH AMERICAN BIG GAME

2 - OFFICIALLY SCORED AND ACCEPTED

+ TIES

3 - OFFICIALLY SCORED AND PENDING

4 - OFFICIALLY SCORED BUT NOT ENTERED

## **In Conclusion**

#### Status

As in previous reports, data collected from a wide array of sources during the 2005-2006 season continued to indicate a diverse statewide deer herd. Unique populations continued to exist in all regions of the state.

Condition data and field habitat evaluations conducted by biologists continued to document the effects of current and long-term overpopulation in some areas of the state. Degradation of deer habitat and noticeable substandard condition indicators such as low reproduction were prevalent. Many locations in the state have experienced on-going damage of native browse by overpopulation of the deer herd since the early 1970's. Deer habitat on poorer soils has been damaged at a greater level than habitat on more fertile soils. In addition, habitat damage on lower fertility soils requires a longer recovery time than on the more fertile soils in regions like the Mississippi Delta. Reduction of deer populations to levels where habitat can recover is unacceptable to many hunters. The result has been continued over-use of quality browse species by deer.

The effects of Hurricane Katrina are beginning to be realized and will be observed for years to come. Lack of hunter's ability to access public and private lands in southeast Mississippi due to timber damage was evident in the hunter man-days and harvest. In the next few years the population levels may increase due to the habitat shift from mature pine stands to more of a cut-over type makeup in this section of the state.

Declines in deer condition and habitat quality have occurred in regions of the state where extensive acreage were converted from agriculture to pine monocultures in the late 1980s. Assorted federal and state incentive programs perpetuated this condition by providing cost-share opportunities to landowners. The result was an increasing acreage of densely planted plantations of pine on sites with a history of agriculture. Herbicide applications to other pine plantations to prevent competition and thereby eliminating browse plants caused decreased body weights and reproduction. Minimal amounts of deer forage are found in these sites, which allow only a moderate deer population to cause over-utilization of the browse that does occur. The result was a poor herd health due to a lack of quality and quantity of native browse plants. However, many of these pine monocultures are reaching the mid-rotation age (14 - 20 years old). Timber thinning is beginning on some of these sites, resulting in additional browse production because sunlight is reaching the forest floor where it has been lacking in the past.

For the third year a tool was offered to landowners and hunting clubs which suffer from extreme overpopulation or whose objective is to reduce total deer numbers. This tool is also effective for the removal of management bucks on above average habitat. Legislation was passed in 2003 allowing the harvest of sub - 4 point bucks by special permit; and altered to include management bucks in 2005. Landowners or clubs must meet certain requirements, such as cooperating with an approved wildlife biologist and be enrolled in DMAP for a minimum of at least one year to be eligible for these tags. A written justification from the biologist must be approved before management tags will be issued to a property. The biologist recommendations are used to determine the management buck criteria on individual properties.

### **Recommendations**

Statewide variance in parameters such as breeding dates, condition Sindicators, and changes in habitat quality continue to warrant intelligent site-specific deer management recommendations. Because of the extreme diversity in management needs across the state, landowners can implement these recommendations only if they are provided with a season framework that offers maximum opportunity or with special permits that allow additional opportunity.

A liberal antlerless season framework is mandatory if landowners are to meet management goals. Antlerless opportunity should be provided to allow landowners in all regions of the state the opportunity to manage deer populations. Decision makers will receive an increasing number of negative reports associated with antlerless hunting opportunity, as behavioral changes in the deer population create changes that make deer less visible to hunters. Continued complaints will arise as hunters incorrectly associate decreasing deer populations to antlerless season opportunity. These complaints will be more frequent in areas of the state with poor soil quality, previously high deer populations, and/or declining habitat quality.

An effective method to monitor statewide harvest on a county basis is needed to take deer management to the next level in Mississippi. Harvest data, which would include sex, harvest method, and county of harvest would provide information from which detailed analyses of the deer herd could occur. A telephone-based method, which provides this type of information, is currently in use in many states across the Southeast. Harvest data at a county level are instantaneously available to wildlife officials in these states. Voluntary implementation of a similar, efficient and cost-effective system, known as Tel-Chek, began in 2002, but has been underutilized. A mandatory tagging and reporting system like Tel-Chek would provide biologists with much needed data, and law enforcement officers with a new tool to catch violators. Evaluation of the 4-Point Law has led to a recommendation by the MDWFP Deer Committee to eliminate this law. The new proposal is to divide the state into 3 Deer Management Zones and use a minimum spread and mainbeam length criteria instead of a point-based criteria.

Research funding should continue. Continued advancement of the state deer program hinges on the professional association and interaction with current deer research projects. The MDWFP Wildlife Technical Staff has benefited professionally from this relationship with Mississippi State University for over 20 years. Many of the advances in the management of Mississippi's deer herd would not have occurred without this relationship. The opportunity to find answers, which address practical management questions, should continue to receive priority.

Existing data collection procedures on public and private lands must continue if responsible harvest recommendations for these lands are expected. Extensive baseline data exists from which objective evaluations can be conducted to examine the effects of changes in habitat, hunting opportunity, and harvest schemes. The annual mail survey will continue to be a valuable tool to monitor trends in a variety of important categories.

Information and education should remain the top priority of the deer program in Mississippi. Deer management needs are well documented in most regions of the state. Landowner and hunter understanding, acceptance, and support of sound deer management will continue to determine the success of deer management in Mississippi. Deer management objectives should be better communicated to the users of this resource. Without landowner and hunter support, success is not expected. When provided the freedom, sportsmen in Mississippi have proven they can make informed decisions that benefit the deer resource if they are provided with the correct management and biological information. Thanks Mississippi! With your help, Pennington Seed has contributed over \$40,000 in donations to support wildlife management in your home state.

# Finally, a white clover that will persist under extreme conditions!

he Durable, All Purpose White Clover

## High protein

 University and biologist recommended

RACKMASTER

RACKMASTER PUL

- Low maintenance
- Makes its own nitrogen



- Resistant to grazing
- More heat and drought tolerant
- More aggressive with grass and weeds
- ) is:
- More persistent
- More tolerant of acidic soil
- Makes up to 150 lbs. free nitrogen



White Clover Grazing Survival Trial — After 4 years under heavy grazing pressure. Percent basal coverage on clover entries continuously grazed in fescue sod 1998-2001.



www.penningtonseed.com 1-800-285-SEED The MDWFP is an equal opportunity employer and provider of programs and services. If anyone believes they have been subjected to discrimination on the basis of political affiliation, race, color, national origin, marital status, sex, religion, creed, age, or disability, they may file a complaint alleging discrimination with either the Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks, Office of Administrative Services, P.O. Box 451, Jackson, MS 39205-0451, or the U.S. Equal Employment Opportunity Commission, 1801 L. Street, N.W. Washington, D.C. 20507.



## MDWFP Wildlife Bureau

Nonprofit Org. U.S. Postage PAID Jackson, MS Permit 449