

11hr_AC-NR_ab0099_pt05



(FORM UPDATED: 08/11/2010)

WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE ... PUBLIC HEARING - COMMITTEE RECORDS

2011-12

(session year)

Assembly

(Assembly, Senate or Joint)

Committee on Natural Resources...

COMMITTEE NOTICES ...

- Committee Reports ... **CR**
- Executive Sessions ... **ES**
- Public Hearings ... **PH**

INFORMATION COLLECTED BY COMMITTEE FOR AND AGAINST PROPOSAL

- Appointments ... **Appt** (w/Record of Comm. Proceedings)
- Clearinghouse Rules ... **CRule** (w/Record of Comm. Proceedings)
- Hearing Records ... bills and resolutions (w/Record of Comm. Proceedings)
(**ab** = Assembly Bill) (**ar** = Assembly Resolution) (**ajr** = Assembly Joint Resolution)
(**sb** = Senate Bill) (**sr** = Senate Resolution) (**sjr** = Senate Joint Resolution)
- Miscellaneous ... **Misc**

* Contents organized for archiving by: Stefanie Rose (LRB) (August 2013)

From
Jeff Gaiser

The American Midland Naturalist

Published Quarterly by The University of Notre Dame, Notre Dame, Indiana

Vol. 146

July, 2001

No. 1

Am. Midl. Nat. 146:1-26

Effects of White-tailed Deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) on Plants, Plant Populations and Communities: A Review

F. LELAND RUSSELL^{1,2}, DAVID B. ZIPPIN AND NORMA L. FOWLER

Integrative Biology, School of Biological Sciences, The University of Texas at Austin, Austin 78712

ABSTRACT.—Large effects of white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) upon individual plants, plant populations and communities have been documented in a number of studies. However, well-supported experimental measures of the magnitude and geographical extent of these effects are still surprisingly scarce. Deer-caused changes in stem morphology and reductions in plant growth rates are well-documented in some parts of the North America. Furthermore, deer have been shown to affect the composition of several plant communities in the north-central and northeastern United States. There are some documented cases of deer-caused reductions in plant survival; most of these are tree seedlings and saplings. However, many studies have detected no effects on plant survival or fecundity, or have found that negative effects occur only in a fraction of years, seasons, sites or deer densities. Little is known about population-level or ecosystem-level impacts. Many regions and plant communities with large deer populations have not been studied. Whereas deer density is clearly important in determining spatial and temporal variation in the presence and magnitude of deer effects, other factors that may modify the effects of deer density are poorly understood.

INTRODUCTION

In many parts of the eastern United States and south-eastern Canada white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus* (Boddaert)) are currently so abundant that many observers have suggested or assumed that deer are having a major impact upon the vegetation of this region (Leopold, 1950; Hough, 1965; Behrend *et al.*, 1970; Whitney, 1984; Alverson *et al.*, 1988; Michael, 1992; Strole and Anderson, 1992; Van Auken, 1993; Boerner and Brinkman, 1996; Phillips and Maun, 1996; Van Deelen *et al.*, 1996; Catling and Larson, 1997; Buckley *et al.*, 1998). Whereas substantial evidence exists that in some community types deer negatively affect the growth rate of tree seedlings and saplings, prevent adult recruitment into tree populations and alter species composition, experimental evidence for widespread (relative to the range of white-tailed deer in North America or to the geographic area over which deer populations recently have increased) substantial effects are less than frequently appears to be assumed. Here we summarize current knowledge about the nature, magnitude and spatial and temporal patterns of the effects of white-tailed deer upon individual

¹ Corresponding author

² Present address: Department of Biological Sciences, 410 Manter Hall, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, 68588-0118. Telephone (402)-477-2123; e-mail: LelandRussell@msn.com

plants, plant populations, plant communities and ecosystem processes and identify major gaps in our current knowledge. We also review some methodological challenges in obtaining more conclusive evidence of deer effects.

Management of deer populations is a contentious issue that has stirred emotional conflict between individuals who want to avoid the extirpation by overbrowsing of rare aesthetically pleasing or economically valuable plants and plant communities (Diamond, 1992; Diefenbach *et al.*, 1997) and individuals who consider hunting deer to be cruel (McShea and Rappole, 1997), hunters who enjoy the abundance of deer (Diefenbach *et al.*, 1997) and land managers who distrust human intervention in "natural" processes within wildlife refuges and preserves (Diamond, 1992). However, the effects of deer herbivory on vegetation are also of interest to ecologists examining the effects of herbivores on individual plants, plant populations and communities. By reviewing this literature we hope to provide information to aid land managers in evaluating the need to hunt deer to preserve rare or economically valuable plant species and to preserve or restore rare plant communities. In addition, we hope to enhance ecologists' understanding of the effects of herbivores on plants and the mechanisms that underlie these effects.

This review will be confined to effects of white-tailed deer, although similarly high densities of related species present similar problems elsewhere (Gill, 1988; Clutton-Brock and Albon, 1992; Melanes *et al.*, 1992; Singer and Renkin, 1995). For brevity we will use the word 'deer' to refer to white-tailed deer. There have been a number of regional reviews of effects of white-tailed deer on plants (Neils *et al.*, 1956; Marquis and Brenneman, 1981; Alverson *et al.*, 1988; Wimmer and deCalesta, 1992), but, to date, no wider overview of the subject.

As we will demonstrate, although there have been large increases in deer populations in many community types during the mid and late 20th century, studies that examine the effects of deer upon plant populations and communities have been conducted in a small subset of these community types (Fig. 1). Furthermore, existing studies primarily have examined deer effects upon a subset of the plant life-stages that are consumed by deer. Whereas there is sufficient evidence to conclude that deer effects can be substantial in some sites and years, we argue that how common those sites and years are remains unclear. More studies, and better designed and targeted studies, are highly desirable. In their absence, we suggest that prudent land managers and plant conservation biologists be alert for potential deer effects on plant individuals, populations and communities such as those reviewed here.

Historical background.—White-tailed deer occur throughout most of the United States and southern Canada east of the Rocky Mountains and are the most abundant wild ungulate on the continent (Gill, 1988). In the absence of direct data on deer abundance before European settlement, disagreement exists about whether and to what extent current deer densities exceed pre-European settlement deer densities (McCabe and McCabe, 1997). Estimates of pre-European settlement deer densities have been constructed from archeological evidence of the consumption rate of deer by native Americans, and hence rely upon assumptions concerning the demographics of native Americans and the rate at which they harvested deer, or are extrapolated from anecdotal accounts of deer abundance by early European settlers. Therefore, estimates of pre-European deer densities must be considered imprecise approximations. Nevertheless, authors have suggested that current deer densities are 2 to 4 times higher than pre-European settlement deer densities in hemlock-northern hardwoods forests (Alverson *et al.*, 1988; Redding, 1995) and white cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*) deer yards (Van Deelen *et al.*, 1996).

Although estimates of pre-European deer densities are imprecise, reliable accounts document a geographically widespread decline in deer populations in the late 19th Century.




FIG. 1.—Locations of studies that have examined effects of white-tailed deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) on individual plants, plant populations, plant communities and ecosystems. Studies of deer diets and habitat use are not included. The shaded area is the range of white-tailed deer in the United States of America and Canada. 'E' denotes studies that used deer exclosures. 'C' denotes studies that simulated deer herbivory by clipping. 'S' denotes studies that compared vegetation among sites with different deer densities. 'D' denotes descriptive studies of deer effects on vegetation other than comparisons among sites. 'M' denotes modeling studies. Sites where multiple studies of the same type have been conducted are represented by the appropriate letter followed by the number of studies in parentheses

By the early 20th Century commercial hunting had extirpated deer from much of their former range and in other areas reduced their populations (McCabe and McCabe, 1984). In the 1930s and 1940s, after establishment of strict hunting regulations and changes in land-use, deer began to increase in abundance and to expand their range (Leopold, 1943; Cook, 1945; Leopold *et al.*, 1947; Taylor and Hahn, 1947; Schorger, 1953; Hough, 1965; Behrend *et al.*, 1970; Gill, 1988). Today deer have re-occupied (or been translocated into) their entire former range and are slowly expanding their range westward (Gill, 1988).

Biologists began documenting deer population trends (particularly die-offs) (Van Volk-enberg and Nicholson, 1943; Hahn, 1945; Leopold *et al.*, 1947; Leopold, 1950), diet (Hosley and Ziebarth, 1935; Petrides, 1941; Bramble and Goddard, 1943; Halloran, 1943; Hill, 1946) and habitat use (Hosley and Ziebarth, 1935; Halloran, 1943) immediately following the increase in deer populations in the late 1930s. These early studies, however, rarely addressed the response of individual plants, plant populations or plant communities to deer herbivory and those studies that did primarily presented qualitative results (Swift, 1946). Quantitative experimental and descriptive studies of plant responses to deer herbivory, including exclo-

sure experiments, appeared in the literature in the late 1950s and are most prevalent since 1970. Therefore, although scientists have been concerned with deer population sizes, diet and habitat use for at least 65 y, much of the literature that is relevant to deer effects on plants has been published in the last 35 y.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

We searched the Agricola and Biosis electronic databases from 1985 to 2000 and 1969 to 2000, respectively, to locate articles that addressed deer effects on vegetation in North America (Table 1). Because *Journal of Wildlife Management* and *Journal of Forestry* contained many relevant articles, we searched all volumes of these journals between 1930 and the present. We did not attempt to search nonpeer reviewed literature comprehensively although we did include such documents in this review if they were referenced in peer-reviewed sources. Although we did not conduct a meta-analysis of the studies we discovered, we did consider the magnitude of treatment effects and the statistical power of studies in our subjective weighting of results.

EVIDENCE OF DEER EFFECTS UPON INDIVIDUAL PLANTS

Effects on plant growth rate, morphology and development.—In theory, an herbivore might affect plant growth rate, morphology or development and yet not affect fecundity or survival. Therefore, evidence of deer effects upon plant growth does not prove that deer affect individual fitness or population growth. We discuss effects of deer upon plant growth for two reasons: information on this subject is relatively abundant and, in many cases, effects upon plant growth most likely do cause, or are concurrent with, effects upon the plant population and community.

Conclusive evidence for negative effects of deer upon plant growth exists only for certain taxa, principally tree species, in certain communities, principally mature and post timber harvest white pine-hemlock-northern hardwoods forests (Alverson and Waller, 1997) and old fields (Inouye *et al.*, 1994; Stange and Shea, 1998). The lack of evidence for widespread negative effects, in part, reflects the limited range of taxa and communities that have been studied. However, in some sites with high deer densities, experiments involving well-studied taxa and communities have found no effect of deer on plant growth rates (Jacobs, 1969) (32.6 deer/km² overwinter) or effects that are highly variable in both time and space (Inouye *et al.*, 1994) (>10.5 deer/km²). For example, in one of two old fields studied, Inouye *et al.* (1994) found that deer significantly reduced proportional rates of increase in height of *Quercus rubra* and *Pinus strobus* seedlings in only 2 and 4 of 9 y, respectively. However, these significant negative effects in a minority of years caused a significant over all negative effect of deer on growth of both species over the 9-yr study. Deer did not affect growth rates of oaks in the second old field.

Many studies have documented fewer saplings and small adult trees outside exclosures than inside them (*e.g.*, Tierson *et al.*, 1966; Harlow and Downing, 1970; Anderson and Loucks, 1979; Tilghman, 1989; Trumbull *et al.*, 1989; Healy, 1997). These differences are often interpreted as arising from deer-caused reductions in growth rates, but some of these differences may arise wholly or in part from deer-caused reductions in survival rather than in growth. (That is, deer might be killing individuals of a given size class outside the enclosure rather than slowing plants from growing into that size class, especially if the enclosure has been in place for a long time.) Studies that do not repeatedly census individuals are unable to determine conclusively whether observed changes result from reduced survival or growth and at which life-stage negative effects occur. We will review the substantial num-

TABLE 1.—Summary of studies that addressed the effects of white-tailed deer on properties of individual plants, plant populations, plant communities and ecosystems. Regional reviews, commentaries, studies of deer diets and habitat use are not included. Some studies that were not included in the text due to methodological problems (i.e., no replication) but do address effects of deer on vegetation are included in the table

Study	Study type	Deer density (deer/km ²)		Dependent variables	Results	Comments
		102.5	no data			
Adams 1949	browsing preference	102.5		% of saplings browsed, vol. of foliage removed	<i>Ponderosa pine</i> juveniles preferred over Douglas fir juveniles	
Aldous 1952	clipping	no data		<i>Thuja</i> height, dbh; hardwoods, weight, length of annual browse prod.	<i>Thuja</i> : 25% clip reduces dbh & hgt increase or decrease with 100% clip	
Allison 1930	comparison among sites, enclosure, clipping	no data		<i>Taxus strobilus</i> and seed production	<i>Taxus strobilus</i> & seed prod. decrease w/ increasing deer impact, higher <i>strobilus</i> prod. w/o deer, 100% clip reduced # of male and female <i>strobili</i>	
Alverson & Waller 1997	enclosure	no data		hgt & survival of transplanted <i>Thuja</i> saplings, correlation between browsing and sapling hgt	sig. taller w/o deer, no sig. diff. in survival, neg. correlation between height and browsing intensity	
Anderson 1994	compare sites w/ different deer densities	high density: 22; low density: 4.8		<i>Tadulum</i> height	sig. taller plants at low density sites or w/o deer	
Anderson & Loucks 1979	enclosure, compare sites w/ different deer dens.	Flambear: 50–100; Memomunee: 37		Size dist. of <i>Thuja canadensis</i> juveniles	stems <90 mm dbh absent at Flambear, all-aged population at Memomunee	Memomunee deer dens. = 5–12 10 y before study
Augustine & Frelich 1998	enclosure, comparison among sites	high density (exclosure): 25–35; low density: 5–10		comparison: size distributions, % flowering, exclosure, survival, flowering rate, leaf area	size dist. skewed to small plants and reduced flowering rate at high deer density; increased flowering rates and leaf area inside exclosure	
Augustine <i>et al.</i> 1998	enclosure	<7 (low), 7–15 (med.), >15 (high)		# of <i>Laportea</i> stems, stems flowering status of stems	sig. reduced pop growth rate in sites w/ high deer density and low plant density	

TABLE 1.—Continued

Study	Study type	Deer density (deer/km ²)	Dependent variables	Results	Comments
Behrend <i>et al.</i> 1970	correlation between deer densities and veg. response	10.4 (1966), 4.6 (1969)	number of stems 8–20 ft high	temporal coincidence of increase in stems > 3 ft and deer reduction	
Boerner & Brinkman 1986	descriptive tree seedling demography	60–70	seedling germination, survival, species comp., browsing pressure	conclude that heavy deer browsing reduced seedling survival rate	
Bowers 1997	exclosures	12–20	woody species richness, evenness, stem density by height (> or < 1 m)	species richness 122% higher w/o deer; stem density & evenness unaffected	
Bowers & Sach 1991	exclosure	12–20	% cover of <i>Trifolium</i> , rate of fungal infection	w/o deer cover initially increases, then reduced below cover with deer by fungal epidemic	
Buckley <i>et al.</i> 1998	compare transplant oak seedlings among pine Vs oak stands	no data	% seedlings browsed, survival rate, growth, # of growth flushes	higher browsing rate in pine stands, high mortality rate in pine due to deer herbivory, no effect on growth	no experimental demonstration of deer effects
Butterworth & Tzilkowski 1990	exclosure	no data	size dist. of trees < 5 cm dbh by commercial vs non commercial	no statistically sig. effects	claim visually apparent release w/ thinning and fencing
Campbell 1993	descriptive comparison of browsed Vs unbrowsed plants	no data	growth, survival, fruit prod., stem #/indiv.	browsed plants w/ sig. lower fruit prod., browsing in two successive years increases mortality risk, no effect on growth	deer selectively browse taller, multi-stem, flowering plants
Canham <i>et al.</i> 1994	clipping	no data	sapling height, leader length, biomass of new shoots at end of exp., survival	saplings clipped for 2 summers grow sig. less, heavy clip in 2 summers increases mortality, no effect of winter clip	
Cadigan & Larson 1997	current distribution and historical abundance	no data	abundance of shrubs at different sites, herbarium records of abundance	temporal coincidence of decline in abundance and increased deer densities	

TABLE 1.—Continued

Study	Study type	Deer density (deer/km ²)	Dependent variables	Results	Comments
D'Uchse & Maun 1996	description of herbivore damage	no data	% of plants browsed, % of capitula removed	1993, 90% browsed, 50% capitula removed, 1994: 23% browsed, 7% removed	
Fretsch & Lortz 1985	comparison among sites, modeling	2 (inland), 10 (deer yard)	hemlock, sugar maple size and age class; model development of size class	hemlock 30 cm—1.4 m tall abundant inland and absent in yard, 60 y of heavy browsing produces unimodal, positively skewed size dist.	
Gedge & Maun 1992	clipping (greenhouse)	no data	biomass, fruit prod., seed prod., seed mass	severe defoliation; sig. fewer fruits & seeds, moderate defol.; no effects	
Gedge & Maun 1994	clipping, fruit removal	no data	clipping surv., biomass prod., fruit prod., fruit removal; firing period length, total fruit prod.	clipping reduced seed prod. in the field, reductions increase near anthesis; fruit removal increased fruit prod. and firing period	both deer and live stock excluded
Halls & Crawford 1960	exclosure	no data	weight of browse and herbs for preferred, non preferred species	weight of vegetative production 2X greater in exclosures after 3 y	
Harlow & Downing 1970	exclosure	24.7	# of saplings and sprouts >4.5 m tall by species	sig. more saplings & sprouts >4.5 m w/o deer, higher species richness of woody plants w/o deer	
Healy 1997	exclosures, comparison among sites w/ different deer densities	3–6 (low), 10–17 (high)	size dist. of saplings (all species combined), sapling species comp.	# of saplings >100 cm sig. greater w/o deer and in stands w/ low deer density, higher sapling species richness w/ few deer	
Hunsley & Marquis 1983	exclosure, weeding of herbaceous layer	probably 11.2	% cover herb species, juvenile tree size dist., growth of black cherry	deer browse <i>Rubus</i> allowing increase in fern cover which decreases juvenile tree recruitment	
Hough 1965	photo record of understory changes	no data	species comp., height and dbh of tree regen.	temporal coincidence of decreased understory cover with increased deer density	

TABLE 1.—Continued

Study	Study type	Deer density (deer/ km ²)	Dependent variables	Results	Comments
Broney <i>et al.</i> , 1994	exclosure	10.5–32.4	height growth and survival for tree juveniles	less growth w/ deer for pines, as- pen, oaks in one field, oaks unaf- fected in second field, stem den- sity unaffected	
Jacobs 1969	exclosure	58.0	height growth, survival and browsing damage to <i>A. size-</i> <i>charum</i> saplings	deer increase sapling mortality 6X, no sig. effect on growth	
Knops <i>et al.</i> , 2000	exclosure	16.0	aboveground and root bio- masses, N mineralization rate, C and N content of soil	primary prod. increased over time w/o deer but not w/ deer, soil N increased w/o deer but de- creased w/ deer	no replication, exco- sure also affects rabbits and go- phers
Little & Sones 1965	exclosure	no data	white cedar stem abundance, height	sig. greater reduction in # of stems outside exclosures, stems sig. shorter outside exclosures	no replication, rabbit & deer con- founded
Long <i>et al.</i> , 1998	natural exclosure	no data	height, basal diam., density and % browsed for hemlock seedlings	mean height 3X greater, mean diam. 2X greater, mean density 6X greater w/o deer	deer effects con- founded w/ other properties of tip- up mounds
Marquis 1981	exclosure	11.2	Number of stems >5 ft tall by species, total number of stems	change in species comp. of stems 2.5 ft, sig. less black cherry, red maple and pin cherry w/ deer	
Marshall <i>et al.</i> , 1955	clipping	no data	tree height, leader length, morphology, survival	repeated clipping reduces height and leader length in red pine, survival in white pine, increases # of plants w/ multiple leaders	
McShea & Schwede 1993	exclosure	35	acorn consumption rates by deer, estimate mortality rate due to weevils	deer consume most acorns during mast-fall, deer cause less mortal- ity than weevils	
Michael 1992	describe correlation between deer densi- ty and tree regen.	Canaan Valley: 32.4, Freeland: 13.9, Pocahontas: 8.1	size dist. of Balsam fir stands	stems 1–5 ft. tall very rare in all sites except Pocahontas site	

TABLE 1.—Continued

Study	Study type	Deer density (deer/ km ²)	Dependent variables	Results	Comments
Mladenoff & Stearns 1993	modeling w/ "gap model"	no data	tree species comp. after 400 year simulation	climate change, lack of germination substrate, reduced seed source prevent <i>Tsuga</i> regen. even w/o deer	qualitative results
Neils <i>et al.</i> 1956	exclosure	97.2	# of seedlings, survival of transplanted saplings	sapling mortality rates higher w/ deer and seedling densities less w/ deer	
Prachar & Samuel 1988	exclosure	no data	height growth, survival, deer damage of aspen suckers	presence of effect on survival depends on season of browsing, reduce growth of 1st year but not 2nd year suckers	
Ritchie <i>et al.</i> 1998	exclosure	15–30	species comp. by functional groups, total biomass & belowground biomass, available soil N	legumes, woody plants sig. more abundant w/o deer, grasses and forbs more abundant w/ deer, total biomass > inside but belowground < inside, soil N greater inside	
Ritchie & Thuman 1995	exclosure	no data	total % percent cover of legumes and by species	% legume cover sig. higher w/o deer, sig. increase in <i>Lathyrus</i> cover	
Rooney 1997	natural deer exclosure	10–12	leaf length, plant dens., firing rate, belowground internode length	sig. longer leaves, greater shoot densities, higher flowering rates w/o deer	
Rooney & Dress 1997	compare present species comp. w/ records of historical sp. comp.	10–15	herb and shrub species frequency, abundance, richness and evenness in 1929 and 1985	decrease in sp. richness, rare species eliminated more often than common species, high sp. richness neg. associated w/ hay-went fern	
Rooney <i>et al.</i> 2000	compare 100 sites, path analysis w/ many envir. variables	no data	size dists. of <i>Tsuga canadensis</i> juveniles <300 cm tall	# of saplings taller than 50 cm significantly and negatively correlated with deer browsing pressure	

TABLE 1.—Continued

Study	Study type	Deer density (deer/km ²)	Dependent variables	Results	Comments
Ross <i>et al.</i> , 1970	exclosure	0-18 (temporal variation)	sapling size, dists. and mean height by species	change sp. comp. of saplings >4.3 m, reduce counter saplings avg. hgt	no replication
Saunders & Puettmann, 1993	clipping	no data	white pine seedling survival, hgt. & diam. growth	compensatory ability less under closed canopy than under open canopy	
Sheehan & Inoué, 1995	exclosure	no data	aboveground morph., height, # of seed heads, # of browsing incidents for <i>Laricina canadensis</i>	7X increase in repair w/o deer, increase in height sig. greater w/o deer	no replication, reference plot adjacent to exclosure
Stange & Shea, 1998	exclosure	no data	<i>Q. rubra</i> seedling survival, height	sig. greater survival rate and height w/o deer	
Stoeckler <i>et al.</i> , 1997	exclosure	13.5-15.4	# of saplings >4.5 ft by species	sig. increase in density of stems >4.5 ft tall w/o deer	
Strauss, 1988	deer foraging preference based on plant size	no data	preference shoot width, presence of browsing, width of regrown shoots	prefer ramets w/ larger shoots, prefer larger shoots w/o a ramet, browsed ramets with larger new growth	
Switzenberg <i>et al.</i> , 1955	comparison of hardwood abundance, quality among sites	no data	hardwood stem density, frequency of rot and other deformities	no effect on density of hardwood regens, some increase in deformities (altered morphology)	no replication
Throop & Fay, 1999	descriptive comparison among sites	no data	shoot number/ramet, inflorescence/ramet	browsing w/ no effect of % ramets browsed, browsed ramets w/ more shoots, inflorescences	
Tierson <i>et al.</i> , 1986	exclosure	8.2	number of saplings >3 ft tall by species	Deer reduce # of saplings >3 ft tall for all species except beech	sample size = 2
Tilghman, 1989	deer exclosures w/ different densities	treatments = 3.7, 7.7, 14.8, 26.8; ambient = 11.2 (7.3-18.9)	size distributions of free seedlings and saplings by other-ance type, cover of fern and <i>Rubus</i>	deer densities between 8-14 reduce number of saplings taller than 0.9 m, densities >14 increase black cherry dominance	

TABLE 1.—Continued

Study	Study type	Deer density (deer/ km ²)	Dependent variables	Results	Comments
Trumbull <i>et al.</i> , 1989	exclosures	8.5	tree regen size dist., tallest sapling in different species categories, % cover ferns, <i>Rubus</i> , grass	sapling >3 ft more abundant w/o deer; tallest black cherry, sugar maple saplings sig. taller w/o deer; shift in understory species comp.	sample size = 2
Van Deelen <i>et al.</i> , 1996	compare past sp. comp. w/ current sp. comp. in deer yards	no data	adult tree species comp. in 1850 and 1990, age dist. of white cedar	increase in abundance of unpalatable species, decrease in palatable species; white cedars establish when deer pops. low	sample size = 2
Webb <i>et al.</i> , 1956	exclosures	7.2-12.7	sapling size dist. by species, herb cover by species	sapling avg. hgt & diam less w/ deer for 2 of 7 species, change in herbaceous sp. comp.	sample size = 2
Whitney 1984	comparison of tree size dist. 1929 and 1978	no data	tree size dist. by species	temporal coincidence between increase in deer and change of sapling species comp.	

ber of studies that document deer effects on size distributions of plant populations in the section entitled "Evidence of Population-level Effects."

Few studies have examined effects of deer upon growth of herbaceous plants. However, Augustine and Frelich (1998) suggest that deer browsing can significantly reduce the growth rate of herbs. In sugar maple-basswood forest remnants, where deer densities exceeded 25 deer/km², the mean leaf area of transplants of the long-lived, perennial herb *Trillium grandiflorum* increased 28.7% where protected from deer for 1 yr. but decreased 11.2% where unprotected. Similarly, in naturally occurring populations of *T. flexipes* and *T. cernuum*, where deer densities exceeded 25 deer/km², the mean leaf area of protected plants decreased 15.4% following a year of deer enclosure, whereas the mean leaf area of exposed plants decreased 41.1%. In forest remnants where deer densities were between 5–10 deer/km², protection from deer herbivory for one year did not significantly affect change in mean leaf area.

In both herbaceous and woody species, plants may be able to partially or, in some cases, fully regrow tissue consumed by herbivores. Such compensatory growth may limit the reduction in aboveground size caused by deer. However, compensation aboveground may reduce growth belowground. For example, clipping that simulated deer herbivory did not significantly reduce aboveground biomass of *Cirsium pitcheri* plants, but belowground biomass declined with increasing intensities and frequencies of clipping (D'Ussé and Maun, 1996). By contrast, Rooney (1997) found no significant difference between the internodal rhizome lengths of *Maianthemum canadense* plants growing in natural refugia from deer (on top of large boulders) and those exposed to deer herbivory.

One hallmark of mammalian herbivory on plants is pronounced changes in plant morphology. The most common of these is production of abundant lateral stems in woody plants as a result of terminal meristem removal. Trees and shrubs browsed by deer often have greater stem densities than unbrowsed plants (Marshall *et al.*, 1955; Switzenberg *et al.*, 1955; Tierson *et al.*, 1966; Jacobs, 1969; Throop and Fav, 1999). Marshall *et al.* (1955) suggest that frequency of browsing is probably more important than its intensity in determining stem density. Another common effect of deer on woody plant morphology is a "browse line" below which deer have removed stems and twigs of trees (Adams, 1949; Aldous, 1952; Marshall *et al.*, 1955; Neils *et al.*, 1956; Halls and Crawford, 1960; Trumbull *et al.*, 1989). Studies rarely have addressed the effects of deer herbivory on plants' belowground morphology or relative allocation to aboveground vs. belowground structures. However, Rooney (1997) showed that the branching frequency (number of nodes between branches) of *Maianthemum canadense* rhizomes did not differ significantly between plants growing in natural refugia and those exposed to deer.

Effects on plant survival and fecundity.—The ultimate measure of the magnitude of effects of deer on individual plants is their impact upon average individual fitness, which is a function of stage-specific survival rate (an estimate of an individual's probability of surviving) and the stage-specific average fecundity of all stages of the life-cycle. Unfortunately, no study has yet examined effects of deer at all life-stages for any given plant species. Thus, we review studies that focused on one or a few life-stages.

Although seeds, particularly acorns, constitute a large portion of deer diets (McCaffery *et al.*, 1974; Harlow *et al.*, 1975; McCullough, 1985; Pekins and Mautz, 1987; Weckerly and Nelson, 1990), effects of deer on germination rates have not been quantified. A study of acorn removal rates in the Shenandoah Valley of Virginia suggested that removal rates by deer and rodent granivores are approximately equal, but both cause less mortality than do curculionid beetles (McShea and Schwede, 1993).

Research on effects of deer on tree survival has focused on seedlings and saplings because

a tree's entire aboveground biomass can be browsed during these life-stages. Stange and Shea (1998) show that in maple-basswood forest fragments in southern Minnesota the survival rate of *Quercus rubra* seedlings over two years was 3.2% for seedlings exposed to deer herbivory and 34.6% for seedlings protected from deer by tree shelters. Deer reduced the survival rate of *Acer saccharum* saplings by 10% over 5 y in a Wisconsin northern hardwoods forest following a partial timber cut (Jacobs, 1969). Although many saplings were browsed repeatedly, no saplings died until the fourth year of this study, suggesting that death occurred as a result of cumulative effects of deer browsing. Alverson and Waller (1997) showed that the survival rate of browsed *Tsuga canadensis* seedlings was lower than that of unbrowsed seedlings, but they did not find a significant effect of deer exclusion on seedling survival. Presumably, too few *T. canadensis* seedlings were browsed repeatedly to produce a significant treatment effect during the two year study.

Conclusive demonstrations that deer reduce survival rates of tree seedlings and saplings are rare because few studies have repeatedly censused individuals. Many studies measure seedling abundance in areas of high and low deer densities (Harlow and Downing, 1970; Trumbull *et al.*, 1989; Butterworth and Tzilkowski, 1990), but these studies do not demonstrate effects of deer on seedling and sapling survival. Differences in seedling and sapling abundance may result from different germination rates among sites due to many possible factors, including differing deer abundance or, when "seedling" and "sapling" refer to size categories, from deer effects on growth rates (Trumbull *et al.*, 1989).

Many workers have suggested that deer can substantially decrease survival rates of herbaceous plants because all aboveground tissue of these plants is accessible (Miller *et al.*, 1992; Anderson, 1994; Balgooyen and Waller, 1995). Unlike trees, herbs do not escape deer herbivory by growing above the browse line. Moreover, during spring and summer forbs often form a significant portion of deer diets (Dunkeson, 1955; Halls and Crawford, 1960; Kohn and Mooty, 1971; Crawford, 1982; Irwin, 1985; McCullough, 1985; Case and McCullough, 1987). The hypothesis that deer have large effects on survival of herbs is difficult to evaluate at this time because of a lack of studies that have repeatedly censused individual plants. In the only study we found that repeatedly censused individual plants, deer did not significantly reduce the survival rate of transplanted *Trillium grandiflorum* plants over 2 y even where deer densities exceeded 25 deer/km² (Augustine and Frelich, 1998). Although deer consumed the entire aboveground tissue of these plants, the plants re-emerged, although smaller in size, the following spring. However, because *T. grandiflorum* is long-lived relative to the 2 y duration of the study, the cumulative effects of tissue removal by deer may ultimately reduce survival rate.

The long lifespan of perennial herbs and many woody species has prevented measurement of effects of deer herbivory on the lifetime fecundity of these plants. In individual years, however, deer can reduce the proportion of plants or ramets in a population that produce reproductive structures (Rooney, 1997; Augustine and Frelich, 1998; Augustine *et al.*, 1998) and the number of reproductive structures produced per plant (Allison, 1990). *Taxus canadensis* shrubs that were protected from deer produced more male and female strobili than unprotected shrubs in the final two years of a 5 y study (Allison, 1990). Several studies have shown that deer reduce the proportion of shoots that flower in perennial forest herbs in individual years (Rooney, 1997; Augustine and Frelich, 1998; Augustine *et al.*, 1998). In maple-basswood forest fragments, where deer densities exceeded 25 deer/km², in southern Minnesota the flowering rate of protected *Trillium cernuum* and *T. flexipes* plants was 19× that of unprotected plants in the second year of protection from deer (Augustine and Frelich, 1998). In addition, in forest fragments with low densities (0.01 stems/m²) of *Laportea canadensis* and high deer densities (winter deer density >15 deer/km²), deer

prevented flowering by *L. canadensis* ramets entirely (Augustine *et al.*, 1998). Similarly, the proportion of *Maianthemum canadensis* plants in Allegheny northern hardwoods forests that flowered in natural refuges from deer was 39 times greater than the flowering rate of exposed plants (Rooney, 1997).

Timing of deer herbivory appears to be important in determining the magnitude of deer effects on plant survival and fecundity (Prachar and Samuel, 1988; Gedge and Maun, 1992, 1994; Canham *et al.*, 1994). For example, timing of simulated herbivory was critical in determining its effects on mortality of *Acer rubrum*, *Prunus serotina* and *Fraxinus americana* seedlings: winter clipping had little or no effect upon plant mortality, but summer clipping increased mortality 2× in *A. rubrum* and *P. serotina* and 5× in *F. americana* over controls (Canham *et al.*, 1994). Similarly, clipping the lakeshore dune annual, *Corispermum hyssopifolium*, reduced fecundity only late in the growing season (Gedge and Maun, 1992, 1994). In *Cahile edentula*, another dune annual, effects of clipping on plant fecundity depended on both the timing and intensity of clipping (Gedge and Maun, 1992, 1994). Reductions in fruit number were proportional to clipping intensity when clipping was performed early in the season, but reductions were much greater when clipping was performed just before anthesis. Clipping did not affect seed mass in either species, but effects on seed viability are unknown. Clearly, the interactions of factors that determine the magnitude of effects of deer, and herbivores in general, on individual plant performance are complex.

Evidence of population-level effects.—If deer alter survival probabilities or fecundities of individual plants in a population, they might be expected to alter the population's growth rate. However, evidence that deer affect growth rates of plant populations is scant because it rarely has been sought. In the only study to measure the effect of deer on the finite rate of increase of a plant population, deer reduced the population growth rate of *Laportea canadensis* where deer were abundant (winter deer density >15 deer/km²) and *L. canadensis* was rare (0.01 stems/m²). Under these conditions the finite rates of increase of protected *L. canadensis* populations were between 2.0 and 6.0, whereas unprotected populations declined slowly. Deer had no effect where they were rare (winter deer density <7 deer/km²) or where *L. canadensis* was abundant (>1 stems/m²) (Augustine *et al.*, 1998).

Most studies examining deer effects on plant populations describe their effects on size structures of tree populations. If deer reduce survival or growth of tree seedlings or small saplings, certain size classes may be under-represented in the population. Under-representation of sapling size classes outside deer exclosures has been described for many forest tree species, including *Tsuga canadensis* (Anderson and Loucks, 1979; Alverson *et al.*, 1988), *Acer saccharum* (Stoekeler *et al.*, 1957) and *Betula alleghaniensis* Britt. (Stoekeler *et al.*, 1957) in mature northern hardwoods forests, *Prunus serotina* and *A. rubrum* in old clearcuts in northern hardwoods forests (Marquis, 1981; Trumbull *et al.*, 1989), *Liriodendron tulipifera* and *Fagus grandifolia* in clear cuts in southern Appalachian cove forests (Harlow and Downing, 1970) and *Quercus rubra* in Massachusetts oak forests (Healy, 1997). For example, Stoekeler *et al.* (1957) found that deer eliminated regeneration of *Acer saccharum* trees more than 1.4 m tall on unprotected sites, whereas stems taller than 1.4 m were abundant on protected sites. In each of the studies listed above deer densities in the study sites exceeded 8.5 deer/km².

Where deer densities are consistently high at a regional scale deer may cause under-representation of saplings at a regional scale. Rooney *et al.* (2000) use a path analysis approach to demonstrate that under-representation of *Tsuga canadensis* saplings taller than 30 cm in forests of northern Wisconsin and the western Upper Peninsula of Michigan is strongly and positively correlated with deer density.

Several studies, however, suggest that the magnitude of deer effects on the rate of re-

recruitment of adult trees can vary greatly on a landscape scale and that deer only prevent adult recruitment in sites with high deer densities, including deer yards and thinned or clear-cut patches in forests. Tilghman (1989) found that deer significantly reduced the number of saplings taller than 0.3 m of "browse sensitive species," including *Acer saccharum*, *A. rubrum*, *Fraxinus americana*, *Betula alleghaniensis* and *B. lenta*, only at experimentally elevated deer densities (14.8 deer/km²) that exceeded the mean deer density for the Allegheny National Forest (11.2 deer/km²) and approached the maximum deer density that was recorded in a survey of 11 sites in the Allegheny National Forest in 1992 (19.0 deer/km²) (Redding, 1995). At experimental densities approximating the regional mean stems taller than 0.9 m remained 77% as abundant as they were in the absence of deer. Similarly, Frelich and Lorimer (1985) showed that, whereas bell-shaped size distributions of *Tsuga canadensis* occurred in a northern Michigan deer yard (winter deer density = 10/km²), *T. canadensis* populations outside the deer yard (winter deer density = 2/km²) had size distributions that decreased monotonically from small to large size categories (Frelich and Lorimer, 1985).

The few studies that have examined effects of deer on size distributions of populations of herbaceous plants show that deer increase the proportion of the population in small size classes (Augustine and Frelich, 1998; Augustine *et al.*, 1998). Under conditions of high deer density (>15 deer/km²) and low plant density (<0.1 stems/m²), deer prevented *Laportea canadensis* ramets from exceeding 40 cm in height, but in exclosures, more than 50% of ramets exceeded 40 cm in height (Augustine *et al.*, 1998). Similarly, in forest fragments with high deer densities (>25 deer/km²), size distributions of *Trillium cernuum* and *T. flexipes* populations shifted toward smaller size classes once deer began browsing plants in the spring, whereas no shift occurred in fragments with lower deer densities (<10 deer/km²) (Augustine and Frelich, 1998). Lower proportional representation of large plants where deer are abundant may reflect the previously documented trend for browsing pressure to increase with plant size for plants below the browse line (Strauss, 1988; Campbell, 1993; Inouye *et al.*, 1994).

Other studies, although not describing size distributions, have shown the mean size of individuals in herbaceous plant populations to be significantly less where deer are present than where deer are absent (Rooney, 1997; Long *et al.*, 1998). For example, the mean leaf area of shoots of *Maianthemum canadense* was 23% less for shoots exposed to deer herbivory than for shoots that occurred in natural refugia (Rooney, 1997).

Evidence of effects on mature or midsuccessional communities.—Exclosure experiments have demonstrated that deer can decrease tree regeneration (Tilghman, 1989; Healy, 1997), change the identity of the dominant tree species in the sapling layer (which could eventually change the species composition of the canopy) (Tilghman, 1989; Healy, 1997) and decrease species richness of tree seedlings, herbs and shrubs (Tilghman, 1989; Healy, 1997; Rooney and Dress, 1997; Augustine *et al.*, 1998). The magnitude of deer effects on community composition may be very large. In old-growth hemlock-beech and hemlock forest in northwestern Pennsylvania an increase in deer densities from near zero in the early 20th Century to 7–19 deer/km² is correlated with 80.4% and 59% decreases in the number of understory herb and shrub species in hemlock-beech and hemlock forests, respectively (Rooney and Dress, 1997). Rare shrub and herbaceous species (<1% of cover in 1929) were significantly more likely to be eliminated during the 70 y of high deer densities than were abundant species (>1% of cover in 1929).

Although large effects of deer on community composition have been demonstrated, whether these effects are widespread or restricted to habitats preferred by deer remains unclear. In northern hardwoods forests of the Allegheny Plateau deer reduced the species

richness of stems taller than 0.9 m and increased dominance of *Prunus serotina* only at experimentally elevated deer densities (26.8 deer/km²) that were more than twice the mean deer density for the Alleghany National Forest (11.2 deer/km²) (Tilghman, 1989). In addition, deer reduced the density of *Laportea canadensis* in the understory of sugar maple-basswood forest fragments in Minnesota only where they were abundant (>15 deer/km²) and *L. canadensis* was rare (<1 stems/m²) (Augustine *et al.*, 1998).

In sites where deer populations are not sufficiently dense to eliminate preferred herbs from forest understories, they may increase species diversity of shrub and herbaceous layers by counteracting competitive exclusion. Webb *et al.* (1956) showed that in deer exclosures cover of *Dryopteris intermedia* increased from 25% to 45% and cover of *Viola spp.* and *Oxalis montana* decreased by 17% and 12%, respectively (Webb *et al.*, 1956).

Effects on succession.—Because deer prefer feeding in disturbed and early successional forest communities (Kolm and Mooty, 1971; Kearney and Gilbert, 1976), one might expect particularly pronounced effects on such communities. Whereas in some instances deer probably affect the rate and direction of succession, existing studies are insufficient to determine whether these effects are common. Furthermore, most studies have examined effects of deer on succession following logging or in old fields. Effects on other successional communities are not known.

Deer could reduce the rate of succession of old fields and clear-cuts to forest by decreasing the rate of invasion by woody species or by retarding the rate of recruitment of woody species to sapling and adult size categories. In most instances, deer appear to have little effect upon the rate of woody species invasion immediately following disturbances. For example, deer did not reduce densities of tree seedlings in old fields in Virginia (Bowers, 1997) or Minnesota (Inouye *et al.*, 1994) or in a clear-cut in a southern Appalachian forest (Harlow and Downing, 1970). In contrast, Ritchie and Tilman (1998) found that deer did reduce the density of tree seedlings and saplings in a Minnesota savanna (Ritchie *et al.*, 1998).

Because deer are known to reduce the rate of recruitment of adult trees in some sites, they may slow the rate of succession to forest in those sites. For instance, deer caused a 75% reduction in the number of stems above the browse line in a southern Appalachian clear-cut (Harlow and Downing, 1970). Other studies, however, have shown infrequent effects of deer (Inouye *et al.*, 1994) or effects only at experimentally elevated deer densities (experimental density = 14.8 deer/km², regional mean = 11.2 deer/km²) (Tilghman, 1989). In some instances the magnitude of deer effects on the rate of canopy closure following disturbance appears to be temporally and spatially variable, and therefore studies of short duration (1 to 3 y) may not detect changes in the rate of overstory regeneration.

The strongest evidence for deer effects on the direction of succession is for changes in the composition of successional forest communities. In a Virginia old field and immediately following clear-cutting in a southern Appalachian forest, deer reduced species richness of regenerating woody species (Harlow and Downing, 1970; Bowers, 1997). Because measures of species diversity consider both the number of species present (species richness) and relative abundances of the species (evenness), the reductions in species richness could have produced a reduction in the species diversity of woody regeneration. Whereas in the forest community deer also reduced species diversity of woody saplings (Harlow and Downing, 1970), in the old field deer did not affect diversity of woody saplings (Bowers, 1997).

Effects of deer on the species composition of early successional communities are not confined to woody species. Deer caused a significant reduction in percent cover of legumes in a 60-y-old, old field in Minnesota by reducing cover of *Lathyrus venosus*, one of three legume species present (Ritchie and Tilman, 1995). The negative effect of deer on legume

cover, however, was less pronounced in the old field than in a savanna that had never been cultivated. In early successional forest habitats changes in herbaceous and shrub layers may mediate indirect effects of deer on tree species composition. Following clear-cutting in Allegheny forests deer caused a decrease in cover of *Rubus* and an increase in cover by ferns and grasses (Horsley and Marquis, 1983). Growth and survival of *Prunus serotina* was lower in the presence of ferns and grass than in the presence of *Rubus*.

Local deer density and size of early successional patches probably are important in determining the magnitude of the effects of deer on the rate and direction of succession. Tilghman (1989) demonstrated that deer densities higher than the mean regional density were required to alter dominance patterns and reduce evenness of the species composition of regenerating canopy trees. In addition, Bowers (1997) suggested that the magnitude of deer effects on community properties is less in larger early successional patches because deer browsing is less concentrated.

Evidence from both early successional communities in hemlock-northern hardwoods forests of the Allegheny Plateau (Horsley and Marquis, 1983; Stromayer and Warren, 1997) and maple-basswood forest fragments of southeastern Minnesota (Augustine *et al.*, 1998) suggests that deer can cause shifts among alternate stable states in forest communities. A particular site has alternate stable states if more than one stable species composition exists for that site. An external force (such as intensive grazing or browsing) can drive the community from one stable species composition to the another. Once an alternative stable species composition has been achieved the community will not revert to its original species composition even if the external force that caused the shift is removed. For example, Stromayer and Warren (1997) suggest deer browsing of *Rubus*, which causes the understory to be dominated by ferns, forces Allegheny hemlock-northern hardwoods forests to shift to an alternate stable state in which competition from ferns will prevent tree regeneration even if deer are removed. The possibility that intense deer herbivory can push the species composition of a site from one stable state to another increases the potential risks of maintaining high deer populations. Once a shift among stable states has occurred it may be impossible to re-establish the original community.

Evidence of ecosystem-level effects.—Wherever deer alter species composition of a plant community a corresponding effect upon ecosystem properties and processes, such as size of nutrient pools in the soil, rate of nutrient cycling or primary productivity may occur. Deer may have large effects upon the quantity of soil nitrogen in old fields and savannas by affecting the abundance of legume species (Bowers and Sacchi, 1991; Ritchie *et al.*, 1998; Knops *et al.*, 2000). For example, Ritchie *et al.* (1998) found that decreased cover of legumes in a Minnesota savanna where deer were present corresponded to decreased total available soil nitrogen and decreased nitrogen in plant tissue. In addition, deer exclusion increased net primary productivity in the savanna, perhaps in response to greater nitrogen availability (Knops *et al.*, 2000).

In some communities negative direct effects of deer on legume abundance may be balanced or exceeded by positive indirect effects. Bowers and Sacchi (1991) documented a positive net effect of deer on cover of the legume, *Trifolium pratense*. Deer reduced the density of *T. pratense* and, thus, prevented epidemics of fungal infections that greatly reduced *T. pratense* density where deer were absent. Because legume cover increased with deer presence in this study, an increase in soil nitrogen might also be expected where deer are present. Therefore, deer effects on nitrogen availability may be more complicated than indicated by direct effects of deer (Bowers and Sacchi, 1991).

In forest ecosystems effects of deer on the relative abundance of conifer and hardwood species (*e.g.*, Ross *et al.*, 1970) could cause large changes in the rate of nutrient cycling.

Conifer litter decomposes more slowly than hardwood litter and contains fewer nutrients (MacLean and Wein, 1978; McClaugherty *et al.*, 1985). Unfortunately, effects of deer on nutrient cycling in forests that contain both conifers and hardwoods have not been studied.

SUMMARY: WHAT IS KNOWN

The most commonly reported effect of deer upon individual plants is a change in plant morphology following removal of the terminal meristem (Marshall *et al.*, 1955; Switzenberg *et al.*, 1955; Tierson *et al.*, 1966; Jacobs, 1969; Throop and Fay, 1999). Strong evidence also exists that deer can reduce growth rates of tree seedlings and saplings (Inouye *et al.*, 1994; Alverson and Waller, 1997; Stange and Shea, 1998). Negative effects of deer on plant survival are less well documented than effects on growth, but the under-representation of saplings in some tree populations in communities where deer are abundant may reflect reductions in seedling survival as well as growth. In general, deer probably have a much larger effect on survival of seedlings and saplings than on the rate at which seeds, even acorns (McShea and Schwede, 1993), become seedlings (*i.e.*, the probability of a seed becoming a seedling, the germination rate).

In sites with high deer densities, deer can affect size distributions of populations of preferred browse species by preventing recruitment to sapling and small adult size classes (Tierson *et al.*, 1966; Harlow and Downing, 1970; Anderson and Loucks, 1979; Marquis, 1981; Tilghman, 1989; Trumbull *et al.*, 1989; Healy, 1997). All studies that documented deer-induced failure of adult recruitment were conducted in sites where deer densities exceeded 8.5 deer/km². In addition, because deer feed selectively, deer can affect the species diversity and identity of the dominant species in both herbaceous (Webb *et al.*, 1956; Horsley and Marquis, 1983; Bowers and Sacchi, 1991) and canopy layers in forest communities (Harlow and Downing, 1970; Marquis, 1981; Tilghman, 1989). These effects on populations and communities are best documented for early successional forest communities following timber harvesting. Both through direct effects on juvenile trees and through indirect effects by changes in the species composition of the herb layer, deer can slow the rate (Stoekeler *et al.*, 1957; Harlow and Downing, 1970; Ritchie *et al.*, 1998) and alter the direction of succession in forests (Harlow and Downing, 1970; Horsley and Marquis, 1983).

Many studies reviewed here have documented large spatial (Anderson and Loucks, 1979; Frelich and Lorimer, 1985; Anderson, 1994; Inouye *et al.*, 1994; Healy, 1997; Augustine and Frelich, 1998; Augustine *et al.*, 1998; Rooney *et al.*, 2000) and temporal variation (Inouye *et al.*, 1994) in the magnitude of deer effects on vegetation. Both experimental (Tilghman, 1989; Anderson, 1994; Augustine and Frelich, 1998; Augustine *et al.*, 1998) and comparative descriptive studies (Frelich and Lorimer, 1985; Michael, 1992; Rooney *et al.*, 2000) have shown that deer density is frequently positively and significantly correlated with the magnitude of deer effects on vegetation. Deer densities may be the primary factor affecting spatial and temporal variation in deer effects. However, the density of the plant consumed by deer (Augustine *et al.*, 1998) and the availability of plant resources (particularly light) (Saunders and Puettmann, 1999) may modulate the effects of deer density. The interactions among these factors should not be discounted in formulating future research questions.

SUMMARY: WHAT IS NOT KNOWN

(1) Most published studies have been conducted in mature and early successional white pine-hemlock-northern hardwoods forests of the Allegheny Plateau (Marquis, 1981; Horsley and Marquis, 1983; Tilghman, 1989; Trumbull *et al.*, 1989; Butterworth and Trilkowski, 1990), the Adirondack mountains (Webb *et al.*, 1956; Stoekeler *et al.*, 1957) or the Upper Great Lakes region (Jacobs, 1969; Ross *et al.*, 1970; Anderson and Loucks, 1979; Frelich

and Lorimer, 1985; Allison, 1990; Alverson and Waller, 1997), in maple-basswood forest fragments in southern Minnesota (Augustine and Frelich, 1998; Augustine *et al.*, 1998; Stange and Shea, 1998) and in old fields in central Minnesota (Inouye *et al.*, 1994; Ritchie and Tilman, 1995; Knops *et al.*, 2000) and western Virginia (Bowers and Sacchi, 1991; Bowers, 1997). The potential for substantial deer effects is high in many other regions of the United States and Canada. It is not known what effects deer have in these other communities and regions.

(2) Effects of deer on aboveground growth rates and stem morphology of plants have been more extensively studied than other potential effects on growth, morphology and phenology of individual plants. The effects of deer herbivory on belowground growth and aspects of aboveground morphology other than stem density require documentation. In particular, the fate of the plant may depend upon the rate at which belowground stored reserves are exhausted and upon the extent to which aboveground regrowth reduces root growth, increasing later drought mortality and decreasing belowground competitive ability.

(3) Clipping experiments suggest that timing of herbivory (*e.g.*, growing season vs. dormant periods, early in the growing season vs. near anthesis) is important in determining the magnitude of the effects of herbivory (Gedge and Maun, 1992, 1994; Canham *et al.*, 1994). However, in general, the effects of timing, frequency and intensity (amount of tissue removed) in determining the magnitude of the effects of deer herbivory are poorly understood. Studies that have examined these mechanisms using actual deer herbivory rather than clipping are especially rare.

(4) Do deer effects on plant morphology and aboveground growth, the best studied properties of individual plants, indicate effects on other individual properties, such as survival and fecundity, population growth rates and community composition? Little is known about the magnitude of deer effects on growth rates of plant populations or on plant fitness. Whereas some studies have quantified effects of deer upon survival (Jacobs, 1969; Inouye *et al.*, 1994; Alverson and Waller, 1997) and fecundity rates (Allison, 1990) of particular age or size classes, no published studies have constructed complete life-tables with and without deer and then used such data to predict deer effects on the finite rate of increase of a plant population. Such information could allow predictions of effects on plant populations and communities to be much more precise.

(5) The vulnerability of most plant communities to being pushed into an alternate stable state by intense deer herbivory is unknown. In how many communities is this potentially irreversible change possible? Can we predict which communities are likely to be pushed into an alternative stable state by intense deer herbivory?

(6) Effects of deer upon ecosystem properties and processes, such as nutrient cycling, biomass distribution and productivity, have received little study and are poorly understood.

(7) What is the magnitude of temporal and spatial variation in effects of deer upon plants? Do differences in deer densities adequately explain temporal and spatial variation in deer effects? How do the density of the plants consumed and the availability of plant resources modify the influence of deer density? Studies reviewed here clearly show that effects of deer vary substantially through time and in space (Frelich and Lorimer, 1985; Inouye *et al.*, 1994; Augustine and Frelich, 1998; Augustine *et al.*, 1998) and that differences in deer densities are important in determining when and where deer will have significant effects on vegetation. However, Augustine *et al.* (1998) also showed that for a constant deer density where the density of the plant consumed was greater, the magnitude of deer effects on the plant population was less. The interactions between deer density, plant abundance and resource availability are poorly understood.

METHODOLOGICAL CHALLENGES AND LIMITATIONS

Experimental designs involving exclosures or enclosures, which are essential to the experimental study of deer herbivory in the field, pose several challenges that warrant discussion. Ideally, designs would be used that overcome all of the problems discussed below. In most cases, however, constraints of time and funds do not allow this. In this situation, readers may be better able to evaluate the strengths and weaknesses of a study's conclusions if they consider the consequences of the limitations of the methodology used.

(1) The great leaping ability of deer can make effective deer exclosures or enclosures difficult to construct. The necessary height of the fence will vary with the area of the site that is to be fenced and the fencing design. However, in exclosure studies scientists can monitor the area inside the fencing for evidence of deer activity, such as recent browse damage, hoof-prints or feces. Published studies that have taken these precautions and have been successful in excluding deer exist. These studies can be used as a guideline for effective fencing design. Studies in which the exclosures are not completely effective in excluding deer can still produce valuable results if the reduction in deer density is quantified.

(2) Subjective (nonrandom) placement of plots can be a serious problem in exclosure and enclosure studies. If plots are placed in areas of unusually high deer density, such as areas with evidence of recent deer browsing, and this placement is not clearly planned, reported and taken into account in the interpretation of the results, erroneous conclusions will be reached. However, if such variation (deer densities, densities of the target plant, etc.) is purposely incorporated into the design of the study and is clearly reported, this information can enhance scientists' understanding of spatial variation in the presence and magnitude of deer effects.

(3) "Fence-line effects" are another challenge of exclosure and enclosure studies. Reference plots that are placed next to exclosures may have exceptionally high rates of herbivory.

(4) Sample sizes frequently are small in exclosure and enclosure experiments because exclosures/enclosures are expensive to build. Exclosure studies reviewed here had a mean sample size of 15.9 plots ($sd = 19.2$, range 1-72, $N = 30$). Seven of the 30 exclosure studies read in preparing this review contained less than two replicates and four were unreplicated (Table 1). Small sample sizes increase the probability that real differences between manipulated plots and controls will not be detected and, hence, present the risk of detecting only deer effects that are of very large magnitude.

(5) The relationship between deer density and the total impact upon a plant, plant population or plant community is important for management. However, studying the effects of different deer densities is difficult. Whereas ambient deer density usually provides the 'control treatment' and exclosures provide complete deer absence, intermediate densities usually must be simulated by clipping. A methodological problem is that the relationship between deer density and degree of browsing damage is usually not known, so the levels of clipping appropriate for a study are unknown. Furthermore, clipping may fail to mimic effects of herbivores in other ways, such as timing and patterns of tissue removal within a plant (Strauss, 1988; Baldwin, 1990; Krause and Raffa, 1992). Instead of clipping, comparisons of vegetation among sites with different deer densities can be made, but then differences in deer densities are confounded with other variables, weakening conclusions. Conclusions from such comparative studies are much stronger if a multivariate analysis, such as path analysis, that includes potentially confounding variables in the regression model is used to explain differences in vegetation between the sites (Rooney *et al.*, 2000). A third method, small randomly located enclosures that contain different deer densities and are

sufficiently replicated avoids inadequacies of clipping and confounded independent variables, but is costly in materials and labor.

(6) Inferring or predicting effects of deer upon plant communities from the extensive literature describing deer diets is tempting. However, problems with this approach are so severe that we have excluded such data from this review. Many diet studies describe deer food intake with no corresponding data on plant abundance. Without the latter, preference cannot be determined. In some studies data on food intake or on plant abundance are problematic because, for example, only certain subsets of plants were sampled (Johnson, 1980) despite the fact that deer are known to eat a wide variety of plants. Furthermore, the relationship between preference and browsing pressure is not always strong and the relationship between browsing pressure and plant response may not be clear.

SUMMARY: WHAT REMAINS TO BE DONE

Sufficient evidence exists to conclude that white-tailed deer can have a substantial impact upon plant morphology and, in some cases, plant growth rates, especially for tree seedlings and saplings. Strong evidence also exists that in certain cases the structure of plant populations and composition of plant communities can be altered by deer. However, this is quite different from concluding that such effects are widespread or usual. Studies conducted to date indicate that effects of deer upon plants vary substantially in both space and time. Deer density is important in determining temporal and spatial variation in deer effects on vegetation. The density of the plant consumed and plant resource availability also contribute to the observed temporal and spatial variation in deer effects. Critical future questions include 'what is the relative importance of these factors in determining when and where substantial deer effects will occur?' and 'how do these factors interact to produce substantial effects of deer on plant populations and communities?' Finally, an answer to the question 'how widespread or frequent are substantial effects of deer on vegetation?' awaits future research in many North American plant communities that have received little or no attention.

Although we fail to reject the null hypothesis that deer do not have widespread effects upon plant individuals, populations, communities and ecosystems this does not, of course, mean that deer effects are not widespread. The many aspects of plant growth, individual fitness, population and community structure and dynamics and ecosystem processes that have not been studied may be affected by deer. Where deer are affecting, for example, plant growth rates, deer probably affect population growth rates, future community composition and so on. Likewise, the absence of experiments in many regions where deer are highly abundant should not be interpreted as evidence that deer do not affect plant populations and communities in these regions.

More interesting than the scarcity of studies that address particular questions in particular communities are three possible explanations why studies that examine deer effects on vegetation may fail to find significant effects. One is that substantial effects may be limited to certain combinations of deer densities, plant densities and site characteristics. Another possibility is that some direct negative effects of browsing are obscured by indirect positive effects caused by reduced competition resulting from having neighboring plants eaten or by maintaining populations below densities at which pathogens are readily transmitted. The third possibility, which is especially strong for short-lived plants, is that many of the most dramatic changes happened in the past, so that present vegetation has already undergone most changes that deer can cause. If so, we will miss these effects because we have no baseline to serve as a reference. For example, some highly preferred species that are highly susceptible to deer browsing may now be so rare or even absent that we cannot now detect

effects upon them. The largest changes in deer density occurred in the late 19th and early 20th centuries (Hahn, 1945; Leopold *et al.*, 1947; Redding, 1995), and the greatest changes in plant communities may also have occurred at that time.

Thus, although evidence for widespread substantial effects of white-tailed deer upon plant populations and communities is not as clear as some have assumed, substantial effects under particular sets of circumstances have been clearly demonstrated. In the face of uncertainty the usual prescription is conservative management. Given the very large, and sometimes increasing, deer populations now common in some plant communities and the worrisome possibility that effects of deer overbrowsing may be irreversible, or reversible only with complicated and expensive intervention in the future, the most prudent management option would be to attempt to keep deer populations at more moderate densities. The optimal deer density for any particular site will vary with the management objective and the plant community, but the deer densities in studies cited in this review and the presence and magnitude of deer effects documented in these studies can provide initial guidelines (Table 1). Furthermore, land managers should be alert for readily observable deer effects, such as altered aboveground morphology or population size distributions, on plant species that are preferred by deer or are of conservation concern.

Acknowledgments.—We thank Deb Overath for insightful comments on early drafts of this manuscript. We thank Tom Rooney and two anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments on the first version of this manuscript submitted. We gratefully acknowledge financial support from the US Fish & Wildlife Service, the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, The Nature Conservancy and the National Science Foundation during the preparation of this review.

LITERATURE CITED

- ADAMS, L. 1949. The effects of deer on conifer reproduction in northwestern Montana. *J. For.*, **47**:900–913.
- ALDOUS, S. E. 1952. Deer browse clipping study in the Lake States region. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **16**:401–409.
- ALLISON, T. D. 1990. The influence of deer browsing on the reproductive biology of Canada yew (*Taxus canadensis* marsh.) I. direct effect on pollen, ovule and seed production. *Oecologia*, **83**:523–529.
- ALVARESON, W. S. AND D. M. WALLER. 1997. Deer populations and the widespread failure of hemlock regeneration in northern forests, p. 280–297. *In*: W. J. McShea, H. B. Underwood and J. H. Rappole (eds.), *The science of over-abundance: deer ecology and population management*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- AND S. L. SOLHEIM. 1988. Forests too deer: edge effects in northern Wisconsin. *Conserv. Biol.*, **2**:348–358.
- ANDERSON, R. C. 1994. Height of white-flowered trillium (*Trillium grandiflorum*) as an index of deer browsing intensity. *Ecol. Appl.*, **4**:104–109.
- AND O. L. LOUCKS. 1979. White-tail deer (*Odocoileus virginianus*) influence on structure and composition of *Tsuga canadensis* forests. *J. Appl. Ecol.*, **16**:855–861.
- AUGUSTINE, D. J. AND L. E. FRELICH. 1998. Effects of white-tailed deer on populations of an understory forb in fragmented deciduous forests. *Conserv. Biol.*, **12**:995–1004.
- AND P. A. JORDAN. 1998. Evidence for two alternate stable states in an ungulate grazing system. *Ecol. Appl.*, **8**:1260–1269.
- BALDWIN, I. T. 1990. Herbivory simulations in ecological research. *Trends Ecol. Evol.*, **5**:91–93.
- BALGOOVEN, C. P. AND D. M. WALLER. 1995. The use of *Clintonia borealis* and other indicators to gauge impacts of white-tailed deer on plant communities in northern Wisconsin. *Nat. Areas J.*, **15**:308–318.
- BEHREND, D. E., G. E. MATTFIELD, W. C. TIERNON AND J. E. WILLY, III. 1970. Deer density control for comprehensive forest management. *J. For.*, **68**:695–700.

- BOERNER, R. E. J. AND J. A. BRINKMAN. 1996. Ten years of tree seedling establishment and mortality in an Ohio deciduous forest complex. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*, 123:309-317.
- BOWERS, M. A. 1997. Influence of deer and other factors on an old-field plant community, p. 310-326. In: W. J. McShea, H. B. Underwood and J. H. Rappole (eds.). *The science of overabundance: deer ecology and population management*. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- , AND C. F. SACCHI. 1991. Fungal mediation of a plant-herbivore interaction in an early successional plant community. *Ecology*, 72:1032-1037.
- BRAMBLE, W. C. AND M. K. GODDARD. 1945. Seasonal browsing of woody plants by white-tailed deer in the bear oak forest type. *J. For.*, 41:471-475.
- BUCKLEY, D. S., T. L. SHARIK AND J. G. ISFBRANDS. 1998. Regeneration of northern red oak: positive and negative effects of competitor removal. *Ecology*, 79:65-78.
- BUTTERWORTH, J. S. AND W. M. TZILKOWSKI. 1990. Understory response to heavy thinning in oak stands with and without deer exclosures. *J. Penn. Acad. Sci.*, 64:81-84.
- CAMPBELL, J. M. 1993. Effects of grazing by white-tailed deer on a population of *Lithospermum carolinense* at Presque Isle. *J. Penn. Acad. Sci.*, 67:103-108.
- CANTHAM, C. D., J. B. MCANINCH AND D. M. WOOD. 1994. Effects of the frequency, timing and intensity of simulated browsing on growth and mortality of tree seedlings. *Can. J. For. Res.*, 24:817-825.
- CASE, D. J. AND D. R. MCCULLOUGH. 1987. The white-tailed deer of North Manitou Island. *Hilgardia*, 55:1-57.
- CAVING, P. M. AND B. M. H. LARSON. 1997. The decline and current status of the dune race of Dwarf Cherry, *Prunus pumila* var. *pumila*, on the Canadian shores of the Lower Great Lakes. *Can. Field-Nat.*, 111:187-193.
- CLIFTON-BROCK, T. H. AND S. D. ALBON. 1992. Trial and error in the Highlands. *Nature*, 358:11-12.
- COOK, F. W. 1945. White-tailed deer in the great plains region. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, 9:237-242.
- CRAWFORD, H. S. 1982. Seasonal food selection and digestibility by tame white-tailed deer in central Maine. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, 46:974-982.
- D'ULISSE, A. AND M. A. MAUN. 1996. Population ecology of *Cirsium pitcheri* on Lake Huron sand dunes: II. survivorship of plants. *Can. J. Bot.*, 74:1701-1707.
- DIAMOND, J. 1992. Must we shoot deer to save nature? *Nat. Hist.*, 101(8):2-8.
- DIFFENBACH, D. R., W. L. PALMER AND W. R. SHOPE. 1997. Attitudes of Pennsylvania sportsmen towards managing white-tailed deer to protect ecological integrity of forests. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.*, 25:244-251.
- DUNKERSON, R. L. 1955. Deer range appraisal for the Missouri Ozarks. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, 19:358-363.
- FRELICH, L. E. AND C. G. LORMER. 1985. Current and predicted long-term effects of deer browsing in hemlock forests in Michigan, USA. *Biol. Conserv.*, 34:99-120.
- GEDGE, K. E. AND M. A. MAUN. 1992. Effects of simulated herbivory on growth and reproduction in two beach annuals, *Cakile edentula* and *Corispermum hyssopifolium*. *Can. J. Bot.*, 70:2467-2475.
- , AND ———. 1994. Compensatory response of two dune annuals to simulated browsing and fruit predation. *J. Veg. Sci.*, 5:99-108.
- GILL, R. M. A. 1988. Monitoring the status of European and North American cervids. No. 8. UNEP, Nairobi, Kenya. 277 p.
- HAIN, H. C. 1945. The white-tailed deer in the Edwards Plateau region of Texas. Texas Game, Fish and Oyster Commission, Austin, Texas. 52 p.
- HALLORAN, A. F. 1943. Management of deer and cattle on the Aransas National Wildlife Refuge, Texas. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, 7:203-216.
- HALLS, L. K. AND H. S. CRAWFORD. 1960. Deer-forest habitat relationships in north Arkansas. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, 24:387-395.
- HARLOW, R. F. AND R. L. DOWNING. 1970. Deer browsing and hardwood regeneration in the southern Appalachians. *J. For.*, 68:298-300.
- , J. B. WHEELAN, H. S. CRAWFORD AND J. E. SKLEN. 1975. Deer foods during years of oak mast abundance and scarcity. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, 39:298-300.
- HEALY, W. M. 1997. Influence of deer on the structure and composition of oak forests in central

- Massachusetts, p. 249-266. *In*: W. J. McShea, H. B. Underwood and J. H. Rappole (eds.). The science of overabundance: deer ecology and population management. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.
- HILL, R. R. 1946. Palatability ratings of Black Hills plants for white-tailed deer. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **10**: 47-54.
- HORSLEY, S. B. AND D. A. MARQUIS. 1983. Interference by weeds and deer with Allegheny hardwood reproduction. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **13**:61-69.
- HOSLEY, N. W. AND R. K. ZIEBARTH. 1935. Some winter relations of the white-tailed deer to the forests in north central Massachusetts. *Ecology*, **16**:535-553.
- HOUGH, A. F. 1965. A twenty-year record of understory vegetational change in a virgin Pennsylvania forest. *Ecology*, **46**:370-373.
- INOUE, R. S., T. D. ALLISON AND N. C. JOHNSON. 1994. Old field succession on a Minnesota sand plain: effects of deer and other factors on invasion by trees. *Bull. Torrey Bot. Club*, **121**:266-276.
- IRWIN, I. L. 1985. Foods of moose, *Alces alces*, and white-tailed deer, *Odocoileus virginianus*, on a burn in boreal forest. *Can. Field Nat.*, **99**:240-245.
- JACOBS, R. D. 1969. Growth and development of deer-browsed sugar maple seedlings. *J. For.*, **67**:870-874.
- JOHNSON, D. H. 1980. The comparison of usage and availability measurements for evaluating resource preference. *Ecology*, **61**:65-71.
- KEARNEY, S. R. AND E. F. GILBERT. 1976. Habitat use by white-tailed deer and moose on sympatric range. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **40**:645-657.
- KNOPS, J. M. H., M. E. RITCHIE AND D. TILMAN. 2000. Selective herbivory on a nitrogen fixing legume (*Lathyrus venosus*) influences productivity and ecosystem nitrogen pools in an oak savanna. *Ecoscience*, **7**:166-174.
- KOHN, B. E. AND J. J. MOFFY. 1971. Summer habitat of white-tailed deer in north-central Minnesota. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **35**:476-487.
- KRAUSE, S. C. AND K. E. RAFFA. 1992. Comparison of insect, fungal and mechanically induced defoliation of larch: effects on plant productivity and subsequent host susceptibility. *Oecologia*, **90**:411-416.
- LEOPOLD, A. 1943. Deer irruptions. *Wis. Conserv. Bull.*, **8**:3-11.
- . 1950. Deer in relation to plant successions. *J. For.*, **48**:675-678.
- , L. K. SOWLS AND D. L. SPENCER. 1947. A survey of over-populated deer ranges in the United States. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **11**:162-177.
- LITTLE, S. AND H. A. SOMES. 1965. Atlantic White-Cedar being eliminated by excessive animal damage in south Jersey. U.S. Forest Service Research Note NE-33. 3 p.
- LONG, Z. T., W. P. CARSON AND C. J. PETERSON. 1998. Can disturbance create refugia from herbivores: an example with hemlock regeneration on treefall mounds. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc.*, **125**:165-168.
- MACLEAN, D. A. AND R. W. WEIN. 1978. Weight loss and nutrient changes in decomposing litter and forest floor material in New Brunswick forest stands. *Can. J. Bot.*, **56**:2730-2749.
- MARQUIS, D. A. 1981. Effect of deer browsing on timber production in Allegheny hardwood forests of northwestern Pennsylvania. NE-475. United States Forest Service, Broomall, Pennsylvania. 32 p.
- , AND R. BRENNEMAN. 1981. The impact of deer on forest vegetation in Pennsylvania. NE-65. United State Forest Service, Broomall, Pennsylvania. 7 p.
- MARSHALL, W. H., T. SCHANTZ-HANSON AND K. WINNSNESS. 1955. Effects of simulated overbrowsing on small red and white pine trees. *J. For.*, **53**:420-424.
- MCCABE, R. E. AND T. R. MCCABE. 1984. Of slings and arrows: an historical retrospective, p. 19-72. *In*: L. K. Halls (ed.). White-tailed deer: ecology and management. Stackpole Books, Harrisburg PA.
- , AND ———. 1997. Recounting whitetails past, p. 11-26. *In*: W. J. McShea, H. B. Underwood and J. H. Rappole (eds.). The science of overabundance: deer ecology and population management. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.

- MCCAFFERY, K. R., J. TRANETZKI AND J. PIECHURA. 1974. Summer foods of deer in northern Wisconsin. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **38**:215-219.
- MCCLAUCHERTY, C. A., J. PASTOR, J. D. ABER AND J. M. MELILLO. 1985. Forest litter decomposition in relation to soil nitrogen dynamics and litter quality. *Ecology*, **66**:266-275.
- MCCULLOUGH, D. R. 1985. Variables influencing food habits of white-tailed deer on the George Reserve. *J. Mammal.*, **66**:682-692.
- MCINNIS, P. E., R. J. NAIMAN, J. PASTOR AND Y. COHEN. 1992. Effects of moose browsing on vegetation and litter of the boreal forest, Isle Royale, Michigan, USA. *Ecology*, **73**:2059-2075.
- MCSHEA, W. J. AND J. H. RAPPOLE. 1997. The science and politics of managing deer within a protected area. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.*, **25**:443-446.
- , AND G. SCHWEDE. 1993. Variable acorn crops: responses of white-tailed deer and other mast consumers. *J. Mammal.*, **74**:999-1006.
- MICHAEL, E. D. 1992. Impact of deer browsing on regeneration of balsam fir in Canaan Valley, West Virginia. *Nor. J. Appl. For.*, **9**:89-90.
- MLADENOFF, D. J. AND F. STEAKNS. 1993. Eastern hemlock regeneration and deer browsing in the Great Lakes Region: a re-examination and model simulation. *Conserv. Biol.*, **7**:889-900.
- MILLER, S. G., S. P. BRATTON AND J. HADJILIAN. 1992. Impacts of white-tailed deer on endangered and threatened vascular plants. *Nat. Areas J.*, **12**:67-74.
- NEILS, G., L. ADAMS AND R. M. BLAIR. 1956. Management of white-tailed deer and ponderosa pine. *J. For.*, **54**:238-242.
- PEKINS, P. J. AND W. W. MAUTZ. 1987. Acorn usage by deer: significance to oak management. *Nor. J. Appl. For.*, **4**:124-128.
- PETRIDIS, G. A. 1941. Observations on the relative importance of winter deer browse species in central New York. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **5**:416-422.
- PHILLIPS, T. AND M. A. MAUN. 1996. Population ecology of *Cirsium pitcheri* on Lake Huron sand dunes I. Impact of white-tailed deer. *Can. J. Bot.*, **74**:1439-1444.
- PRACHAR, R. E. AND D. E. SAMUEL. 1988. Influence of white-tailed deer browsing on mortality and growth of regenerating aspen. *Trans. Northeast Sect. Wildl. Soc.*, **45**:27-36.
- REDDING, J. 1995. History of deer population trends and forest cutting in the Allegheny National Forest, p. 214-224. *In* Proc. 10th central hardwood forest conference, Broomall PA.
- RITCHIE, M. E. AND D. TILMAN. 1995. Responses of legumes to herbivores and nutrients during succession on a nitrogen-poor soil. *Ecology*, **76**:2648-2655.
- , AND J. M. H. KNOPS. 1998. Herbivore effects on plant and nitrogen dynamics in oak savanna. *Ecology*, **79**:165-177.
- ROONEY, T. P. 1997. Escaping herbivory: refuge effects on the morphology and shoot demography of the clonal forest herb *Maianthemum canadense*. *J. Torrey Bot. Soc.*, **124**:280-285.
- , AND W. J. DRESS. 1997. Species loss over sixty-six years in the ground-layer vegetation of Heart's Content, an old-growth forest in Pennsylvania, USA. *Nat. Areas J.*, **17**:297-305.
- , R. J. MCCORMICK, S. L. SOLHEIM AND D. M. WALLFR. 2000. Regional variation in recruitment of hemlock seedlings and saplings in the upper Great Lakes, USA. *Ecol. Appl.*, *In press*
- ROSS, B. A., J. R. BRAY AND W. H. MARSHALL. 1970. Effects of long-term deer exclusion on a *Pinus resinosa* forest in north-central Minnesota. *Ecology*, **51**:1088-1093.
- SAUNDERS, M. R. AND K. J. PUETTSMANN. 1999. Effects of overstory and understory competition and simulated herbivory on growth and survival of white pine seedlings. *Can. J. For. Res.*, **29**:536-546.
- SHELTON, A. L. AND R. S. INOUVE. 1995. Effect of browsing by deer on the growth and reproductive success of *Lactuca canadensis* (Asteraceae). *Am. Midl. Nat.*, **134**:332-339.
- SCHORGER, A. W. 1953. The white-tailed deer in early Wisconsin. *Trans. Wisc. Acad. Sci., Arts Lett.*, **42**:197-247.
- SINGER, F. J. AND R. A. RENKIN. 1995. Effects of browsing by native ungulates on the shrubs in big sagebrush communities in Yellowstone National Park. *Great Basin Nat.*, **55**:201-212.
- STANGE, E. E. AND K. L. SHEA. 1998. Effects of deer browsing, fabric mats and tree shelters on *Quercus rubra* seedlings. *Rest. Ecol.*, **6**:29-34.


- STOLCKELFR, J. H., R. O. STROTHMAN AND L. W. KREFTING. 1957. Effect of deer browsing on reproduction in the northern hardwood-hemlock type in northeastern Wisconsin. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **21**:75-80.
- STRAUSS, S. Y. 1988. Determining the effects of herbivory using naturally damaged plants. *Ecology*, **69**: 1628-1630.
- STROLE, T. A. AND R. C. ANDERSON. 1992. White-tailed deer browsing: species preferences and implications for central Illinois forests. *Nat. Areas J.*, **12**:139-144.
- STROMAYER, K. A. K. AND R. J. WARREN. 1997. Are overabundant deer herds in the eastern United States creating alternate stable states in forest plant communities? *Wildl. Soc. Bull.*, **25**:227-234.
- SWIFT, E. 1946. A history of Wisconsin deer. Publ. 323, Wisconsin Department of Conservation, Madison, Wisconsin, p. 96.
- SWITZENBERG, D. F., T. C. NELSON AND B. C. JENKINS. 1955. Effect of deer browsing on quality of hardwood timber in northern Michigan. *For. Sci.*, 161-67.
- TAYLOR, W. P. AND H. C. HAHN, JR. 1947. Die-offs among the white-tailed deer in the Edwards Plateau of Texas. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **11**:317-323.
- THROOP, H. L. AND P. A. FAY. 1999. Effects of fire, browsers and gullets on New Jersey Tea (*Ceanothus herbaceus*) growth and reproduction. *Am. Midl. Nat.*, **141**:51-58.
- PIERSON, W. C., E. F. PATRIC AND D. E. BEHREND. 1966. Influence of white-tailed deer on the logged northern hardwood forest. *J. For.*, **64**:801-805.
- TILGHMAN, N. G. 1989. Impacts of white-tailed deer on forest regeneration in northwestern Pennsylvania. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **53**:524-532.
- TRUMBULL, V. L., E. J. ZIELINSKI AND E. C. ALARRAII. 1989. The impact of deer browsing on the Allegheny forest type. *Nor. J. Appl. For.*, **6**:162-165.
- VAN AUKEN, O. W. 1993. Size distribution patterns and potential change of some dominant woody species of the Edwards Plateau region of Texas. *Texas J. Sci.*, **45**:199-210.
- VAN DELEN, T. R., K. S. PREGITZER AND J. B. HAUFER. 1996. A comparison of presettlement and present-day forests in two northern Michigan deer yards. *Am. Midl. Nat.*, **135**:181-195.
- VAN VOLKENBERG, H. L. AND A. J. NICHOLSON. 1943. Parasitism and malnutrition of deer in Texas. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **7**:220-223.
- WEBB, W. L., R. T. KING AND E. F. PATRIC. 1956. Effect of white-tailed deer on a mature northern hardwood forest. *J. For.*, **54**:391-398.
- WECKERLY, F. W. AND J. P. NELSON, JR. 1990. Age and sex differences of white-tailed deer diet composition, quality and calcium. *J. Wildl. Manage.*, **54**:532-538.
- WHITNEY, G. C. 1984. Fifty years of change in the arboreal vegetation of Heart's Content, an old-growth hemlock-white pine-northern hardwood stand. *Ecology*, **65**:403-408.
- WITMER, G. W. AND D. S. DECALESTA. 1992. The need and difficulty of bringing the Pennsylvania deer herd under control, p. 130-137. *In*: Proc. Fifth Eastern Wildlife Damage Control Conference, Ithaca, New York.

Copyright of American Midland Naturalist is the property of University of Notre Dame / Review of Politics. The copyright in an individual article may be maintained by the author in certain cases. Content may not be copied or emailed to multiple sites or posted to a listserv without the copyright holder's express written permission. However, users may print, download, or email articles for individual use.



Recent population trend


Wisconsin Deer Population, 1960-2003



R. Rolley WI DNR



WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE



Deer - Impacts on Forest Ecology and Management

Exclosures

Exclosures have been erected by many individuals as part of formal studies and as demonstrations. Deer exclosures have been used to demonstrate browsing impacts in the Lake States since at least the 1950's. Long-term maintenance of exclosures is necessary, but difficult to sustain. Exclosures consistently demonstrate the impacts of herbivory on plant composition and growth.



A 15-year old deer exclosure in Vilas County. Inside the exclosure, regeneration of maple, birch, hemlock, and white pine is abundant. Outside, where deer browse, grasses and sedges dominate the understory (photo 2004 by T. Rooney).

Overview

- Council Position
- Letter to the Governor

Deer Research

- 2005 Reforestation Survey
 - 2006 Plantation Assessment
 - 2006 Natural Oak Regeneration Survey
 - Exclosures
 - Presentations
 - Literature Addressing Impacts
 - Chronology of Deer Hunting
 - Deer Population
-

2009 DNR Spring Rule Hearings - WCC County Meetings
 Summary of Results
 Statewide by Question

Question	Question Description	Votes Yes	Votes No	Majority	Counties Approving	Counties Rejecting	Counties Tie vote	Counties Not Voting
2009 STATEWIDE ATTENDANCE								
1	Background checks for angler education programs Part 1	5960	844	Yes	72	0	0	0
2	Background checks for angler education programs Part 2	5381	1201	Yes	72	0	0	0
3	Lake Winnebago walleye/ sauger bag limit	4632	1071	Yes	72	0	0	0
4	Minnows/ VHS rules correction	5260	781	Yes	72	0	0	0
5	Clarifying rules re: use of remote controlled devices for fishing	5094	1165	Yes	72	0	0	0
6	Eliminate barbless hooks restriction during early trout season	3379	3032	Yes	43	27	2	0
7	Crayfish harvest license requirements	3552	2701	Yes	55	16	1	0
8	Provide clarification for sloughs, bayous and flowages Part 1	4242	1179	Yes	72	0	0	0
9	Provide clarification for sloughs, bayous and flowages Part 2	4180	1113	Yes	71	1	0	0
10	Mussel harvest	3036	2044	Yes	57	14	1	0
11	Beaver Dam Lake (Barron County) walleye regulations	3263	1825	Yes	67	4	1	0
12	Long Lake (Vilas County) walleye regulations	3245	1966	Yes	63	9	0	0
13	Dead Pike Lake (Vilas County) walleye regulations	3156	1930	Yes	64	7	1	0
14	Walleye Length Limits on Upper Clam (Ashland & Iron counties)	2633	1132	Yes	67	4	1	0
15	Bayfield County trout lakes	2432	994	Yes	68	3	1	0
16	Twenty-six Lake bass regulation change	2414	1006	Yes	69	3	0	0
17	Anderson Lake trout regulations	2139	1011	Yes	68	2	2	0
18	Silver Lake northern pike regulations	1982	1411	Yes	53	18	1	0
19	Burrows lake bass regulations	1862	1390	Yes	51	18	3	0
20	Wisconsin River walleye regulation	3010	738	Yes	70	1	1	0
21	Big Round Lake walleye regulations	2284	1070	Yes	62	9	1	0
22	Manley Creek trout regulations	1986	1085	Yes	60	10	2	0
23	Big Sand Lake and Long Lakes muskellunge regulations	2296	1709	Yes	52	18	2	0
24	Kentuck Lake muskellunge regulation	2228	1733	Yes	46	22	4	0
25	White Sand Lake walleye regulation	2259	1219	Yes	64	6	2	0
26	Twin Lakes Chain walleye regulations	2094	1411	Yes	57	15	0	0
27	Urban pond proposals	2378	840	Yes	66	5	1	0
28	Clarify the definition of "open water hunting" for waterfowl	3133	2424	Yes	54	17	1	0
29	Extend the fall turkey season	4607	2142	Yes	62	10	0	0
30	Registration of wild turkeys	5743	1051	Yes	72	0	0	0
31	Modify the bobcat hunting and trapping seasons Part 1	3447	1851	Yes	62	10	0	0
32	Modify the bobcat hunting and trapping seasons Part 2	3061	2071	Yes	58	12	2	0

2009 DNR Spring Rule Hearings - WCC County Meetings
 Summary of Results
 Statewide by Question

4:17 PM 04/14/2009

Question	Question Description	Votes Yes	Votes No	Majority	Counties Approving	Counties Rejecting	Counties Tie vote	Counties Not Voting
33	Clarify the definition of legal firearm types for hunting	3956	2156	Yes	63	8	1	0
34	Issuance of left-over turkey hunting permits	3639	2753	Yes	57	14	1	0
35	Turkey hunting by disabled permit holders Part 1	4290	1918	Yes	70	0	2	0
36	Turkey hunting by disabled permit holders Part 2	4745	1426	Yes	72	0	0	0
37	Require the registration of harvested sharp-tailed grouse	2500	3208	No	20	50	2	0
38	Special waterfowl hunting regulations at Mead - 1PM	2107	2046	Yes	36	33	3	0
39	Special waterfowl hunting regulations at Mead - Closed Prior to Duck Season	2086	2006	Yes	36	32	4	0
40	Special waterfowl hunting regulations at Mead - Townline/Berkhahn	2280	1484	Yes	58	9	5	0
41	Special waterfowl hunting regulations at Mead - Rice Lake/Pool 10	2269	1505	Yes	57	12	3	0
42	Allow the use of dogs for turkey hunting statewide during the fall season	3168	3398	No	33	38	1	0
43	Allow the harvest hen pheasants at Sand Creek Fishery Area, Monroe County	2629	1200	Yes	57	4	1	0
44	Allow the use of rifles for firearm deer hunting in Dunn County	3532	836	Yes	71	0	1	0
45	Eliminate the Nelson-Trevino Mississippi River closed area in Buffalo County	2969	1068	Yes	66	5	1	0
46	Allow the use of rifles for firearm deer hunting in Shawano County	3667	959	Yes	71	0	1	0
47	Allow firearm deer hunting at Whitefish Dunes state park, Door County	3464	667	Yes	72	0	0	0
48	Establish antlerless-only deer seasons Wildcat Mountain State Park	1949	1922	Yes	34	32	6	0
49	Hunting seasons at Cadiz Spring State Park and Recreation Area	2805	786	Yes	71	1	0	0
50	Eliminate the late season archery deer hunt at Brunet Island State Park	1401	2965	No	4	68	0	0
51	Reduce the size of Dike 17 waterfowl refuge Jackson County	2625	982	Yes	68	2	2	0
52	Reduce the size of Vernon Marsh waterfowl refuge	3039	622	Yes	72	0	0	0
53	1:00 p.m. closure of migratory bird hunting, Lake Mills Wildlife Area	1649	1633	Yes	39	31	2	0
54	Allow firearm deer hunting at Potawatomi state park, Door County	3622	622	Yes	72	0	0	0
55	Allow rifles for deer hunting on all of Hartman Creek State Park	3260	926	Yes	71	0	1	0
56	Youth Conservation Congress	4377	1637	Yes	69	3	0	0
57	An EAB Alternative	1126	5472	No	0	71	1	0
58	Turkey Hunting with Dogs Regulations	2158	3988	No	5	66	1	0
59	Buck Fawn Identification Information	5174	1369	Yes	71	1	0	0
60	Later Muzzleloader Deer Seasons - 10 day	2546	4174	No	10	61	1	0
61	Later Muzzleloader Deer Seasons - 16 day	2432	4440	No	12	60	0	0
62	Deer Registration Information	5772	962	Yes	71	1	0	0
63	Private Land-only, Antlerless-only Deer Season	2570	3933	No	12	58	2	0
64	Eliminate Earn-A-Buck (EAB) and October Antlerless Deer Hunts	5012	1321	Yes	72	0	0	0
65	Maximum of Two Consecutive Years Earn-a-Buck	5112	1325	Yes	72	0	0	0

2009 DNR Spring Rule Hearings - WCC County Meetings
 Summary of Results
 Statewide by Question

4:17 PM 04/14/2009

Question	Question Description	Votes Yes	Votes No	Majority	Counties Approving	Counties Rejecting	Counties Tie vote	Counties Not Voting
66	Allow Bow Hunting During the 9-Day Deer Gun Season	4659	2270	Yes	69	2	1	0
67	Magnifying Scopes on Muzzleloaders	4049	2606	Yes	62	9	1	0
68	Prohibit the Shooting of Antlered Deer in the CWD Zone - Shooting Permits	3602	1959	Yes	66	5	1	0
69	Remove Woodchucks from the List of Protected Species	5532	760	Yes	72	0	0	0
70	Treestands on State Lands	4624	2103	Yes	69	3	0	0
71	Statewide Coyote Hunting Season Year Round	5870	582	Yes	72	0	0	0
72	Extend Trap Check Times	3206	1793	Yes	65	6	1	0
73	Bobcat Permit Application Fee Increase	2843	2740	Yes	42	30	0	0
74	Allow Trappers to Use Bait and Lures Prior to the Trapping Season	3082	2309	Yes	53	18	1	0
75	Restrict Lake Michigan Commercial Fishing Harvest in Select Grids	3850	574	Yes	72	0	0	0
76	Allow Elderly Persons the Use of All Terrain Vehicles while Hunting	4421	1966	Yes	69	3	0	0
77	Change in the Minimum Age for Sturgeon Spearing	4081	1339	Yes	70	2	0	0
78	Prohibit Legis. Re: Wildlife and Fisheries w/o Hearings/DNR input	5379	970	Yes	72	0	0	0
79	Winter Free Fishing Weekend	5519	742	Yes	72	0	0	0
80	Include 16 & 17 Year Olds in the Youth Hunts	3294	3003	Yes	42	26	4	0
81	Increased Youth Opportunity	5677	894	Yes	72	0	0	0
82	Day Old Chick Program Requirements	3365	1120	Yes	70	1	1	0
83	Atlatl and Dart - Small Game	3053	2455	Yes	46	23	3	0
84	Combine Pheasant and Turkey Stamps	3008	2943	Yes	41	30	1	0
85	Increased Size Limit on Muskellunge, Green Bay and Related Waters	2480	2260	Yes	38	32	2	0
86	Creating a Size Limit on Northern Pike in the Waters of Green Bay	2641	1736	Yes	52	17	3	0
87	The Great Northwest Bass Restoration Initiative	2316	1354	Yes	62	9	1	0
88	Size Limit on Bass in Washburn County	2481	1134	Yes	65	7	0	0
89	Chippewa Flowage Winter Bag Limit on Crappie	2745	1062	Yes	69	0	3	0
90	Manage Smallmouth and Largemouth Bass as Separate Species	3242	1448	Yes	68	4	0	0
91	Walleye Daily Bag Limit Change, Peterwell and Castle Rock Flowages	2036	1835	Yes	41	30	1	0



WISCONSIN STATE LEGISLATURE



Wisconsin Bowhunters Association

William Friede Complex 17 E Third Street
PO Box 240 Clintonville, WI 54929 ph: (715) 823-4670 Fax: (715) 823-1385
office@wisconsinbowhunters.org www.wisconsinbowhunters.org



PROMOTE, PROTECT, PRESERVE

For immediate release

April 18, 2011

Bowhunters support proposed legislation returning stability and tradition to Wisconsin deer hunting

Senator Moulton and Representative Tiffany and any additional co-sponsors of this bill should be applauded for their effort to protect Wisconsin's deer hunting heritage while still providing the DNR the ability to manage our deer herd.

"It is very encouraging that these legislators understand the situation and are taking action to stabilize hunting traditions that we can depend on and pass on to younger hunters" said Mike Brust, President of Wisconsin Bowhunters Association.

Brust noted that although the DNR meant well in implementing changes over the last several years, they sometimes lost sight of the fact that all the programs in the world don't actually manage deer - hunters do.

"Bowhunters will welcome the permanent elimination of the early herd control hunts, Earn-A-Buck and threats to change the dates of the gun season. With consistent seasons and regulations, all hunters will be able to plan ahead and re-establish many of the traditions that have been a part of Wisconsin deer hunting for generations" Brust said. "We can enjoy hunting again without having to carry around a regulations book and worry about how things might change again next year".

Founded in 1941, The Wisconsin Bowhunters Association is the nation's oldest and largest state bowhunting organization, dedicated to promoting, protecting and preserving the sport of hunting with a bow and arrow. WBH considers the wild deer herd to be one of Wisconsin's most valuable natural resources.

###