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Abstract  We captured 74 (17 male, 57 female) individual white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), including 48 adults, 5 yearlings, and 21 fawns. We radio-collared and VIT tagged 41 female deer. We detected pregnancy with ultrasound in 93% of adult (*n* = 41) and 33% of yearling (*n* = 3) females. We captured and radio-collared 32 neonate fawns (19 male, 13 female). Thirteen of 19 (68%) vaginal implant transmitter searches resulted in the location of 16 live fawns. We obtained 5,771 adult female and neonate fawn radiolocations, and captured or continued to monitor a total of 144 individual deer. We observed 20 radio-collared adult female white-tailed deer mortalities, 16 mortalities of radio-collared fawns born during 2015, and 14 mortalities of radio-collared fawns born during 2014. To estimate deer abundance, we placed 64 remote infrared cameras throughout the study area at baited sites and obtained 28,650 images including 6,494 observations of deer (4,994 adult females, 298 adult males, 1,052 fawns, and 150 unidentified deer). To estimate horizontal cover and deer forage with respect to available land cover, we completed vegetation surveys at 329 random locations stratified within 5 different land cover types. We immobilized 10 adult black bear (*Ursus americanus*; 2 male, 8 female) and 7 yearlings (3 male, 4 female) in their dens and observed 6 cubs (4 male, 2 female) from 2 females. From February to June we captured and immobilized 8 coyotes (*Canis latrans*; 2 male, 6 female), 6 bobcats (*Lynx rufus*; 3 male, 3 female), and 4 wolves (*C. spp.*; 1 male, 3 female) and either fitted them with GPS collars or released them due to their small size. During May–June we captured 4 adult black bears (3 male, 1 female) and fitted each with a GPS collar. We collected 297 hair samples and > 490,000 images from bobcat hair snares and remote cameras, respectively. We collected 2170 hair samples and 34,431 images from black bear hair snares and remote cameras, respectively. During howl surveys we recorded an average coyote response rate (RR) of 29% and wolf RR of 0.2%. We conducted investigations at 715 carnivore cluster sites to identify carnivore prey sources and opportunistically collected 642 scats from black bear, bobcat, coyote, and wolf. We conducted 5 ruffed grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) drumming surveys to estimate grouse abundance and had a 50% average detection rate across surveys. We completed snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus*) pellet count surveys at 485 random locations stratified within 5 different land cover types to estimate hare densities with respect to available land cover. To provide an index of beaver (*Castor canadensis*) abundance, we conducted aerial surveys and detected 36 inactive lodges, 53 active lodges with a cache present, and 8 caches with no sign of a lodge. We published 6 refereed manuscripts in the journals PLOS One, Population Ecology, The Wildlife Society Bulletin, Behavioural Processes, and Human-Wildlife Interactions. Throughout the year, we hosted many volunteers from various organizations and two photographers/videographers, gave 46 presentations, hosted 2 workshops, and kept our Facebook page (www.Facebook.com/MIpredprey) current with project results.
Summary

- We captured 74 deer (17 male, 57 female) individual white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*), including 48 adults, 5 yearlings, and 21 fawns.

- We fitted 41 pregnant female deer with a radio-collar and a VIT.

- We detected pregnancy with ultrasound in 93% of adult (*n* = 41) and 33% of yearling (*n* = 3) females.

- We captured and radio-collared 32 neonate fawns (19 male, 13 female).

- Thirteen of 19 (68%) vaginal implant transmitter searches resulted in the location of 16 live fawns.

- We obtained 5,776 radiolocations of adult female and neonate fawn white-tailed deer.

- We observed 20 dead radio-collared adult female white-tailed deer. We attributed 11 mortalities to predation: 7 wolf, 1 coyote, and 3 unidentified canid (either coyote [*Canis latrans*] of wolf [*Canis* spp.]). We censored five mortalities, in which predation was the apparent proximate cause, from the study sample because they occurred within 10 days of capture. We observed 2 mortalities from illegal harvest, and two mortalities in which the cause of death could not be determined from evidence at the carcass site.

- Of the 32 neonate fawns collared during 2015, sixteen fawns died as of 20 September. We attributed 15 mortalities to predation: 5 black bear, 3 bobcat, 2 coyote, and 5 unidentified predations. We observed 1 mortality due to a vehicle collision. Additionally, we censored three fawns from the study sample after their radio-collars appeared to have fallen off.

- We placed 64 remote infrared cameras throughout the study area to estimate deer abundance and obtained 28,650 images including 6,494 observations of deer (4,994 adult females, 298 adult males, 1,052 fawns, and 150 unidentified deer).

- We completed vegetation surveys at 329 random locations stratified within 5 different land cover types to estimate horizontal cover and deer forage with respect to available land cover.

- We immobilized 10 adult black bear (*Ursus americanus*; 2 male, 8 female) and 7 yearlings (3 male, 4 female) in their dens and observed 6 cubs (4 male, 2 female) from 2 females.

- We set 12 cage traps to capture bobcats (*Lynx rufus*). We captured 6 bobcats and were able to collar 5 with GPS collars. We did not collar one of the bobcats because it weighed < 7.3 kg.

- We captured and immobilized 4 adult black bear (3 male, 1 female) using foot snares and barrel traps as capture techniques. We fitted 1 bear with a GPS camera collar and the remaining 3 bears with GPS radio-collars.
We set padded foothold traps and non-powered cable neck restraints (coyotes only) along roadways and in frozen marshes to capture bobcats, coyotes, and wolves. We captured 8 coyotes and 4 wolves and fitted each with a GPS or VHF radio-collar.

We deployed hair snares and remote cameras at 64 sites throughout the study area to estimate bobcat abundance. We obtained 297 hair samples and > 490,000 images.

We deployed hair snares and remote infrared cameras at 64 sites throughout the study area to estimate black bear abundance and obtained 2170 samples of black bear hair.

We obtained a coyote response rate (RR) of 29% and wolf RR of 0.2% to broadcasted recordings of coyote group-yip-howls during howl surveys.

We conducted investigations at 715 carnivore cluster sites to identify carnivore prey.

We opportunistically collected 642 scats from black bear, bobcat, coyote, and wolf.

We conducted 5 ruffed grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) drumming surveys to estimate grouse abundance. On average, grouse response rate was 50% across surveys.

We completed snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus*) pellet count surveys at 485 random locations stratified within 5 land covers to estimate hare densities.

We conducted a beaver (*Castor canadensis*) cache survey to estimate beaver abundance within the study area. We flew 558 km of river and lakeshore and detected 53 active beaver caches.

We hosted individuals from Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Northern Michigan University, Purdue University, and members of the Safari Club International Michigan Involvement Committee. We hosted production crews of Discovering Michigan and Michigan Out-of-Doors who took photos and video footage of project staff performing field duties featured in two television specials.

We updated our Facebook page ([www.Facebook.com/MIpredprey](http://www.Facebook.com/MIpredprey)) to provide the public with project results.

We hosted students from Purdue University for demonstrations of detection dogs, carnivore immobilizations, fawn searches, and black bear den checks.

We gave presentations to 46 different groups or organizations (including school groups) about ongoing project activities and findings.

During January–March 2015 and May–August 2015 we hired and employed 6 and 13 technicians, respectively. We hired one technician to assist with fall project activities.
Introduction

Management of wildlife is based on an understanding, and in some cases, manipulation of factors that limit wildlife populations. Wildlife managers sometimes manipulate the effect of a limiting factor to allow a wildlife population to increase or decrease. White-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) are an important wildlife species in North America providing many ecological, social, and economic values. Most generally, factors that can limit deer numbers include food supply, winter cover, disease, predation, weather, and hunter harvest. Deer numbers change with changes in these limiting factors.

White-tailed deer provide food, sport, income, and viewing opportunities to millions of Americans throughout the United States and are among the most visible and ecologically–important wildlife species in North America. They occur throughout Michigan at various densities, based on geographical region and habitat type. Michigan spans about 600 km from north to south. The importance of factors that limit deer populations vary along this latitudinal gradient. For example, winter severity and winter food availability have less impact on deer numbers in Lower Michigan than in Upper Michigan.

Quantifying the relative role of factors potentially limiting white-tailed deer recruitment and how the importance of these factors varies across this latitudinal gradient is critical for understanding deer demography and ensuring effective management strategies. Considerable research has demonstrated the effects of winter severity on white-tailed deer condition and survival (Ozoga and Gysel 1972, Moen 1976, DelGiudice et al. 2002). In addition, the importance of food supply and cover, particularly during winter, has been documented (Moen 1976, Taillon et al. 2006). Finally, the role of predation on white-tailed deer survival has received considerable attention (e.g., Ballard et al. 2001). However, few studies have simultaneously addressed the roles of limiting factors on white-tailed deer.

The overall goal of this project is to assess baseline reproductive parameters and the magnitude of cause-specific mortality and survival of white-tailed deer fawns, particularly mortality due to predation, in relation to other possible limiting mortality agents along a latitudinal gradient in Michigan. We will simultaneously assess effects of predation and winter severity and indirectly evaluate the influence of habitat conditions on fawn recruitment. Considering results from Lower Michigan (Pusateri Burroughs et al. 2006, Hiller 2007) as the southern extent of this gradient, we propose three additional study sites from south to north across Upper Michigan. Because of logistical and financial constraints, we propose to conduct work sequentially across these study areas. The following objectives are specific to the Upper Michigan study area but applicable to other study areas with varying predator suites.

Objectives

1. Estimate survival and cause-specific mortality of white-tailed deer fawns and does.

2. Estimate proportion of fawn mortality attributable to black bear (*Ursus americanus*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), bobcat (*Lynx rufus*), and wolf (*Canis* spp.).

3. Estimate number and age of fawns killed by a bear, coyote, bobcat, or wolf during summer.

4. Provide updated information on white-tailed deer pregnancy and fecundity rates.

5. Estimate annual and seasonal resource use (e.g., habitat) and home range of white-tailed deer.
6. Estimate if familiarity of an area to each predator species affects the likelihood of fawn predation.

7. Assess if estimated composite bear, coyote, bobcat, and wolf use of an area influences fawn predation rates.

8. Describe association between fawn birth site habitat characteristics and black bear, coyote, bobcat, or wolf habitat use.

9. Estimate seasonal resource use (e.g., habitat, prey) and home range size of black bear, coyote, bobcat and wolf.

**Study Area**

The second phase of this study spans about 1,000 km² (386 mi²) within Deer Management Unit 036 in Iron County (Figure 1). The general study area boundaries follow State Highway M-95 on the east, US Highway 41/28 on the north, US Highway 141 on the west, and State Highway M-69 on the south. The core study area, where we conducted most capture efforts and population surveys, is north of the Michigamme Reservoir and includes state forest, commercial forest association, and private lands. The final study area will comprise a minimum convex polygon that will include the composite locations of all telemetered animals. We selected this study area because it occurs within the mid-snowfall range, receiving about 180 cm of snowfall annually (about 53 cm more snowfall annually than the phase 1 study area near Escanaba). Deer in this area migrate longer distances and exhibit yarding behavior during most winters as compared to deer near Escanaba that migrate only short distances or are non-migratory (Beyer et al. 2010) and yard less frequently.

**Accomplishments**

**Deer Trapping**

From 11 January 2015 to 15 March 2015 we captured white-tailed deer in Clover traps (Figure 2) to place radio-collars on pregnant females. We captured 74 unique deer (57 females, 17 males), with an additional 47 recaptures. Individuals captured included 44 adult females, 4 adult males, 3 yearling females, 2 yearling males, 10 female fawns, and 11 male fawns. The fawn:adult female ratio for winter captures in 2014–2015 was 0.48:1. For comparison, the fawn:adult female ratio was 1:1 for winter 2012–2013 captures and 0.27:1 for winter 2013–2014 captures. We collected body condition scores (BCS) by palpation of fat deposits (scale: 1 [moribund]–5 [obese]) by two independent observers and attached ear tags (females = blue, males = yellow) to each deer. We also assessed pregnancy of yearling and adult females using ultrasonography.

Females \( (n = 55) \) and males \( (n = 17) \) had mean \( (± SD) \) body condition scores of 2.46 \( ± 0.52 \) and 2.39 \( ± 0.54 \), respectively. Two deer (one adult female, one male fawn) were euthanized due to spinal injuries sustained from the trap, and a third deer (adult female) died as a result of apparent cardiac arrest during the immobilization (necropsy pending).

We immobilized 44 females and fitted 41 with radio-collars (model 2610B, Advanced Telemetry Systems Inc., Isanti, MN). We fitted 41 pregnant females with a vaginal implant transmitter (VIT; model 3930, Advanced Telemetry Systems Inc., Isanti, MN). We monitored temperature, respiration, and heart rate as soon as practical after immobilization and at about 10-minute intervals...
thereafter until we administered a reversal drug. We recorded deer morphometrics and mid-rump fat depths (Table 1) when practical.

We detected pregnancy with ultrasound in 98% of adults \((n = 41)\) and 33% of yearlings \((n = 3)\). Two adult females identified as pregnant using ultrasound during winter capture did not have a parturition event during the summer, and so were either not pregnant or had an early termination of pregnancy. Estimated age of captured does using cementum annuli ranged from 1.7-15.7 years old, with a mean estimated age of 5.77 years.

In order to increase sample sizes for fawn winter survival and cause-specific mortality, we also fitted 10 fawns (7 Male, 3 Female) with expandable radio-collars (model 4210, Advanced Telemetry Systems, Inc., Isanti, MN) during January deer capture, without immobilization.

In addition to the 41 adult females and 10 fawns radio-collared this winter, we continued to monitor 27 does captured during January–March 2013 or 2014, and 14 fawns captured during May–June 2014.

**Fawn Capture**

Beginning mid-May we captured, radio-collared, and obtained radio-locations for white-tailed deer fawns. We captured 32 neonate fawns (19 male, 13 female) and fitted them with expandable radio-collars (model 4210, Advanced Telemetry Systems, Inc., Isanti, MN) during May–July. We attached 2 individually numbered plastic ear tags to fawns and attempted to collect fawn morphometrics (Table 2), blood, hair, and identify sex. We also recorded bed site and surrounding habitat, flush distance, presence of dam, additional deer sighted, and handling time.

Estimated parturition dates of captured fawns were 24 May–4 July, with a median parturition date of 8 June (Figure 3). Average estimated birth mass of fawns in 2014 was similar to average birth mass of fawns born in 2013 \((3.6 \pm 1.3 \text{ kg and } 3.1 \pm 1.1 \text{ kg, respectively})\). Mean estimated fawn age at capture was 2.25 days.

We conducted vaginal implant transmitter (VIT) searches to find fawns of 19 implanted pregnant adult females. Thirteen of nineteen (68%) VIT searches resulted in the location of 16 live fawns.

**Deer Telemetry**

We used bi-weekly aerial telemetry, 24-hour ground telemetry, and 5 GPS collars to obtain 5,776 locations of radio-collared adult females and fawns during 15 September 2014 to 15 September 2015. We monitored deer collars every two weeks for survival status. We monitored a total of 121 deer via radio-collar during 15 September 2014–15 September 2015 (Table 3).

**Deer Mortality**

From 15 September 2014–15 September 2015, we recorded 20 adult female mortalities. We attributed 11 mortalities to predation (7 wolf, 1 coyote, and 3 unidentified). Unidentified predations showed signs of predation (e.g., puncture wounds, hemorrhaging, evidence of struggle), but lacked species-specific sign (e.g., canine spacing, tracks, scat) or showed sign of multiple predator species. We censored five mortalities, in which predation was the apparent proximate cause, from the study sample because they occurred within 10 days of capture. We observed 2 mortalities from illegal harvest, and two mortalities in which the cause of death could not be determined from evidence at the carcass site.

We recorded 14 mortalities and 7 censors of fawns born in May–June 2014. We attributed causes of mortality to 5 wolf predations, 4 coyote predations, 2 unidentifiable predations, 1 winter
starvation, and 2 unknown causes in which we could not distinguish predation from scavenging. Censors were due to dropped collars and radio failure.

We recorded 16 mortalities of neonate fawns born in May–July 2015, including 5 black bear predations, 3 bobcat predations, 2 coyote predations, and 5 unidentified predations. We censored three fawn collars that appeared to have fallen off the animal. Excluding censers, 2015 fawn apparent survival from birth to 1 September was 44%.

**Deer Camera Survey**

We pre-baited sixty-four sites throughout the study area (Figure 4) with 7.5 l of whole kernel corn beginning 12 August and re-baited sites at 3-day intervals. The 10-day survey period started at pre-baited sites beginning 22 August on and ended by 3 September. We obtained 28,650 images including 6,494 observations of deer (4,994 adult females, 298 adult males, 1,052 fawns, and 150 unidentified deer). From camera images, we will estimate deer abundance/density for the 298 km² sampling area using an occupancy modeling approach (Duquette et al. 2014).

**Deer Forage and Vegetation Survey**

From 12 May to 13 August we conducted vegetation surveys at 329 random locations within 6 main land cover types (deciduous \( n = 51 \), coniferous \( n = 60 \), mixed forest \( n = 38 \), woody wetland \( n = 46 \), herbaceous wetland \( n = 92 \), and herbaceous grassland \( n = 40 \); Table 4). At each random location we established 5 plots. Within each plot, we estimated horizontal cover and counted number of tree, shrub, and percent of herbaceous plants selected for by white-tailed deer (McCaffery et al. 1974, Stormer and Bauer 1980). We also collected vegetation samples, which we dried for 24 hours in a forced air oven and then subsequently weighed. We will use vegetation data to estimate forage availability within each of our land cover types.

**Black Bear Den Checks**

During 16 January 2015–2 March 2015 we immobilized 10 adult black bears (2 male, 8 female) and 7 yearlings (3 male, 4 female). We weighed, recorded morphometric measurements, and drew blood from each immobilized bear. We replaced VHF radio-collars or Global Positioning System (GPS) collars with new GPS collars on 10 previously collared adult black bears. We programmed the GPS collars to obtain a location every 35 h until 1 May and then every 15 min until we remove the collar in the den. We handled 6 cubs (4 male, 2 female) from 2 adult females; mean litter size was 3 (SD = 1.41; Table 5).

**Bobcat Capture**

We set cage traps \( n = 17 \) to capture bobcats at previously baited bobcat hair snare sites during 6–15 March. We captured 3 female (7.3, 9.5, 12.7 kg) and 3 male (11.8, 12.8, 15.9 kg) bobcat. Once immobilized, we weighed, sexed, and collected morphometric measurements from bobcats. We collared every bobcat > 7.3 kg with a GPS collar that we programmed to record 35 h locations until 1 May and then every 15 min until 31 August. We were unable to collar one female bobcat due to her light weight (7.3 kg).

**Coyote Cable Neck Restraints**

We baited 6 locations with vehicle-killed deer carcasses to attract coyotes for capture. We set 13 relaxing-lock cable neck restraints at 4 sites starting on 10 February. We immobilized 1 adult female coyote on 21 February (13.6 kg) and fit a GPS collar programmed to record 35 h locations until 1 May
and then every 15 min until 31 August. We removed all coyote cable neck restraints by 12 March due to continuing unfavorable snow conditions.

Spring/Summer Carnivore Capture

During 22 May–15 June, we captured 3 male black bears, 8 coyotes (2 male, 6 female), and 4 wolves (1 male, 3 female) using foothold traps. We immobilized captured individuals and recorded gender, weight, and affixed uniquely numbered ear tags (Figure 5; Table 6). We recorded morphometric measurements and collected blood and hair from each immobilized carnivore. We estimated body condition scores for each carnivore and estimated body condition of black bears using bioelectrical impedance analysis. We removed a lower premolar or upper incisor for age estimation in coyotes, and a vestigial premolar for age estimation in black bears. We fitted all bobcats, coyotes, and wolves with Lotek 7000SU global positioning system (GPS) radio-collars (Lotek Engineering, Newmarket, ON, Canada). Of the 4 captured bears, we fitted 3 male bears with GPS radio-collars, and fitted one female bear with a Lotek 7000MU GPS camera collar that we programmed to record video every half hour for 30 seconds during 0500–1000 hours and 1800–2100 hours.

We programmed all 7000SU GPS radio-collars for bobcats, coyotes, and wolves to obtain a location every 35 hours until 1 May, every 15 minutes from 1 May–31 September and then every 35 hours until the scheduled collar drop-off date. We programmed all 7000MU GPS radio-collars, fitted on black bear, to obtain a location every 35 hours until 1 May and then every 15 minutes until we change their collars out in their dens. We fitted the 7000MU GPS camera collar and all 7000SU GPS radio-collars with a drop-off mechanism to release collars 25–35 weeks after deployment. We fit all radio-collars on black bears with a leather breakaway device in case bears disperse and we cannot relocate them.

Carnivore Monitoring

We recovered 2 bobcat, 3 coyote, and 3 wolf GPS radio-collars after the drop-off mechanisms activated during September–December 2014 and 2 additional wolf and 1 black bear GPS radio-collars in September 2015. We sent three damaged GPS radio-collars to the manufacturer for refurbishment. We observed six harvested black bear and recovered their collars, during the Michigan and Wisconsin 2014 black bear hunting seasons. We sent a premolar from each black bear to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources Disease Laboratory for age estimation.

We were unable to locate or recover GPS collars from 1 wolf, 2 bobcats, and 1 coyote. From 25 September to 15 December 2014, we located 9 black bears 5 times to follow their movements and confirm denning location. We located 9 bear dens (2 male, 7 female) during 1–12 December.

Bobcat Hair Snares

We began baiting 64 bobcat hair snare sites (Figure 4) on 15 December 2014. After a two-week pre-bait period, we set 4–5 hair snares at each site beginning 2 January 2015. We also deployed a trail camera at each site, directed at the bait, to obtain images of all animals visiting the site.

We visited each bait site every 7 days to collect hair samples, reset snares, perform trail camera maintenance, and add bait as necessary. The eight-week survey was completed and we pulled snares during 27 February–6 March 2015.

We collected 297 hair samples (of both target and non-target species) which were sent to the MDNR Wildlife Disease Laboratory in Lansing for DNA extraction. We also obtained >490,000 camera images, including 11,050 observations of bobcat.
Black Bear Abundance Estimation: Hair Snares

During 27 May – 11 July we conducted a hair snare survey to estimate black bear abundance. Hair snares (n = 64; Figure 4), erected during 2012, consist of a single strand of 4-pronged barbed wire placed around three or four trees to create an enclosure about 50 cm above ground. We baited snares by placing 0.5 L of fish oil on a pile of dead wood in the center of each enclosure and spraying anise oil on each of the trees 2 m above ground. We checked snares, added lure, and collected hair samples every ten days, for a total of five checks. We collected 2170 hair samples. We sent these hair samples to the MDNR lab for DNA extraction and subsequent individual identification. We removed all hair snares, cameras, and signage following the survey as this was the final year for this survey in this study area.

Coyote Howl Surveys

We completed 5 howl surveys at 40 sites (Figure 6) beginning on 13 July. Surveys are on a 10 day rotation with each survey completed in 4 days, weather permitting. We elicited vocalizations using a FoxPro game caller (FoxPro Inc., Lewistown, PA) using a group-yip howl to elicit coyote vocal response. At each survey site we recorded moon phase, cloud cover, wind speed, species responding, response time and direction, number of individuals responding, type of response (e.g., bark-howl, lone howl), and recordings of responses.

Through the end of the survey we obtained coyote and wolf response rates of 29% and 0.2%, respectively. We will estimate coyote abundance using an occupancy modeling approach (Petroelje et al. 2014).

Wolf Track Surveys

The Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) conducted wolf track surveys for the 2015 population estimate during 9–27 February within our study area to identify the number of wolf packs in the study area and the minimum number of individuals within each pack. We also used information from 3 GPS collared individuals to estimate territorial boundaries for 2 packs within the study area; Deer Lake and Mitchigan. Michigan DNR personnel identified a minimum of 25 individuals consisting of four packs with their entire territories occurring within the study area: Deer Lake (minimum 6 individuals); Mitchigan (minimum 7 individuals); Shank Lake (minimum 7 individuals); and Republic (minimum 5 individuals).

Carnivore Cluster Investigation

We used clusters of carnivore locations obtained from GPS radio-collars to identify potential kill sites and estimate the number of prey species killed. In 2015, we investigated 715 GPS cluster locations identified using ArcGIS and the statistical program R (R Development Core Team, Vienna, Austria). We defined a cluster as > 4 locations within 50 m of each other within a 24-hour period. Of the 715 clusters investigated this year, 239 were black bear (mean clusters/black bear = 23.9), 160 bobcat (mean clusters/bobcat = 23.3), 189 coyote (mean clusters/coyote = 32.2), and 127 wolf (mean clusters/wolf = 23.9).

Preliminary results from cluster investigations include black bears foraging on chokecherries (Prunus virginiana), raspberries (Rubus ideaus), blueberries (Vaccinium spp.), fawns, and various colonial insects (e.g., ants). We identified black bear clusters where foraging and bedding sites co-occurred. We identified ruffed grouse (Bonasa umbellus), porcupine (Erithizon dorsatum), muskrat (Ondatra zibethicus), beaver (Castor canadensis), 1 Sandhill crane (Grus canadensis), and fawn predations at bobcat clusters sites. We identified predations of snowshoe hare (Lepus americanus), frog (Rana spp.), turkey (Meleagris gallopavo), ruffed grouse, and fawn and adult deer at coyote clusters.
We identified predations of beaver, fawn and adult deer at wolf clusters. Analysis of cluster findings is ongoing.

**Carnivore Scat Collection**

We opportunistically collected 642 scats from black bear, bobcat, coyote, and wolf. We labeled collected scats with date, species, presence of tracks, diameter, and Universal Transverse Mercator (UTM) coordinates. We have begun washing and drying scats. We packaged 611 scats (174 black bear, 18 bobcat, 216 coyote, and 203 wolf) and sent them to Mississippi State University’s Carnivore Ecology Laboratory for identification of prey remains.

**Ruffed Grouse Drumming Survey**

We conducted ruffed grouse (*Bonasa umbellus*) drumming surveys during 23 April–1 May. We conducted surveys from one half hour before sunrise to 5 hours after sunrise. Each survey contained 3 routes with 20–25 sites in each route for a total of 65 sites (Figure 7). Observers listened for 5 minutes at each site for drumming grouse and recorded number and bearing of each drumming grouse. We will use site occupancy to estimate male grouse density. Throughout the survey we heard drumming grouse at 50% of the sites on average.

**Snowshoe Hare Pellet Counts**

We conducted snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus*) pellet counts during 24 April–26 May. We counted number of hare pellets within a 1 m² rectangle at 485 random sites (Figure 8). We separated pellet counts into 6 main land cover types (aspen [*Populus tremuloides*]), deciduous (excluding aspen), coniferous, mixed forest, woody wetland, and open herbaceous). We related hare pellet densities to hare abundance using a linear regression developed by McCann et al. (2008) and observed a decreasing trend in the hare population during 2013–2015 (Figure 9). Snowshoe hare densities were greatest within mixed aspen/evergreen and woody wetland land covers.

**Aerial Beaver Cache Survey**

To provide an index of beaver abundance, we flew 558 km of river and lakeshore on 5–6 November to identify active beaver caches. We conducted flights at an altitude of 550–650 m. We detected 36 inactive lodges, 53 active lodges with a cache present, and 8 caches with no sign of a lodge (equates to one active cache for every 9.1 km flown; Figure 10).

**Public Outreach**

During black bear den checks and white-tailed deer trapping we hosted individuals from Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR), Northern Michigan University, Purdue University, Michigan Out-of-Doors, 906 Outdoors (Discovering), and other interested members of the public. We hosted two TV shows who obtained images and video footage of project staff performing various field duties and provided this media to Safari Club International Foundation to promote the project. We hosted 5 observers from Northern Michigan University on several occasions and gave presentations for Northern Michigan University Wildlife Society’s “Wolf Week”. We attended several MDNR Sportsman’s Coalition Meetings where we discussed the project with interested members of the public and tried to improve regional awareness of project goals and activities. We hosted 31 undergraduate students from Purdue University on 4–5 June for demonstrations of detection dogs, carnivore immobilizations, fawn capture, vegetation surveys, and deer telemetry. We presented at a local community center in Iron River, MI on 9 May to inform members of the public about ongoing
research in the area. We also gave presentations to 25 classes at local public schools, reaching over 400 students. We updated our Facebook page (www.Facebook.com/MIpredprey) to provide the public with project results.

**Presentations to hunting groups and service organizations:**


Seminars and Workshops:


Popular Media:


Technician Hiring

During January–March 2015 and May–August 2015 we hired and employed 7 and 13 technicians, respectively. We hired one technician from 72 applicants to assist during fall 2015.

Publications


Work to be completed (September–December 2015)

White-tailed Deer Monitoring
We will use radio-telemetry to locate collared does and fawns weekly. We will also investigate mortalities as soon as practical after detecting a mortality signal to determine cause of death.

Carnivore Monitoring and GPS Radio-collar Recovery
We will continue to monitor collared carnivores twice monthly until drop-off mechanisms detach for bobcats, coyotes, and wolves. We will recover the dropped radio-collars and download location and activity data. We will clear recovered collars of data, clean them, and store or send them back to the manufacturer for refurbishment. We will monitor black bears until dens are located in early to mid-November.

Black Bear Den Checks
We will locate and mark black bear dens in late-November before heavy snow fall and conduct black bear den checks beginning in mid-December to change GPS collar batteries on collared male black bear.

Aerial Beaver Cache Survey
Starting around 15 October, after leaf-off, we will conduct an annual aerial beaver cache survey. We will fly along rivers, streams, lakes, and other hydrology to locate and mark active beaver caches as an index to beaver abundance.

Equipment Organization, Inventory, and Storage
We will inventory, organize, repair, and store all summer field equipment and repair and store all project ATVs. Additionally, we will move all project equipment to Baraga in preparation for the 3rd phase of the project.

Public Outreach
We will continue to update our project Facebook page (http://www.facebook.com/MIPredPrey) and web site (http://fwrc.msstate.edu/carnivore/predatorprey/) with project results.
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Table 1. Mean (\( \bar{x} \)) and standard deviation (SD) of 43 captured adult \((n = 41)\) and yearling \((n = 3)\) female white-tailed deer morphometrics and body condition estimates, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, January–March 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Metric</th>
<th>Adults</th>
<th>Yearlings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body weight (kg)</td>
<td>61.6 6.6</td>
<td>44.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind foot (cm)</td>
<td>48.4 1.3</td>
<td>46.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BCS(^1)</td>
<td>2.5 0.6</td>
<td>2.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MIDF(^2) (cm)</td>
<td>0.62 0.6</td>
<td>0.16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Body Condition Score (BCS) for does derived from palpation following Cook et al. (2010).
\(^2\) Middle rump fat (MIDF) estimate measured at mid-point between ilium and ischial tuberosity on right hip (Cook et al. 2007).
Table 2. Mean (\(\bar{x}\)) and standard deviation (SD) of 32 captured female \((n = 13)\) and male \((n = 19)\) neonate fawn morphometrics, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 24 May–4 July 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Estimate</th>
<th>Female (\bar{x} \pm SD)</th>
<th>Male (\bar{x} \pm SD)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Body Weight (kg)</td>
<td>4.5 ± 1.9</td>
<td>4.4 ± 1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Body Length (cm)</td>
<td>61.0 ± 4.8</td>
<td>60.0 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chest Girth (cm)</td>
<td>35.6 ± 3.4</td>
<td>34.9 ± 2.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hind Foot (cm)</td>
<td>26.7 ± 2.0</td>
<td>26.1 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shoulder Height (cm)</td>
<td>51.5.7 ± 7.3</td>
<td>48.6 ± 3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>New Hoof Growth (mm)</td>
<td>2.2 ± 1.1</td>
<td>3.0 ± 1.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birth Mass (kg)(^1)</td>
<td>4.2 ± 1.7</td>
<td>3.8 ± 1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Birth masses of fawns with unknown parturition dates estimated by assuming an average daily mass gain of 0.2 kg since birth (Verme and Ullrey 1984, Carstensen et al. 2009).
Table 3. Sample sizes of radio-collared and/or ear-tagged white-tailed deer captured or monitored via telemetry, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 15 September 2014–15 September 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Adult (&gt;1 year)</th>
<th>Fawn, born 2014</th>
<th>Fawn, born 2015</th>
<th>All Deer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>Male</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Radio-collared</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ear-tagged, not</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>collared</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Marked</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sample</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4. Land cover designations as defined in the national land cover database (Jin et al. 2013). Iron County, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, 2011.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land cover class</th>
<th>Definition of designation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Deciduous forest</td>
<td>Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20% of total vegetation cover. More than 75 percent of the tree species shed foliage simultaneously in response to seasonal change.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Woody wetland</td>
<td>Areas where forest or shrub land vegetation accounts for greater than 20 percent of vegetative cover and the soil or substrate is periodically saturated with or covered with water.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mixed forest</td>
<td>Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20% of total vegetation cover. Neither deciduous nor evergreen species are greater than 75 percent of total tree cover.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Evergreen forest</td>
<td>Areas dominated by trees generally greater than 5 meters tall, and greater than 20% of total vegetation cover. More than 75 percent of the tree species maintain their leaves all year. Canopy is never without green foliage.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergent herbaceous wetland</td>
<td>Areas where perennial herbaceous vegetation accounts for greater than 80 percent of vegetative cover and the soil or substrate is periodically saturated with or covered with water.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Den check data for 22 black bears, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 15 December 2015–02 March 2015.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Den check date</th>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Body weight (kg)</th>
<th>Right ear tag</th>
<th>Left ear tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>BB146</td>
<td>15-Jan</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>407</td>
<td>302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB142</td>
<td>16-Jan</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>115.7</td>
<td>269</td>
<td>279</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB120</td>
<td>23-Feb</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>229</td>
<td>228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB156</td>
<td>23-Feb</td>
<td>Yearling of BB120</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>424</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB157</td>
<td>23-Feb</td>
<td>Yearling of BB120</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>423</td>
<td>422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB163</td>
<td>24-Feb</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB179</td>
<td>24-Feb</td>
<td>Yearling of BB163</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>481</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB103</td>
<td>25-Feb</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>56.7</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB149</td>
<td>25-Feb</td>
<td>Yearling of BB103</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>413</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB116</td>
<td>27-Feb</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>65.8</td>
<td>239</td>
<td>238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB152</td>
<td>27-Feb</td>
<td>Yearling of BB116</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>482</td>
<td>486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB112</td>
<td>28-Feb</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>77.1</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>219</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB169</td>
<td>28-Feb</td>
<td>Cub of BB112</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB170</td>
<td>28-Feb</td>
<td>Cub of BB112</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB144</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>63.5</td>
<td>268</td>
<td>272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB154</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Yearling of BB144</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>353</td>
<td>354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB155</td>
<td>1-Mar</td>
<td>Yearling of BB144</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>351</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB162</td>
<td>2-Mar</td>
<td>Adult</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>NA*</td>
<td>305</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB171</td>
<td>2-Mar</td>
<td>Cub of BB162</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB172</td>
<td>2-Mar</td>
<td>Cub of BB162</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB173</td>
<td>2-Mar</td>
<td>Cub of BB162</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BB174</td>
<td>2-Mar</td>
<td>Cub of BB162</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Unable to weigh bear due to den dimensions
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>ID</th>
<th>Capture date</th>
<th>Sex</th>
<th>Body weight (kg)</th>
<th>Right ear tag</th>
<th>Left ear tag</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>BB175</td>
<td>09-May-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>337</td>
<td>336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>BB176</td>
<td>11-May-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>67.1</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>BB177</td>
<td>16-May-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>349</td>
<td>350</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>BB178</td>
<td>16-Jun-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>60.3</td>
<td>346</td>
<td>345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bear</td>
<td>BB117</td>
<td>28-Jun-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>73.0</td>
<td>173</td>
<td>161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>BC111</td>
<td>7-Mar-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>412</td>
<td>411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>BC112</td>
<td>7-Mar-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>404</td>
<td>410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>BC113</td>
<td>9-Mar-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>408</td>
<td>409</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>BC114</td>
<td>10-Mar-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>405</td>
<td>406</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>BC106</td>
<td>10-Mar-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>250</td>
<td>249</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bobcat</td>
<td>BC115</td>
<td>11-Mar-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>420</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>CO113</td>
<td>21-Feb-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>402</td>
<td>401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>CO114</td>
<td>6-May-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>418</td>
<td>416</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>CO115</td>
<td>16-May-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>347</td>
<td>348</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>CO116</td>
<td>18-May-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>CO117</td>
<td>25-May-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>CO118</td>
<td>2-Jun-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>110</td>
<td>109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyote</td>
<td>CO119</td>
<td>5-Jun-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>113</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>WO110</td>
<td>4-May-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>28.1</td>
<td>1110</td>
<td>1109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>WO111</td>
<td>15-May-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>1238</td>
<td>1239</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>WO102</td>
<td>18-May-15</td>
<td>M</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>1104</td>
<td>1103</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wolf</td>
<td>WO112</td>
<td>29-May-15</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>1117</td>
<td>1241</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Animal euthanized due to long bone fracture
Figure 1. Location of phase 1 and 2 study areas and Michigan Department of Natural Resources Deer Management Units, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, 2008–2015.
Figure 2. Locations of Clover traps for deer capture, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 11 January–26 March 2015.
Figure 3. Estimated parturition dates of 32 free-ranging white-tailed deer fawns and 5 Vaginal Implant Transmitter drop sites where a fawn was not found but a birth site was evident, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 2015.
Figure 4. Locations of 64 bobcat hair snares, black bear hair snares, and corn baited camera sites to estimate bobcat, black bear, and white-tailed deer abundance, respectively; Upper Peninsula of Michigan, 2015.
Figure 5. Ear tagged black bear, bobcat, coyote, and wolf, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 2009.
Figure 6. Locations of 40 howl survey sites to estimate coyote abundance, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, 2015.
Figure 7. Locations of 65 grouse drumming survey sites with 550 m audible buffer along 3 routes to estimate abundance, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 2015.
Figure 8. Locations of 448 hare pellet plot survey sites used to estimate snowshoe hare abundance, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 2015.
Figure 9. Snowshoe hare (*Lepus americanus*) densities by land cover type, Phase 2 study area, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 2013–2015.
Figure 10. Locations of beaver caches and lodges detected aerially during 5–6 November, Upper Peninsula of Michigan, USA, 2014.