2013 - JCR Evaluation Form

| SPECIES: Pronghorn HERD: PR615-RED DESERT |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 60-61, 64 |  | PREPARED BY: GREG HIATT |
| 2008-2012 Average | $\underline{2013}$ | 2014 Proposed |
| Population: 12,933 | 10,152 | 10,237 |
| Harvest: 716 | 451 | 340 |
| Hunters: 739 | 494 | 375 |
| Hunter Success: 97\% | 91\% | 91\% |
| Active Licenses: 798 | 553 | 375 |
| Active License Percent: 90\% | 82\% | 91\% |
| Recreation Days: 2,109 | 1,765 | 1,080 |
| Days Per Animal: 2.9 | 3.9 | 3.2 |
| Males per 100 Females 60 | 58 |  |
| Juveniles per 100 Females 60 | 36 |  |
| Population Objective: |  | 15,000 |
| Management Strategy: |  | Special |
| Percent population is above (+) or below (-) objective: |  | -32.3\% |
| Number of years population has been + or - objective in rece | nd: | 4 |
| Model Date: |  | 3/5/2014 |
| Proposed harvest rates (percent of pre-season estimate for each sex/age group): |  |  |
|  | JCR Year | Proposed |
| Females $\geq 1$ year old: | 2.5\% | 1.5\% |
| Males $\geq 1$ year old: | 11.2\% | 8.7\% |
| Juveniles (<1 year old): | 0.1\% | 0.2\% |
| Total: | 4.3\% | 3.2\% |
| Proposed change in post-season population: | +5.8\% | +0.8\% |

Population Size - Postseason
$\square$ PR615-POPULATION - PR615- OBJECTIVE


## Harvest



Number of Hunters


Harvest Success

PR615 - Hunter Success \% PR615 - Active License Success


## Active Licenses



Days Per Animal Harvested
PR615-Days


Preseason Animals per 100 Females
1 PR615-Males

- PR615 - Juveniles

for Pronghorn Herd PR615-RED DESERT

|  |  | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cls } \\ & \text { Obj } \end{aligned}$ | Males to 100 Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pre Pop | Ylg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | Ylng | Adult | Total | Conf Int | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \end{aligned}$ | Conf Int | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 11,455 | 136 | 428 | 564 | 21\% | 1,255 | 47\% | 842 | 32\% | 2,661 | 2,167 | 11 | 34 | 45 | $\pm 3$ | 67 | $\pm 4$ | 46 |
| 2009 | 13,234 | 268 | 749 | 1,017 | 24\% | 1,987 | 47\% | 1,190 | 28\% | 4,194 | 1,907 | 13 | 38 | 51 | $\pm 3$ | 60 | $\pm 3$ | 40 |
| 2010 | 15,563 | 361 | 951 | 1,312 | 31\% | 1,823 | 43\% | 1,077 | 26\% | 4,212 | 2,595 | 20 | 52 | 72 | $\pm 4$ | 59 | $\pm 3$ | 34 |
| 2011 | 15,951 | 263 | 736 | 999 | 27\% | 1,540 | 42\% | 1,115 | 31\% | 3,654 | 2,650 | 17 | 48 | 65 | $\pm 4$ | 72 | $\pm 4$ | 44 |
| 2012 | 12,390 | 177 | 888 | 1,065 | 32\% | 1,600 | 48\% | 667 | 20\% | 3,332 | 2,103 | 11 | 56 | 67 | $\pm 4$ | 42 | $\pm 3$ | 25 |
| 2013 | 10,648 | 66 | 809 | 875 | 30\% | 1,517 | 52\% | 539 | 18\% | 2,931 | 1,629 | 4 | 53 | 58 | $\pm 3$ | 36 | $\pm 2$ | 23 |

## 2014 HUNTING SEASONS RED DESERT PRONGHORN HERD (PR615)

| Hunt Area | Type | Dates of Seasons |  | Quota | Limitations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Opens | Closes |  |  |
| 60 | 1 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 22 | 50 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 22 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| 61 | 1 | Sep. 13 | Oct. 14 | 150 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sep. 13 | Oct. 14 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| 64 | 1 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 22 | 100 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 22 | 50 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| Archery |  |  |  |  |  |
| 60, 64 |  | Aug. 15 | Sep. 19 |  | Refer to Section 3 of this Chapter |
| 61 |  | Aug. 15 | Sep. 12 |  | Refer to Section 3 of this Chapter |


| Hunt Area | Type | Quota change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 60 | 1 | -25 |
|  | 6 | 0 |
| 61 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 6 | -25 |
| 64 | 1 | -100 |
|  | 6 | -50 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 2 5}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{6}$ | -75 |

## Management Evaluation

Current Management Objective: 15,000
Management Strategy: Special
2013 Postseason Population Estimate: ~10,150
2014 Proposed Postseason Population Estimate: ~10,240
The Red Desert pronghorn herd is managed toward a post-hunt population of 15,000 , an objective last publicly reviewed in 1994. Population size is estimated using a spreadsheet model developed in 2012 and most recently updated in 2014. The herd is in special management, with harvest quotas designed to maintain pre-hunt buck:doe ratios above 60:100.

## Herd Unit Issues

Historically, access in this herd unit has been good. Much of the unit is public land, and hunters have been able to acquire access to most private lands in the checkerboard. The seasonal
distribution map for the herd has not been updated for many years, and it is likely there are crucial winter habitats, particularly in Area 60, that have not yet been delineated.

Habitat issues in this herd unit include continued gas field development, coalbed natural gas development, opening of an in situ uranium mine with other mines proposed and possible development of shale oil. Many miles of sheep-tight fences exist in the herd unit, impeding pronghorn movements and migrations, and increasing losses during severe winters.

## Weather

Severe drought conditions in 2012, with almost no precipitation throughout the spring and summer, were followed by three severe late winter blizzards in April 2013. Based on low yearling ratios in 2013, losses appeared to be well above normal during the 2012-13 winter. The 2013 summer was also exceptionally dry, reducing browse availability for the 2013-14 winter. Precipitation increased in the fall, providing for some herbaceous plant growth, but appeared to be too late for most forbs and shrubs. The 2013-14 winter had numerous bitter cold spells, and high winds, but those winds also exposed forage on most winter ranges. Losses may still be above average because of the poor body condition of animals going into the winter.

## Habitat

While no herbaceous habitat transects are established within this herd unit, herbaceous forage production is expected to have been minimal due to record drought. Only one shrub transect has been established near this herd unit, on the Chain Lakes WHMA, but was not read in 2013.

BP America transferred ownership of two water wells on Chain Lakes WHMA to WGFD.
Developed with funds provided by WWNRT, these solar wells provide additional water sources for wildlife and help disperse domestic livestock that graze Chain Lakes WHMA.

Habitat losses to uranium development increased with opening of the Ur in situ uranium mine in Area 61, but is not in or near crucial pronghorn ranges. Habitat losses to gas development have slowed due to low gas prices and demand for drilling rigs in the Bakken fields.

## Field Data

Fawn production fell to $36: 100$, the lowest fawn: doe ratio ever recorded for this herd, exceeding the previous record of $42: 100$ set in 2012. Production was lowest in Area 60 at only 22:100, the second lowest for that arid area. Production in Area 64 was only 34:100, the lowest ever for that Area. Fawn production was highest in Area 61 at 46:100, which was an improvement over production in 2012 for that area.

The herd buck:doe ratio failed to meet the special management criterion of 60:100, largely because of the exceptionally poor yearling buck:doe ratio of 4:100. Yearling recruitment was poorest for Area 64. Both Areas 60 and 61 met the $60: 100$ criterion, but the buck:doe ratio for Area 64 was only $47: 100$, the lowest in five years. With the poor production seen this year, yearling buck:doe ratios are unlikely to improve in 2014.

## Harvest Data

Hunter success dropped to its lowest level in seven years, at 82 percent, while hunter effort increased to its highest level ever, at 3.9 days per animal. As with the herd ratios, hunter success was best in Area 61 and lower in Areas 60 and 64. The average days of effort required to harvest an animal was high in all three areas. These data suggest the number of pronghorn in the herd has decreased, particularly in the western half.

## Population

The Time-Specific Juvenile \& Constant Adult Survival (TSJ,CAS) spreadsheet model provided the best fit with observed buck:doe ratios for this herd, behaved predictably when 2013 classification and harvest data were added and is considered a "Fair" model of the herd. Annual adult survival was predicted at 88 percent, a reasonable level. Juvenile survival rates fluctuated within the allowed range but did hover at maximum or minimum values for many years. The CJ,CA and SCJ,SCA models each had slightly lower AIC values, but both models predicted herd sizes well below line transect estimates and generated roughly stable buck:doe estimates that did not track the dips and rises of observed values. Fawn production in 2014 was projected to be near the five-year average and the model was run with median juvenile survival in 2014.

The model predicts the herd has been roughly 30 percent below objective for the past two years. Even with optimistic assumptions on fawn production and survival, the 2014 pre-hunt population should be roughly equal to that seen in 2013 and herd growth will be minimal. Without major improvement in fawn production and survival, proposed reductions in harvest quotas for 2014 will only stabilize the herd near the current size.

## Management Summary

This herd was well below objective size following a record harvest and severe winter losses in 1992. Conservative harvests after that winter combined with improved fawn production and survival beginning in 2007 allowed the herd to reach and be maintained at objective size in 2010 and 2011.

According to the spreadsheet model, the combination of heavy harvests and extremely poor fawn production in 2012 and 2013 significantly reduced herd size, estimated at just over 10,000.

With the population estimated to be 30 percent below objective, harvests need to be reduced to allow the herd to recover. Quotas for Type 6 doe/fawn licenses are reduced to minimal numbers in Areas 60 and 61, and reduced by half for Area 64. Quotas for Type 1 licenses are also reduced in Areas 60 and 64. With the highest buck:doe ratio and fawn production, no decrease is recommended for these licenses in Area 61. With the projected harvest of roughly 260 bucks and 80 does and fawns, the model predicts the herd will remain near the current size in 2014. If precipitation improves, raising both fawn production and survival, some minor increase in herd size may occur, but the herd is unlikely to reach objective in two or three years.






| SPECIES: Pronghorn HERD: PR630-IRON SPRINGS |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 52, 56, 108 |  | PREPARED BY: GREG HIATT |
| 2008-2012 Average | 2013 | 2014 Proposed |
| Population: 10,924 | 8,293 | 7,922 |
| Harvest: 776 | 717 | 410 |
| Hunters: 802 | 722 | 475 |
| Hunter Success: 97\% | 99\% | 86 \% |
| Active Licenses: 898 | 846 | 475 |
| Active License Percent: 86\% | 85\% | 86 \% |
| Recreation Days: 2,568 | 2,854 | 1,500 |
| Days Per Animal: 3.3 | 4.0 | 3.7 |
| Males per 100 Females 45 | 43 |  |
| Juveniles per 100 Females 51 | 50 |  |
| Population Objective: |  | 12,000 |
| Management Strategy: |  | Recreational |
| Percent population is above ( + ) or below (-) objective: |  | -30.9\% |
| Number of years population has been + or - objective in rec | end: | 6 |
| Model Date: |  | 4/19/2014 |
| Proposed harvest rates (percent of pre-season estimate for each sex/age group): |  |  |
|  | JCR Year | Proposed |
| Females $\geq 1$ year old: | 6.4\% | 3.1\% |
| Males $\geq 1$ year old: | 19.6\% | 13.9\% |
| Juveniles (<1 year old): | 1.2\% | 0.7\% |
| Total: | 8.1\% | 4.9\% |
| Proposed change in post-season population: | -8.2\% | -4.5\% |

## Population Size - Postseason



Harvest


Number of Hunters


Harvest Success
$\square$ PR630 - Hunter Success \% $\square \begin{aligned} & \text { PR630 - Active License Success }\end{aligned}$


## Active Licenses

$\square$ PR630-Active Licenses


Days Per Animal Harvested


## Preseason Animals per 100 Females



## 2008-2013 Preseason Classification Summary

for Pronghorn Herd PR630-IRON SPRINGS

|  |  | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cls } \\ & \text { Obj } \end{aligned}$ | Males to $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pre Pop | Ylg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | YIng | Adult | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Conf } \\ \text { Int } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conf } \\ & \text { Int } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 13,098 | 204 | 637 | 841 | 25\% | 1,734 | 51\% | 844 | 25\% | 3,419 | 1,373 | 12 | 37 | 49 | $\pm 3$ | 49 | $\pm 3$ | 33 |
| 2009 | 12,165 | 225 | 525 | 750 | 22\% | 1,764 | 52\% | 861 | 26\% | 3,375 | 1,343 | 13 | 30 | 43 | $\pm 3$ | 49 | $\pm 3$ | 34 |
| 2010 | 12,157 | 159 | 710 | 869 | 23\% | 1,874 | 50\% | 968 | 26\% | 3,711 | 1,477 | 8 | 38 | 46 | $\pm 3$ | 52 | $\pm 3$ | 35 |
| 2011 | 11,289 | 150 | 576 | 726 | 22\% | 1,627 | 49\% | 984 | 29\% | 3,337 | 1,791 | 9 | 35 | 45 | $\pm 3$ | 60 | $\pm 3$ | 42 |
| 2012 | 10,153 | 212 | 604 | 816 | 23\% | 1,801 | 52\% | 863 | 25\% | 3,480 | 1,295 | 12 | 34 | 45 | $\pm 3$ | 48 | $\pm 3$ | 33 |
| 2013 | 9,082 | 131 | 514 | 645 | 22\% | 1,488 | 52\% | 746 | 26\% | 2,879 | 1,336 | 9 | 35 | 43 | $\pm 3$ | 50 | $\pm 3$ | 35 |

## 2014 HUNTING SEASONS IRON SPRINGS PRONGHORN HERD (PR630)

| Hunt Area | Dates of Seasons |  |  | Quota | Limitations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Type | Opens | Closes |  |  |
| 52 | 1 | Sep. 16 | Oct. 31 | 100 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 2 | Sep. 16 | Nov. 14 | 100 | Limited quota; any antelope valid south of North Spring Creek |
|  | 6 | Sep. 16 | Oct. 31 | 75 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
|  | 7 | Sep. 16 | Nov. 14 | 100 | Limited quota; doe or fawn valid south of North Spring Creek |
| 56 | 1 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 31 | 50 | Limited quota; any antelope |
| 108 | 1 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 31 | 75 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 31 | 50 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| Archery |  |  |  |  |  |
| 52 |  | Aug. 15 | Sep. 15 |  | Refer to Section 3 of this Chapter |
| 56,108 |  | Aug. 15 | Sep. 19 |  | Refer to Section 3 of this Chapter |


| Hunt Area | Type | Quota change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 52 | 1 | -50 |
|  | 2 | -100 |
|  | 6 | -75 |
|  | 7 | -150 |
| 56 | 1 | -25 |
| 108 | 1 | -25 |
|  | 6 | -25 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 \& 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 0 0}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{6 \& 7}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 5 0}$ |

## Management Evaluation

Current Management Objective: 12,000
Management Strategy: Recreation
2013 Postseason Population Estimate: ~8,300
2014 Proposed Postseason Population Estimate: ~7,925
The Iron Springs pronghorn herd is managed toward a post-hunt population of 12,000, an objective last publicly reviewed in 1994. Population size is estimated using a spreadsheet model developed in 2012 and updated in 2014. The herd is in recreational management, with harvest quotas designed to maintain pre-hunt buck: doe ratios below 60:100

## Herd Unit Issues

Construction of the proposed Chokecherry and Sierra Madre wind farms, consisting of roughly 1,000 turbines and the associated road network, could have significant impacts on important habitats in large portions of Areas 56 and 108, as well as the north portion of Area 52. Construction of several large, trans-continental powerlines would cross important winter habitats at the north edge of Area 56.

Access remains an issue in this herd unit, particularly in the checkerboard in association with the proposed Chokecherry and Sierra Madre wind farms. The Walk-In program has opened access to large blocks of private land, primarily in Area 52, which helped address concerns over large numbers of pronghorn residing on irrigated croplands during summer and fall.

The seasonal distribution map was last revised in March 1994 and no changes have been made since that review. Observations during winters since 1994 indicate consideration should be given to delineating crucial winter ranges south of Saratoga, southeast of Chokecherry Knob and near Fort Steele. The southern boundary between Area 108 and Area 53 of the Baggs herd was moved further south onto more easily recognized county roads in 2011 and the herd unit boundary should be expanded to align with the new hunt area boundary. Fences continue to pose barriers to pronghorn movements throughout much of the herd unit, increasing mortality during tough winters. Sheep-tight fences may also contribute to low fawn survival in pastures with limited water sources during dry summers.

Small acreages of crucial winter range have been lost to subdivision of deeded lands, primarily in the southern portion of the herd, and along Interstate Highway 80 in Area 56. Increased subdivision of these habitats, especially if these tracts are fenced, could seriously degrade the quality and utility of some winter ranges and migration routes. Development, partitioning, and fencing of these lands could have more deleterious effects on pronghorn migrations and habitat than some energy developments. Segregating land ownership among dozens of owners also deters recreational use of those divided lands and inter-mixed public lands.

Losses to EHD were confirmed in the South Ferris herd immediately north of Area 56 in late summer 2013 and the disease probably struck pronghorn in this herd as well. A mule deer fawn died of EHD at the southern tip of Antelope Area 108 so it is likely the disease spanned at least the northern half of the Iron Springs herd unit.

## Weather

Severe drought conditions in 2012, with almost no precipitation throughout the spring and summer, were followed by three severe late winter blizzards in April 2013. Losses appeared to be above normal during the 2012-13 winter. The 2013 summer was also exceptionally dry, reducing browse availability for the 2013-14 winter. Precipitation increased in the fall, providing for some herbaceous plant growth, but appeared to be too late for most forbs and shrubs. The 2013-14 winter had numerous bitter cold spells, and high winds, but those winds also exposed forage on most winter ranges. Losses this winter may still be above average because of the poor body condition of animals going into the winter.

## Habitat

This herd unit overlaps most of the western half of the Platte Valley Mule Deer herd, and habitats for pronghorn suffer the same low productivity due to overuse, decadent shrubs and drought. Treatments designed to improve habitat for mule deer through the Platte Valley Habitat Partnership are likely to improve habitats for pronghorn as well. Recent tebuthiuron treatments on top of Miller Hill in Area 108 and prescribed burns in Area 52 should improve summer ranges for pronghorn, at least in the short term.

Oil and gas drilling activity has tapered off in the herd unit, as most drilling rigs are active in more productive fields elsewhere in the country, but a successful shale oil well a few miles east of the herd unit may lead to increased interest here. Proposed strip mining of coal in Kindt Basin in Area 56 could damage winter habitats, but is unlikely to occur in the near future because of more competitive coal reserves elsewhere in the state and conflict with the Chokecherry wind farm. Increased interest in developing coalbed methane resources in southern Wyoming may lead to proposals to develop well fields to extract the methane from these coal seams.

Construction of the 1,000 turbine Chokecherry and Sierra Madre wind farms is predicted to begin next year. Planned revegetation of the massive road network necessary for this project is likely to improve summer forage for pronghorn, but will permanently remove browse in winter ranges and provide avenues for expansion of noxious weeds, as seen in gas fields to the west. Wind turbines have been shown to reduce soil moisture in their wind shadow and the large number of turbines in already arid habitats may remove the benefits gained from revegetation of roads and pads.

## Field Data

Classification sample size dropped to its lowest level in 10 years in 2013. Classification sample size declined again in Area 56 for the fourth year, and was the smallest sample in over 30 years. The 2013 sample size was less than 30 percent of the 2007 sample. In Area 52, the 2013 sample was the smallest in ten years and 25 percent less than that of 2012. Only in Area 108 have sample sizes remained relatively stable over recent years.

As a consequence of extreme drought, fawn production dropped to 48:100 in 2012 and remained low in 2013, at only 50:100, the second lowest in 16 years. Fawn production was lowest in Area 56, at only 15:100. Production improved slightly in Area 52 in 2013, to 59:100, but was still the second lowest ratio in 10 years for that area. Fawn production in Area 108 remained stable at $42: 100$, which was above the five-year average for that area.

The buck:doe ratio dropped slightly in 2013, mostly from a reduced number of yearling bucks in the sample. The yearling buck:doe ratio for this herd was not unusually low, especially considering the low fawn crop in 2012. Either losses during the April 2013 blizzards were less extreme in this herd, or mortalities also affected doe age classes. Yearling buck:doe ratios were similar for the three hunt areas. Surprisingly, the supply of mature bucks was highest in Area 52, at 38:100. The buck:doe ratio in Area 56 declined again, despite the limited access for hunters. If access continues to be denied after the wind project is constructed, buck:doe ratios will be
expected to rise in this area and may exceed the maximum for recreational management. The adult buck:doe ratio declined in Area 108, but was within the recent range for this area. Overall, buck:doe ratios for this herd over the past seven years have been less than would be desired in areas with large blocks of public land.

## Harvest Data

Hunter success declined in 2013, for almost all license types in each of the three areas. Success was lowest for the Type 7 licenses in southern Area 52, at only 75 percent. Similarly, the average number of days of effort required to harvest an animal increased for most license types, but was highest for Type 7 license holders in Area 52. This average was also high for the Type 2 hunters in Area 52, again those restricted to the southern half of the area.

## Population

This herd was more than 10 percent below objective size following severe losses during the 1992-93 winter and remained below objective size for the rest of that decade due to poor fawn production. Fawn production began to improve in 1999, particularly in Area 52, allowing the herd to quickly reach objective size and then exceed it by $\sim 35$ percent by 2002. Most of the population growth was associated with irrigated croplands in the southern portion of Area 52. Harvests were increased, especially with the addition of Type 2 and 7 licenses limited to the southern portion of Area 52. Harvest statistics and landowners' comments about low numbers of pronghorn in their fields indicate that strategy was successful.

Losses in the northern portion of the herd unit were high again during the 2007-08 winter and pronghorn densities in that portion of the herd have not recovered due to repeated poor fawn production in low desert habitats in Areas 56 and 108. Losses were not exceptional in Area 52 during that winter and fawn production remained adequate in that portion of the herd until 2012.

Prior to the development of a reasonable spreadsheet model in mid-2012, population estimates suggested this herd was roughly at objective size up until 2011. According to the spreadsheet model and a line transect survey flown in spring of 2012, the herd was actually 15 percent below objective as early as 2010 . The combination of continued doe/fawn harvest and extremely poor fawn production in 2012 and 2013 significantly reduced herd size, estimated at about 8,300 animals in 2013, more than 30 percent below objective.

The Time-Specific Juvenile \& Constant Adult Survival (TSJ/CAS) spreadsheet model provided the best fit with observed buck:doe ratios for this herd, behaved predictably when 2013 classification and harvest data were added and is considered a "Fair" model of the herd. Annual adult survival was predicted at 88 percent, a reasonable level. Juvenile survival rates fluctuated within the allowed range and did not hover at maximum or minimum values for most years. The CJ,CA and SCJ,SCA models each had slightly lower AIC values, but both models predicted herd sizes well below the confidence interval of the most recent line transect estimate and generated roughly stable buck:doe estimates that did not track major dips and rises of observed values. The SCJ,SCA model also overestimated observed buck:doe ratios for each of the past three years. Due to the poor condition of animals going into this winter, fawn production in 2014 was
projected to be similar to that seen in 2013. The model was run using a median to low juvenile survival in 2014.

## Management Evaluation

With the population estimated to be more than 30 percent below objective, harvests should be reduced to allow the herd to recover. Recommended quotas were reduced for all license types in Area 52, particularly for the Type 2 and Type 7 licenses which are restricted to the southern portion. These licenses are intended to direct harvest to irrigated hayfields, and even those landowners have been expressing concern over low pronghorn numbers. License quota for Area 56 is reduced to compensate for the extremely low fawn production in 2013. License quotas in Area 108 have also been reduced because of low numbers and poor buck:doe ratios, but doe/fawn licenses intended primarily to address landowner concerns over high pronghorn numbers on one ranch that allows public hunting have been retained.

If fawn production remains low, the expected harvest of roughly 260 bucks and 150 does and fawns from the 2014 season quotas should still slightly reduce herd size, projected to be roughly 7,900 at post-hunt 2014. If fawn production improves, the recommended quotas should allow for a small increase in herd size. When weather and range conditions allow for growth of this population towards objective size, the most desired areas for that growth would be in the northern portion of Area 52 and southern portion of Area 108 where access is available and numbers of pronghorn on private lands has been less of an issue.

Opening dates for all areas and types are consistent with the application booklets. Opening dates for licenses in Area 52 are the same as in 2013 and coincide with seasons in neighboring Areas 50 and 51. As in 2013, the Type 2 and 7 licenses in the southern portion of this area are valid for an additional two weeks into November. The season in area 52 entirely overlaps local deer and elk general license seasons. Opening dates for areas 56 and 108 are the same as in the previous 15 years and coincide with neighboring areas 53 and 55 of the Baggs herd. Closing dates for areas 56 and 108 are extended to the end of October. Archery seasons use standardized opening dates and close the day before the regular season opens for each area.

If significant portions of the herd unit remain closed to hunting, buck:doe ratios for the herd may have to exceed 60:100 in order to maintain reasonable levels of buck quality on the portions where harvest occurs.






2013 - JCR Evaluation Form

| SPECIES: Pronghorn |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| HERD: PR631 - WIND RIVER |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 84 |  | PREPARED BY: GREG |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Population Size - Postseason



## Harvest



Number of Hunters


Harvest Success
$\square$ PR631 - Hunter Success \% PR631 - Active License Success


## Active Licenses



Days Per Animal Harvested
$\square$ PR631 - Days


Preseason Animals per 100 Females


2008-2013 Preseason Classification Summary
for Pronghorn Herd PR631 - WIND RIVER

|  |  | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | Cls <br> Obj | Males to 100 Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pre Pop | Ylg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | YIng | Adult | Total | Conf Int | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \end{aligned}$ | Conf Int | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 663 | 0 | 0 | 103 | 24\% | 223 | 52\% | 105 | 24\% | 431 | 453 | 0 | 0 | 46 | $\pm 0$ | 47 | $\pm 0$ | 32 |
| 2009 | 790 | 0 | 0 | 123 | 24\% | 262 | 51\% | 129 | 25\% | 514 | 523 | 0 | 0 | 47 | $\pm 0$ | 49 | $\pm 0$ | 34 |
| 2010 | 923 | 0 | 0 | 79 | 13\% | 352 | 59\% | 169 | 28\% | 600 | 541 | 0 | 0 | 22 | $\pm 0$ | 48 | $\pm 0$ | 39 |
| 2011 | 0 | 4 | 17 | 21 | 10\% | 124 | 58\% | 67 | 32\% | 212 | 0 | 3 | 14 | 17 | $\pm 0$ | 54 | $\pm 0$ | 46 |
| 2012 | 0 | 7 | 29 | 36 | 20\% | 97 | 55\% | 44 | 25\% | 177 | 0 | 7 | 30 | 37 | $\pm 0$ | 45 | $\pm 0$ | 33 |
| 2013 | 0 | 7 | 14 | 21 | 24\% | 52 | 60\% | 13 | 15\% | 86 | 0 | 13 | 27 | 40 | $\pm 0$ | 25 | $\pm 0$ | 18 |

## 2014 HUNTING SEASONS WIND RIVER PRONGHORN (PR 631)

| Hunt <br> Area | Type | Season Dates |  |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Opens |  |  |  |$\quad$ Closes $\quad$ Quota | Limitations |
| :--- |
|  |
| 84 |


| Hunt Area | Type | Quota change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 84 |  |  |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |
| Total |  |  |
|  |  |  |

## Management Evaluation

Current Management Objective: 400
Management Strategy: Recreational
2013 Postseason Population Estimate: unknown
2014 Proposed Postseason Population Estimate: unknown

## Management Issues

The Wind River pronghorn herd has a management objective of 400 with a recreational management strategy. This objective has been in place since 1994. Despite the length of time the numerical objective has been on record, personnel have never been able to effectively estimate the population based on interchange with the Wind River Reservation (WRR) and difficulty collecting adequate demographic data in the mountainous terrain throughout the herd unit. Over the next year, the Lander Region plans to adopt a suitable alternative objective.

## Habitat/Weather

This pronghorn population occupies the upper Wind River basin west of the WRR. Much of the habitat throughout the herd unit is marginal or unsuitable. Pronghorn densities are highest on the east end of the herd unit where they occupy deer and elk winter range throughout the summer months. Some pronghorn winter on bare slopes in the mountain foothills, but many migrate east down the Wind River onto the WRR. Available habitat and climatic conditions seem to be the biggest factors limiting this population.

The past year was characterized by extreme drought throughout the herd unit. Vegetation transects monitored to determine the amount of forage available on elk winter range revealed herbaceous vegetation production was approximately $55 \%$ of the previous 5 year average.

Herbaceous production was even lower than in 2012 which was also a very dry year. No shrub data is collected in the herd unit, but the dry conditions undoubtedly resulted in poor browse production. Casual observations of shrub conditions in the herd unit did indicate growth was poor. Given the majority of antelope spend much of the year on elk winter range, they subsisted on very poor feed in 2013 and undoubtedly entered winter in poor shape. In contrast to low precipitation during the growing season, there was unusually high precipitation throughout the herd unit starting in September. Much of the precipitation was snow and appeared to force some antelope out of the herd unit onto the WRR during the hunt season. With average winter conditions, overwinter antelope mortality may be higher than normal due to the poor condition of animals entering winter.

## Field/Harvest Data/Population

Classification samples have been collected from the ground and have been low over the past 3 years. Prior to that classification data was collected aerially and sample sizes were much higher. In 2013 the classification sample was very low at 86 antelope. Personnel were involved in other duties in August, 2013 so the low sample size is more an artifact of effort than a population change. That said, the classification sample yielded a very low fawn/doe ratio at $25 / 100$. The buck/doe ratio was also extremely low at 18/100. Given poor weather conditions over the past 2 years it is certainly possible recruitment was low and the buck/doe ratio declined. However, the magnitude of the declines in both ratios for 2013 should be viewed with caution given the low sample size.

Similar to classification data, harvest statistics for 2013 indicate low buck numbers. The Type 1 license success rate was only $61 \%$. Hunter success tends to be lower in this herd than many antelope herds with a 10 year average of $83 \%$. That said, $61 \%$ success in 2013 is quite low even for this herd unit. While the low success rate is indicative of poor hunting, it is not necessarily related to a population decline. As mentioned previously, there was abnormally high snowfall and rain throughout the herd unit in the fall. Weather conditions are likely to have resulted in decreased antelope hunter effort. In addition, casual observations suggest some antelope moved onto the WRR along the Wind River as a result of the early winter conditions during the hunt season. These animals subsequently moved back into the herd unit as conditions moderated in mid-winter.

While both classification data and harvest statistics indicate a significant population decline in 2013, the data is suspect for the reasons mentioned above. It is likely the population did decline some over the past 2 years as a result of poor environmental conditions, but it is doubtful the magnitude of decline is as great as indicated by 2013 data. If classification data and harvest statistics for 2014 are similar to 2013 values the possibility of a larger population decline should be considered.

## Management Summary

Given scarce demographic data it is difficult to make strong statements regarding population trend in this herd unit. Anecdotally, based on public and personnel observations, it appears this population grew substantially from the middle to end of the past decade. Following a harsh winter in 2010 and extreme drought in 2012 and 2013 it seems the population declined somewhat, but not as dramatically as indicated by the 2013 data. License numbers were reduced
in 2013 in response to the perceived decline. For 2014, license numbers will remain unchanged since the numbers are low enough to have little effect on the overall population.


2013 - JCR Evaluation Form

| SPECIES: Pronghorn |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HERD: PR632-BEAVER RIM |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 65-69, 74, 106 |  | PREPARED BY: STAN HARTER |
| 2008-2012 Average | 2013 | 2014 Proposed |
| Population: 18,706 | 17,333 | 16,880 |
| Harvest: 2,570 | 1,115 | 1,125 |
| Hunters: 2,587 | 1,272 | 1,200 |
| Hunter Success: 99\% | 88\% | 94 \% |
| Active Licenses: 2,924 | 1,366 | 1,325 |
| Active License Percent: 88\% | 82\% | 85 \% |
| Recreation Days: 8,180 | 3,889 | 3,800 |
| Days Per Animal: 3.2 | 3.5 | 3.4 |
| Males per 100 Females 56 | 46 |  |
| Juveniles per 100 Females 59 | 54 |  |
| Population Objective: |  | 25,000 |
| Management Strategy: |  | Special |
| Percent population is above (+) or below (-) objective: |  | -30.7\% |
| Number of years population has been + or - objective in rece | rend: | 7 |
| Model Date: |  | 3/3/2014 |
| Proposed harvest rates (percent of pre-season estimate for each sex/age group): |  |  |
|  | JCR Year | Proposed |
| Females $\geq 1$ year old: | 2.3\% | 2.4\% |
| Males $\geq 1$ year old: | 21.4\% | 22.3\% |
| Juveniles (<1 year old): | 0.1\% | 0.1\% |
| Total: | 6.0\% | 6.2\% |
| Proposed change in post-season population: | +11.8\% | -2.6\% |

## Population Size - Postseason

$\square$ PR632-POPULATION - PR632-OBJECTIVE


## Harvest



Number of Hunters


Harvest Success
$\square$ PR632 - Hunter Success \% PR632 - Active License Success


## Active Licenses



## Days Per Animal Harvested

$\square$ PR632 - Days

Preseason Animals per 100 Females
PR632 - Males
| PR632 - Juveniles


2008-2013 Preseason Classification Summary
for Pronghorn Herd PR632-BEAVER RIM

|  |  | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cls } \\ & \text { Obj } \end{aligned}$ | Males to 100 Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pre Pop | YIg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | YIng | Adult | Total | Conf Int | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \end{aligned}$ | Conf Int | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 24,128 | 687 | 1,447 | 2,134 | 26\% | 3,747 | 46\% | 2,232 | 28\% | 8,113 | 2,064 | 18 | 39 | 57 | $\pm 2$ | 60 | $\pm 2$ | 38 |
| 2009 | 23,584 | 649 | 1,673 | 2,322 | 26\% | 4,109 | 46\% | 2,529 | 28\% | 8,960 | 2,190 | 16 | 41 | 57 | $\pm 2$ | 62 | $\pm 2$ | 39 |
| 2010 | 22,951 | 778 | 1,745 | 2,523 | 26\% | 4,278 | 45\% | 2,800 | 29\% | 9,601 | 2,381 | 18 | 41 | 59 | $\pm 2$ | 65 | $\pm 2$ | 41 |
| 2011 | 20,529 | 521 | 1,413 | 1,934 | 26\% | 3,544 | 47\% | 2,011 | 27\% | 7,489 | 1,893 | 15 | 40 | 55 | $\pm 2$ | 57 | $\pm 2$ | 37 |
| 2012 | 16,470 | 317 | 1,234 | 1,551 | 27\% | 2,867 | 50\% | 1,350 | 23\% | 5,768 | 1,766 | 11 | 43 | 54 | $\pm 2$ | 47 | $\pm 2$ | 31 |
| 2013 | 18,560 | 149 | 1,314 | 1,463 | 23\% | 3,199 | 50\% | 1,725 | 27\% | 6,387 | 1,608 | 5 | 41 | 46 | $\pm 2$ | 54 | $\pm 2$ | 37 |

## 2014 HUNTING SEASONS

Beaver Rim Pronghorn Herd Unit (PR 632)

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \hline \text { HUNT } \\ & \text { AREA } \end{aligned}$ | Season Dates |  |  |  | LIMITATIONS |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | TYPE | OPENS | CLOSES | Quota |  |
| 65 | 1 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 75 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
|  | 7 | Sept. 1 | Oct. 31 | 75 | Limited quota; doe or fawn valid north of the Little Popo Agie River |
| 66 | 1 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 75 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 75 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| 67 | 1 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 250 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| 68 | 1 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 250 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| 69 | 1 | Sept. 15 | Oct. 31 | 75 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sept. 15 | Oct. 31 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| 74 | 1 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 200 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |
| 106 | 1 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 100 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 6 | Sept. 20 | Oct. 22 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |


| Hunt Area | Type | Change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 65 | 6 | -25 |
|  | 7 | +75 |
| 67 | 1 | -50 |
| 68 | 1 | -50 |
|  | 6 | -25 |
| 69 | 1 | -25 |
| 106 | 1 | -25 |
|  | 6 | -25 |
|  | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 2 5}$ |
| Total PR 632 | $\mathbf{6}$ \& 7 | $\mathbf{0}$ |
|  |  | $\mathbf{- 1 2 5}$ |

## MANAGEMENT EVALUATION

Current Management Objective: 25,000
Management Strategy: Special (60-70 bucks/100 does)
2013 Post-season Population Estimate: ~17,300
2014 Post-season Population Estimate: ~16,900

## Herd Unit Issues

Habitats are relatively intact with localized energy development and agricultural developments scattered throughout the herd unit, and urban/rural residential development occurring primarily near Lander. This population fluctuated below objective in the 1990s, approached the objective in the mid-2000s, and has subsequently declined to a 2013 post-season population of about 17,300 pronghorn, about $31 \%$ below objective.

## Weather/Habitat

Drought conditions were extreme to exceptional for most of the past two years, beginning with minimal snowfall in winter 2011-12 and continuing with almost no precipitation during spring and summer 2012. In April 2013, a series of several late winter/early spring snow storms produced heavy snow through early May throughout the herd unit. These storms were extremely helpful in lessening the effects of drought, yet they only helped change the drought status from Extreme to Severe. Drought returned in summer 2013, with only 0.34 and 0.2 inches of precipitation recorded in Lander and Jeffrey City respectively from June 1 to September 1. This reduced forage production in herbaceous and browse species across the herd unit, although some improvement over 2012 conditions was noted. Thus, poor body condition was observed in many pronghorn by late-summer, especially lactating females. Many does were observed in late-August and September with backbones and ribs showing. Rain and snow returned to the area in September and October 2013, with nearly 300\% of normal precipitation recorded in Lander and Jeffrey City with warm temperatures between early storms. This led to improvement in vegetation condition, primarily grasses. Consequently, many pronghorn were observed with apparent improvement in body condition in fall and early-winter compared with those observed in late-summer. In spite of fairly mild winter conditions in 2013-14, late winter mortality may still be above average due to the poor condition of winter range shrubs following long-term drought.

## Field Data

Fawn/doe ratios have declined the past 3 years, but increased to $54 \mathrm{~J} / 100 \mathrm{~F}$ in 2013 . Buck/doe ratios continued to decline to $46 \mathrm{M} / 100 \mathrm{~F}$ in 2013 . As expected following an 18 -year low fawn/doe ratio in 2012, the yearling buck/doe ratio fell dramatically to $5 \mathrm{YM} / 100 \mathrm{~F}$ in 2013 . This was also likely due in part to the extensive late-winter blizzard conditions experienced in April 2013 causing mortality among many species. With the lingering effects of drought on sagebrush and other shrubs throughout the herd unit, we don't anticipate rapid recovery of this population or buck/doe ratios.

## Harvest Data

With declines in pronghorn numbers, 2013 hunting seasons had dramatic reductions in license quotas. Yet, harvest statistics indicated some hunters still had difficulty finding pronghorn or were less satisfied with quality, especially adult buck quality. Hunter success in 2013 dropped from $101 \%$ to $88 \%$, along with active license success decreasing from $88 \%$ to $82 \%$. In all, it took 3.5 days of hunting for each animal harvested. This statistic was the highest since 1994, albeit barely above the 3.4 days/animal needed in some years. However, this is a large herd unit and success rates were more variable between hunt areas (range of $49 \%$ to $100 \%$ for Type 6 doe/fawn licenses and $67 \%$ to $92 \%$ for Type 1 any antelope licenses). Concerns about low pronghorn numbers were heard from hunters in several areas. Adjustments to the 2014 season structure have been made considering these variables, combined with variations in classification data to best fit harvest to individual hunt areas.

## Population

A spreadsheet model was developed for this population in 2012, and updated utilizing 2013 pre-season classification and 2013 harvest data. The CJ, CA model was selected because it had the lowest Relative AICc value and generated population estimates that are either closely aligned with the LT point estimate or lie within the $95 \%$ confidence intervals (CI) for 5 of 6 LT estimates. Therefore, the model is considered Good. The latest LT survey was conducted in bio-year 2010, with a resultant end-of-year population estimate of almost 20,000. The spreadsheet model simulates the 2010 end-of-year trend just below the CI for that LT, but the 2013 model aligns closer to this CI than did the 2012 version. Regardless, the model appears to consistently follow perceived population trends. The initial model in 2012 showed a much lower population throughout the past decade than the 2013 version and did not align as well with all LT estimates. In addition, another LT survey is planned for the end of the current bio-year (2013). Therefore, we anticipate the need to adjust population data in the JCR database once the LT is completed to reflect the model as it incorporates the new LT. We predict this model will then "settle in" and don't anticipate such dramatic changes will be needed in the future.

## Management Summary

For 2014, adjustments in license numbers were made to control limited private land damage situations, while providing hunter opportunity. Due to very low yearling buck/doe ratios and overall lower buck numbers, the number of Type 1 licenses was reduced again in some areas, especially where buck/doe ratios fell or were already low. The overall buck/doe ratio is about $23 \%$ below the minimum of $60 \mathrm{M} / 100 \mathrm{~F}$ needed to keep this population within the Department's Special Management criteria. Reductions made in 2013 and continued adjustments for 2014 are consistent with public comments received during hunting seasons and at public meetings.

The seasons outlined should curb population decline if drought lessens and fawn production levels improve. Doe/fawn licenses remain a part of the 2014 hunting season structure to address localized damage to private land hay crops. Growing numbers of pronghorn in the Lander Foothills have prompted an increase in the number of Hunt Area 65 Type 7 licenses available, and at the request of one landowner who will provide access, the season length for that license has been changed to open early (Sept. 1 compared to Sept. 20 as advertised online) and close later (end of October). A total of 1,025 any antelope and 300 doe/fawn licenses will be available for 2014 , and should result in a harvest of approximately 1,100 animals. With average survival in combination with our harvest, we anticipate the population to remain relatively stable at just under 17,000 pronghorn.






2013 - JCR Evaluation Form

| SPECIES: Pronghorn |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |
| :--- | :--- | :---: |
| HERD: PR634 - BADWATER |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 75 |  | PREPARED BY: GREG |
|  |  |  |
|  |  |  |

Population Size - Postseason


## Harvest



Number of Hunters


Harvest Success
$\square$ PR634 - Hunter Success \% PR634 - Active License Success


## Active Licenses



Days Per Animal Harvested
$\square$ PR634-Days


Preseason Animals per 100 Females


## 2008-2013 Preseason Classification Summary

for Pronghorn Herd PR634-BADWATER

|  |  | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cls } \\ & \text { Obj } \end{aligned}$ | Males to 100 Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pre Pop | YIg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | YIng | Adult | Total | Conf Int | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Conf Int | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 6,512 | 176 | 361 | 537 | 29\% | 858 | 47\% | 439 | 24\% | 1,834 | 1,489 | 21 | 42 | 63 | $\pm 5$ | 51 | $\pm 4$ | 31 |
| 2009 | 6,285 | 164 | 360 | 524 | 28\% | 923 | 49\% | 433 | 23\% | 1,880 | 1,279 | 18 | 39 | 57 | $\pm 4$ | 47 | $\pm 4$ | 30 |
| 2010 | 6,195 | 191 | 425 | 616 | 32\% | 860 | 44\% | 464 | 24\% | 1,940 | 1,955 | 22 | 49 | 72 | $\pm 5$ | 54 | $\pm 4$ | 31 |
| 2011 | 4,904 | 113 | 468 | 581 | 31\% | 875 | 47\% | 421 | 22\% | 1,877 | 1,689 | 13 | 53 | 66 | $\pm 5$ | 48 | $\pm 4$ | 29 |
| 2012 | 4,650 | 83 | 296 | 379 | 28\% | 631 | 47\% | 339 | 25\% | 1,349 | 1,522 | 13 | 47 | 60 | $\pm 5$ | 54 | $\pm 5$ | 34 |
| 2013 | 3,617 | 58 | 268 | 326 | 26\% | 646 | 51\% | 285 | 23\% | 1,257 | 1,098 | 9 | 41 | 50 | $\pm 5$ | 44 | $\pm 4$ | 29 |

## 2014 HUNTING SEASONS <br> BADWATER PRONGHORN (PR 634)

| Hunt <br> Area | Type | Season Dates <br> Opens | Closes | Quota | Limitations |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 75 | 1 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 22 | 300 | Limited quota; any antelope <br>  |
| 6 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 22 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn |  |
| Archery |  | Aug. 15 | Sep. 19 |  | Refer to Section 3 of this Chapter |


| Hunt Area | Type | Quota change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 75 | 1 | -100 |
|  | 6 | -225 |
|  |  |  |
| Total | $\mathbf{1}$ | $\mathbf{- 1 0 0}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{6}$ | $\mathbf{- 2 2 5}$ |

## Management Evaluation

Current Management Objective: 3,000
Management Strategy: Recreational
2013 Postseason Population Estimate: ~3,000
2014 Proposed Postseason Population Estimate: ~3,000

## Management Issues

The Badwater pronghorn herd is managed toward a numerical objective of 3,000 . The population is estimated using a spreadsheet model developed in 2012 and updated in 2014. The herd is managed for recreational opportunity. The objective was last reviewed in 1994.

This pronghorn population inhabits a heavily industrialized area in central Wyoming. Much of the herd unit has or will soon be designated as a special management area emphasizing oil and gas production in both the Casper and Lander BLM RMPs. The Lander BLM is currently analyzing a proposal by EnCana to develop approximately 4,200 oil/gas wells in the central part of the herd unit. Given the commodities production emphasis in the area, it is likely a significant amount of pronghorn habitat will we lost or degraded over the next 20 years.

## Habitat/Weather

Over the past 2 years, drought conditions were extreme in this herd unit. Virtually no vegetation grew throughout the herd unit for the past 2 years. The exception being some early fall green-up in September, 2013. This late season green-up helped antelope entering winter but they remained in generally poor body condition. Given the poor feed resource, pronghorn body condition in the herd unit was quite poor in 2013. This was particularly true for reproductively successful does that succeeded in raising fawns through early fall. Despite relatively mild winter
conditions in 2013/14 it is likely winter mortality was above average due to the poor body condition of many animals in the fall.

## Field Data

Personnel observed significantly fewer pronghorn along classification routes in 2013. The number of antelope seen along designated classification routes declined from a high of 1,940 in 2010 to 1,257 in 2013. Additionally, the buck/doe ratio in the area has steadily declined over the past 4 years from 72/100 in 2010 to 50/100 in 2013. Fawn recruitment was very low in 2013 with a fawn/doe ratio of $44 / 100$. Compounding the impacts of very low fall recruitment, it is likely winter fawn survival will be lower than average over the 2013/14 winter due to lack of feed resources. All of the classification data from the past several years indicate the population has declined.

## Harvest Data

Harvest statistics were unremarkable in 2013 with a Type 1 license success of $92 \%$. This was higher than the 5 -year average of $87 \%$. Some of the increase could be attributable to fewer hunters in the field given a reduction in Type 1 licenses from 2012 to 2013. The days/animal for Type 1 license holders also declined from 3.7 in 2012 to 2.8 in 2013. Again, while 2013 harvest statistics are not remarkable, classification data, the population model, and comments from the public all indicate the population declined significantly over the past several years.

## Population

The population estimate for 2013 is approximately 3,000 pronghorn. The population is at objective. This population increased steadily in the late 1990's through the mid 2000's. The population peaked around 2007 at approximately 5,900 animals according the most recent population model. Over the past 6 years the population has declined dramatically and reached objective in 2013. The long-term population decline is a result of extended, poor environmental conditions combined with increased harvest designed to reduce the population to objective.

In 2012, a spreadsheet model was developed for this population. The model behaved predictably with the addition of 2013 data and appears to track population trends reliably. For 2013, the SCJ/SCA version of the model was selected to simulate the population. The SCJ/SCA model had a slightly higher AIC value than the CJ/CA model, but the $\mathrm{CJ} / \mathrm{CA}$ version models a population increase over the past several years and is not biologically defensible. The TSJ/CA had a significantly higher AIC value but produced similar trends to the SCJ/SCA version. Annual juvenile survival in the selected model is 0.9 and considered reasonable for the area. The SCJ/SCA model has 3 years with modified juvenile survival to account for extreme winter conditions in 2010 and extreme drought conditions in 2012 and 2013. Juvenile survival for these years is fixed at $0.4,0.4$, and 0.5 respectively. This model version produces population estimates mirroring field personnel impressions and supported by harvest statistics. The model attempts to track 6 line transect estimates over the past 20 years. The estimates from 2007 and 2010 were vastly different and the model is unable to track through the CIs of the estimates effectively. Nevertheless, the model produces a peak estimate in 2007 and shows a significant population decline over the past 6 years with a marked reduction over the past 3 years. The model appears to track population trends in the herd unit well and estimates from the past several years are
supported by trends in classification data as well as harvest statistics. Due to the lack of survival estimates, the model is considered a fair simulation.

## Management Summary

Given the population decline over the past several years, expected low survival over the 2013/14 winter, and the fact the population is at objective, Type 6 licenses will be reduced significantly in 2014. Type 1 licenses will also be reduced given the recent, marked decline in the buck/doe ratio. Given average survival over the next year combined with the proposed hunting season, the population is expected to remain stable at 3,000 in 2014. Although this population has been managed toward the objective of 3,000 over the past several years, public comments indicate the Department may need to review the population objective for the herd. Field personnel have received numerous complaints over the past several years from the public concerned about the decline in antelope numbers and buck quality in the herd unit.









Comments: $\qquad$


2013 - JCR Evaluation Form

| SPECIES: Pronghorn |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HERD: PR635-PROJECT |  |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 97, 117 | 2008-2012 Average | PREPARED BY: GREG ANDERSON |  |
|  |  | $\underline{2013}$ | 2014 Proposed |
| Hunter Satisfaction Percent | 94\% | 88\% | 85\% |
| Landowner Satisfaction Percent | 0\% | 34\% | 40\% |
| Harvest: | 397 | 504 | 475 |
| Hunters: | 340 | 470 | 450 |
| Hunter Success: | 117\% | 107\% | 106\% |
| Active Licenses: | 442 | 87\% | 500 |
| Active License Percentage: | 90\% | 87\% | 95\% |
| Recreation Days: | 1,281 | 1,434 | 1,300 |
| Days Per Animal: | 3.2 | 2.8 | 2.7 |
| Males per 100 Females: | 58 | 70 |  |
| Juveniles per 100 Females | 65 | 55 |  |
| Satisifaction Based Objective |  |  | 60\% |
| Management Strategy: |  |  | Recreational |
| Percent population is above (+) or (-) objective: |  |  | 1\% |
| Number of years population has been + or - objective in recent trend: |  |  | 1 |



## Harvest



Number of Hunters


Harvest Success

PR635 - Hunter Success \% PR635 - Active License Success


## Active Licenses



Preseason Animals per 100 Females


2008-2013 Preseason Classification Summary
for Pronghorn Herd PR635-PROJECT

|  |  | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cls } \\ & \text { Obi } \end{aligned}$ | Males to 100 Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pre Pop | YIg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | Ylng | Adult | Total | Conf Int | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \end{aligned}$ | Conf Int | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 563 | 0 | 0 | 78 | 17\% | 229 | 51\% | 144 | 32\% | 451 | 450 | 0 | 0 | 34 | $\pm 0$ | 63 | $\pm 0$ | 47 |
| 2009 | 429 | 0 | 0 | 58 | 17\% | 149 | 43\% | 136 | 40\% | 343 | 391 | 0 | 0 | 39 | $\pm 0$ | 91 | $\pm 0$ | 66 |
| 2010 | 634 | 0 | 0 | 118 | 23\% | 226 | 45\% | 163 | 32\% | 507 | 524 | 0 | 0 | 52 | $\pm 0$ | 72 | $\pm 0$ | 47 |
| 2011 | 0 | 45 | 89 | 134 | 32\% | 171 | 41\% | 109 | 26\% | 414 | 0 | 26 | 52 | 78 | $\pm 0$ | 64 | $\pm 0$ | 36 |
| 2012 | 0 | 67 | 112 | 179 | 38\% | 202 | 43\% | 86 | 18\% | 467 | 0 | 33 | 55 | 89 | $\pm 0$ | 43 | $\pm 0$ | 23 |
| 2013 | 0 | 28 | 125 | 153 | 31\% | 219 | 45\% | 120 | 24\% | 492 | 0 | 13 | 57 | 70 | $\pm 0$ | 55 | $\pm 0$ | 32 |

PROJECT PRONGHORN (PR 635)

| Hunt <br> Area | Type | Season Dates <br> Opens | Closes | Quota | Limitations |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 97,117 | 1 | Sep. 20 <br> Aug. 15 | Oct. 22 <br> Oct. 22 | 300 <br>  | 2 |


| Hunt Area | Type | Quota change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 97,117 | 1 | +50 |
|  | 2 | -50 |
|  | 7 | -75 |
|  |  |  |
|  |  | +50 |
| Total | 1 | -50 |
|  | 2 | -75 |
|  | 7 |  |
|  |  |  |

## Management Evaluation

Current Management Objective: Hunter/Landowner Satisfaction 60\%
Management Strategy: Recreational
2013 Hunter Satisfaction: 88\%
2013 Landowner Satisfaction: 34\% (71\% very satisfied, satisfied, or neutral)
3 year Average Hunter Satisfaction: 92\%
3 year Average Landowner Satisfaction: unknown

## Management Issues

In 2013 the Department conducted an objective review for the Project pronghorn herd unit. Previously the herd had a population objective of 400 pronghorn. The population objective was impractical because personnel were unable to collect adequate demographic data due to extensive interchange with the neighboring Wind River Reservation (WRR). Following an internal review, a public meeting and contact with numerous landowners the objective was changed in 2013 to manage for $60 \%$ hunter and $60 \%$ landowner satisfaction. Hunter satisfaction is taken directly from the harvest survey while landowner satisfaction in 2013 was determined by mailing a survey (Appendix A) to a number of landowners in the herd unit.

## Habitat/Weather

This herd occupies a heavily agricultural area in central Wyoming as well as lands interspersed with the WRR. Land ownership patterns and extensive border with the WRR make it cost prohibitive to collect adequate demographic data in the herd unit. The highest densities of pronghorn are found along the northern portion of hunt area 97 and commonly move between the herd unit and the WRR. Drought conditions were extreme throughout the region in 2013, but adult pronghorn were not severely impacted due to the extensive agricultural feed resource in the area. Anecdotally there appears to have been a bit of a distribution shift over the past several years in response to drought conditions. There appear to be fewer antelope inhabiting the Muddy Ridge area and more antelope congregating further west along Muddy Creek closely associated with irrigated fields.

## Field/Harvest Data/Population

The fawn/doe ratio in hunt area 97 was $55 / 100$ in 2013. This was well below the 5 year average of $67 / 100$. Taken in combination with a fawn/doe ratio of $43 / 100$ in 2012, it demonstrates even animals in this area with extensive agriculture are not immune to impacts from harsh drought. The last 2 years of low recruitment likely resulted in a population decrease. This is also evidenced by a decrease in the buck/doe ratio from 89/100 in 2012 to 70/100 in 2013. Regardless of any recent population changes, the buck/doe ratio remains quite high and harvest success on Type 1 licenses in 97 was $90 \%$ in 2013. Combined with a days/animal statistic of 2.2 , indications are recreational hunt quality continues to be good in the herd.

The population is considered to be at objective in 2013. Hunter satisfaction (satisfied or very satisfied) decreased from $94 \%$ in 2012 to $88 \%$ in 2013. This still represents a high rate of satisfaction and in combination with a $90 \%$ Type 1 success rate indicates hunt quality was good. This was the first year the landowner satisfaction survey was conducted so it is not possible to compare with previous years. While only $34 \%$ of landowners were satisfied or very satisfied with antelope numbers, $71 \%$ were satisfied, very satisfied, or neutral. In contrast only $29 \%$ were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied with numbers. Of dissatisfied landowners, $50 \%$ desired more antelope and $50 \%$ desired fewer antelope. Given the even split between landowners wishing for more or less antelope combined with a majority of satisfied hunters and landowners overall, the population is deemed to be at objective and management in 2014 will maintain the current population.

## Management Summary

Given fairly low recruitment in 2013, the number of Type 6 licenses will remain unchanged in 2014. This number of licenses should provide adequate harvest for landowners who desire fewer antelope without significantly impacting the overall population. Type 1 licenses will be increased by 50 to provide a bit more recreational opportunity. Despite a decrease in the buck/doe ratio from 2012 to 2013, the ratio remains quite high at 70/100 and well above the desired level for a recreationally managed herd. Type 2 and 7 licenses will each be reduced by $50 \%$. These licenses are issued to address specific damage problems in the herd unit and the affected landowners felt a reduction from 2013 levels was warranted. This management is intended to keep the population at the current level through 2014.

## Appendix A

2013 landowner letter and satisfaction survey
December 12, 2013

Dear Landowner,
Starting in 2014, the Wyoming Game and Fish Department (Department) will begin utilizing landowner and hunter satisfaction surveys to manage deer (mule deer and white-tailed deer) in hunt areas 157 and 170 and antelope hunt areas 97and 117.

You are being asked to participate in this survey because you have allowed deer or antelope hunting on your property in the past (as indicated by your submission of landowner coupons). If you have an interest in deer and antelope management in these hunt areas, please take a minute to complete the survey below. Your answers, in combination with other landowners and hunters, will be considered when we develop hunt season structure for the coming year. If surveys indicate a majority of respondents are satisfied with deer and antelope numbers, it is likely upcoming hunting seasons will be very similar to last year's. If the majority of respondents feel there are too many or too few deer or antelope, we will likely recommend the Wyoming Game and Fish Commission consider issuing more or fewer licenses respectively.

Finally, if you have too many deer or antelope on your property and would like to see some reduction in numbers through doe/fawn harvest, please let us know and the Department will contact you to discuss potential options. If you have any questions, please contact your local game wardens, Allen Deru (856-4982) or Brad Gibb (856-9005), or wildlife biologist Greg Anderson (332-2688).

Please help us manage mule deer and white-tailed deer in hunt areas 157 and 170 and antelope in hunt areas 97 and 117 by filling out the enclosed survey and returning it in the self-addressed envelope by January 31, 2014.

The Department sincerely values your input, and we thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

## Greg Anderson

Wildlife Biologist, North Lander

## Mule Deer and White-tailed Deer - Hunt Areas 157 and 170 Antelope - Hunt Areas 97and 117

1. What is your level of satisfaction with mule deer numbers?

Very satisfied $\square$ Satisfied $\square$ Neutral $\square$ Unsatisfied $\square$ Very unsatisfied $\square$
2. If you are not satisfied with mule deer numbers, what would you like to see?

Significantly more $\square$ A few more $\square$ Significantly fewer $\square$ A few less $\square$
3. What is your level of satisfaction with white-tailed deer numbers?

Very satisfied $\square$ Satisfied $\square$ Neutral $\square$ Unsatisfied $\square$ Very unsatisfied
4. If you are not satisfied with white-tailed deer numbers, what would you like to see?

Significantly more $\square$ A few more $\square$ Significantly fewer $\square$ A few less $\square$
5. What is your level of satisfaction with antelope numbers?

Very satisfied $\square$ Satisfied $\square$ Neutral $\square$ Unsatisfied $\square$ Very unsatisfied $\square$
6. If you are not satisfied with antelope numbers, what would you like to see?

Significantly more $\square$ A few more $\square$ Significantly fewer $\square$ A few less
7. Would you like to be contacted by the Department to discuss hunter access and increased doe/fawn deer or antelope harvest for the 2014 hunting season?

Yes No
If YES, please list your name, phone number, what hunt areas you own property in, and indicate the species you are interested in:


Name $\qquad$

Phone number $\qquad$
In what antelope hunt area(s) is your property? $\qquad$
In what deer hunt area(s) is your property?

In future years, we plan to conduct this survey electronically to reduce costs. Accordingly, if you have an interest in future participation, please provide us with an e-mail address. We will not share your e-mail address with any other entity.

Name $\qquad$
E-mail $\qquad$


2013 - JCR Evaluation Form

| SPECIES: Pronghorn |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| HERD: PR636-NORTH FERRIS |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 63 |  | PREPARED BY: GREG HIATT |
| 2008-2012 Average | 2013 | 2014 Proposed |
| Population: 5,287 | 4,670 | 4,852 |
| Harvest: 716 | 247 | 225 |
| Hunters: 752 | 314 | 280 |
| Hunter Success: 95\% | 79\% | 80 \% |
| Active Licenses: 812 | 343 | 280 |
| Active License Percent: 88\% | 72\% | 80 \% |
| Recreation Days: 2,243 | 894 | 670 |
| Days Per Animal: 3.1 | 3.6 | 3.0 |
| Males per 100 Females 68 | 59 |  |
| Juveniles per 100 Females 53 | 45 |  |
| Population Objective: |  | 5,000 |
| Management Strategy: |  | Recreational |
| Percent population is above (+) or below (-) objective: |  | -6.6\% |
| Number of years population has been + or - objective in recent | rend: | 3 |
| Model Date: |  | 3/5/2014 |
| Proposed harvest rates (percent of pre-season estimate for each sex/age group): |  |  |
|  | JCR Year | Proposed |
| Females $\geq 1$ year old: | 2.2\% | 0\% |
| Males $\geq 1$ year old: | 26.1\% | 16.0\% |
| Juveniles (<1 year old): | 0.5\% | 0\% |
| Total: | 7.7\% | 4.4\% |
| Proposed change in post-season population: | +1.7\% | +3.9\% |

## Population Size - Postseason

$\square$ PR636 - POPULATION - PR636 - OBJECTIVE



Number of Hunters


Harvest Success
$\square$ PR636 - Hunter Success \% PR636 - Active License Success


## Active Licenses



Days Per Animal Harvested
$\square$ PR636 - Days


Preseason Animals per 100 Females


## for Pronghorn Herd PR636-NORTH FERRIS

|  |  | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | Cls <br> Obj | Males to 100 Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Year | Pre Pop | Ylg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | Ylng | Adult | Total | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Conf } \\ & \text { Int } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \end{aligned}$ | Conf Int | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 7,224 | 166 | 370 | 536 | 29\% | 775 | 42\% | 522 | 28\% | 1,833 | 2,190 | 21 | 48 | 69 | $\pm 6$ | 67 | $\pm 5$ | 40 |
| 2009 | 6,935 | 240 | 573 | 813 | 31\% | 1,192 | 45\% | 627 | 24\% | 2,632 | 2,040 | 20 | 48 | 68 | $\pm 4$ | 53 | $\pm 3$ | 31 |
| 2010 | 6,318 | 99 | 274 | 373 | 32\% | 519 | 45\% | 257 | 22\% | 1,149 | 2,145 | 19 | 53 | 72 | $\pm 7$ | 50 | $\pm 6$ | 29 |
| 2011 | 5,733 | 72 | 288 | 360 | 31\% | 516 | 45\% | 275 | 24\% | 1,151 | 1,914 | 14 | 56 | 70 | $\pm 7$ | 53 | $\pm 6$ | 31 |
| 2012 | 4,158 | 55 | 253 | 308 | 29\% | 534 | 51\% | 208 | 20\% | 1,050 | 1,330 | 10 | 47 | 58 | $\pm 6$ | 39 | $\pm 5$ | 25 |
| 2013 | 4,951 | 57 | 216 | 273 | 29\% | 459 | 49\% | 205 | 22\% | 937 | 1,460 | 12 | 47 | 59 | $\pm 7$ | 45 | $\pm 6$ | 28 |


| Hunt <br> Area | Type | Dates of Seasons <br> Opens | Closes | Quota | Limitations |
| :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 63 | 1 | Sep. 20 | Oct. 31 | 100 | Limited quota; any antelope <br>  2 | | Sep. 20 | Oct. 31 | 200 |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | | Limited quota; any antelope valid |
| :--- |
| east of the Buzzard Road (Natrona |
| County Road 410 - Carbon |
| County Road 497) |

Archery
63
Aug. 15
Sep. 16
Refer to Section 3 of this Chapter

| Hunt Area | Type | Quota change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 63 | 1 | 0 |
|  | 2 | 0 |
|  | 6 | -25 |
|  | 7 | -25 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 \& 2}$ | $\mathbf{0}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{6} \& \mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 0}$ |

## Management Evaluation

Current Management Objective: 5,000
Management Strategy: Recreation
2013 Postseason Population Estimate: ~4,670
2014 Proposed Postseason Population Estimate: ~4,850
The North Ferris pronghorn herd is managed toward a post-hunt population of 5,000, an objective last publicly reviewed in 1994. Population size is estimated using a spreadsheet model developed in 2012 and updated in 2013. The herd is in recreational management, with harvest quotas designed to maintain pre-hunt buck:doe ratios below 60:100. Public review of the management objectives for this herd is scheduled for 2014.

## Herd Unit Issues

Historically, access has not been an issue in this herd unit which is mostly public lands, but access to some blocks of private land has become more difficult in recent years and may affect management ability to attain adequate harvests in the future. Potential for economic wind power exists within the herd unit, but appears unlikely when other resource issues such as T\&E species
and sage-grouse Core Area are considered. Many miles of sheep-tight fences still stand in the herd unit, impeding pronghorn movements.

## Weather

Following severe drought conditions in 2012, with almost no precipitation throughout the spring and summer, body condition of pronghorn checked in 2012 was poor. Given the poor condition of animals at the end of fall, mortality was expected to be above average during the 2012-13 winter, particularly following three severe winter storms in April. However, yearling buck:doe ratios in 2013 did not reflect unusual fawn losses that winter. Drought continued into 2013, reducing forage quantity and quality for a second year. Improved precipitation in late fall provided for some herbaceous plant growth, but was probably too late to improve production by forbs and shrubs.

## Habitat

While no herbaceous habitat transects are established within this herd unit, herbaceous forage production is expected to have been minimal due to record drought. Two shrub transects have been established within this herd unit, primarily to monitor mule deer winter forage. One of these, on the Morgan Creek WHMA, was burned in the 2012 fires and the second was not read in 2013. New owners of the Pathfinder Ranch, which encompasses the north-central portion of this herd, have expressed interest in looking for opportunities for improving habitat conditions for wildlife, possibly as mitigation for wind power projects in other parts of the state. Habitat issues that would benefit pronghorn include shrub treatment on winter ranges, adjustments of grazing use, and modification of sheep-tight fences.

## Field Data

Classification sample size declined again for the fourth year, was the smallest sample in over 30 years, and was only 35 percent the size of the sample from 2009 . These data are collected from the ground along routes that have had only minor changes over the past two decades. Higher densities of pronghorn were again found in the eastern half of the area near Pathfinder Reservoir and along irrigated hayfields on the Buzzard and Sand Creek Ranches. Fawn production improved slightly, but was still the second lowest ratio in 20 years, a direct result of the exceptionally dry spring and summer.

Following exceptionally high recruitment of yearlings in 2005, buck:doe ratios exceeded the 60:100 maximum criterion for recreational management in this herd. Buck harvests were increased for the following seven years, often double or triple historic levels, and surplus bucks were successfully harvested prior to 2012 when the buck:doe ratio returned to an acceptable 58:100. The ratio recorded in 2013 was little changed, at 59:100. Much of this decline was in the supply of adult bucks, with that ratio dropping to its lowest level in eight years. As expected, hunter complaints about poor quality of bucks were common and the buck:doe ratio is expected to continue to decline in 2014.

Pronghorn herds to the south and west showed dramatically low yearling buck:doe ratios in 2013, suggesting fawn losses were high in the 2012-13 winter and April blizzards, but this ratio
was at 12:100 in Area 63, which is low for this herd but not surprising given the record low fawn production in 2012. It would appear winter survival was not unusually low in this herd that winter.

## Harvest Data

Success for hunters with Type 1 licenses dropped again to its lowest level in 11 years, at just 78 percent, a consequence of both reduced numbers of pronghorn and the lowered buck:doe ratio. Success for hunters with Type 2 licenses was even worse, at only 71 percent. Doe/fawn hunters had the poorest success since doe/fawn licenses were reintroduced in this herd in 2006, again a result of fewer pronghorn in the herd. Success was markedly different between the Type 6 and Type 7 licenses. Field contacts suggest a large proportion of hunters with the Type 6 tags use them in the western portion of the area, and these hunters had only 38 percent success. Those with Type 7 licenses, which restricted them to the eastern portion where pronghorn densities are higher, had 79 percent success, which was still a record low.

The average effort required to harvest a pronghorn also indicates numbers are historically low, especially in the western portion where doe/fawn hunters averaged 8.5 days hunting for each pronghorn harvested.

## Population

This herd was below objective size for most of the decade following the 1992-93 winter, occasionally by as much as 20 percent or more, a consequence of low fawn production and poor recruitment. High fawn production followed by an unusually mild winter in 2004 provided the first significant growth in herd size.

Prior to the development of a reasonable spreadsheet model in mid-2012, population estimates suggested this herd was well above objective size from 2006 up until 2012, and harvests were increased accordingly. The 2013 spreadsheet model predicts the increased harvests successfully reduced the herd to within 20 percent of objective by 2011 and dropped below objective in 2012. This revised model, however aligns with the maximum limit of the confidence interval on the most recent line transect survey and is probably over-estimating herd size. Hunter comments, classification data and harvest statistics all suggest there has been a greater decline in herd size than predicted by the latest model.

The Time-Specific Juvenile \& Constant Adult Survival (TSJ,CAS) spreadsheet model provided the best fit with observed buck:doe ratios for this herd, particularly for the most recent seven years. The model behaved well when 2013 classification and harvest data were added and is considered a "Fair" model of the herd. Annual adult survival was predicted at 82 percent, a level slightly lower than models for some nearby pronghorn herds. Juvenile survival rates fluctuated within the allowed range but frequently hovered at maximum or minimum allowed values. The CJ,CA and SCJ,SCA models each had lower AIC values, but both models predicted herd sizes greatly exceeding past trend counts, without following count trends, and generated roughly stable buck:doe estimates that did not follow dips and rises in observed values. Estimated buck:doe ratios of these two models approximated observed values in only four or five of the past 20 years.

Due to the poor condition of animals going into this winter and poor browse conditions following two years of drought, fawn production in 2014 was projected to be similar to that seen in 2012 and 2013. The model was run using a median juvenile survival in 2014.

Losses to EHD were documented in pronghorn herds south and west of North Ferris in 2013, and reports of carcasses in Area 63 suggests the disease was here as well. Significant losses in late summer and early fall 2013 would have affected harvest statistics but would not yet affect estimates in the herd model, so it may be over-estimating herd size.

## Management Summary

With record low fawn production and the herd estimated to be below objective, harvests need to be reduced to prevent further reduction in herd size. Since buck:doe ratios are at the maximum for recreational management, no reduction is recommended for either the Type 1 or Type 2 license quotas. But the recommendation is to eliminate the Type 6 and Type 7 doe/fawn licenses, which were at minimal quotas in 2013.

The expected harvest of roughly 225 bucks from the 2014 license quotas should provide only a minimal increase ( $<4$ percent) in herd size, projected to be $\sim 4,850$ at post-hunt 2014. This assumes average survival through the 2013-14 winter and fawn production similar to the low level seen in 2012 and 2013. If either winter survival or fawn production exceeds expectations in 2014, the increase would be improved, and doe/fawn harvests from this herd would need to be restored.

Opening date is shifted back four days to fall on a Saturday for the first time in decades, synchronizing with Area 68 to the north. This change is compatible with the application booklet and, as opposed to the traditional day, will increase crowding on opening weekend. The closing date is the same as in 2012 and 2013 and extends to the closing of the local deer season. Archery season uses a standardized opening date and closes the day before the opening of the regular season.






2013 - JCR Evaluation Form

| SPECIES: Pronghorn HERD: PR637-SOUTH FERRIS |  | PERIOD: 6/1/2013-5/31/2014 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |
| HUNT AREAS: 62 |  | PREPARED BY: GREG HIATT |
| 2008-2012 Average | 2013 | 2014 Proposed |
| Population: 5,418 | 5,112 | 4,811 |
| Harvest: 228 | 180 | 105 |
| Hunters: 261 | 196 | 125 |
| Hunter Success: 87\% | 92\% | 84 \% |
| Active Licenses: 270 | 218 | 125 |
| Active License Percent: 84\% | 83\% | 84 \% |
| Recreation Days: 740 | 586 | 380 |
| Days Per Animal: 3.2 | 3.3 | 3.6 |
| Males per 100 Females 61 | 48 |  |
| Juveniles per 100 Females 42 | 42 |  |
| Population Objective: |  | 6,500 |
| Management Strategy: |  | Recreational |
| Percent population is above (+) or below (-) objective: |  | -21.4\% |
| Number of years population has been + or - objective in rece | nd: | 3 |
| Model Date: |  | 3/5/2014 |
| Proposed harvest rates (percent of pre-season estimate for each sex/age group): |  |  |
|  | JCR Year | Proposed |
| Females $\geq 1$ year old: | 1.7\% | 0.8\% |
| Males $\geq 1$ year old: | 9.4\% | 6.6\% |
| Juveniles (<1 year old): | 0\% | 0\% |
| Total: | 3.4\% | 2.1\% |
| Proposed change in post-season population: | -8.3\% | -7.2\% |

## Population Size - Postseason

$\square$ PR637-POPULATION - PR637-OBJECTIVE


Harvest


Number of Hunters
$\square$ PR637-TOT $\square$ PR 637 -RES $\square$ PR637-NONRES


Harvest Success
$\square$ PR637-Hunter Success \% PR637 - Active License Success


## Active Licenses



Preseason Animals per 100 Females


## for Pronghorn Herd PR637-SOUTH FERRIS

| Year | Pre Pop | MALES |  |  |  | FEMALES |  | JUVENILES |  | Tot Cls | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Cls } \\ & \text { Obj } \end{aligned}$ | Males to 100 Females |  |  |  | Young to |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Ylg | Adult | Total | \% | Total | \% | Total | \% |  |  | Ylng | Adult | Total | $\begin{gathered} \text { Conf } \\ \text { Int } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 100 \\ & \text { Fem } \end{aligned}$ | Conf Int | $\begin{gathered} 100 \\ \text { Adult } \end{gathered}$ |
| 2008 | 5,285 | 171 | 440 | 611 | 28\% | 1,116 | 52\% | 419 | 20\% | 2,146 | 1,157 | 15 | 39 | 55 | $\pm 3$ | 38 | $\pm 3$ | 24 |
| 2009 | 5,657 | 127 | 495 | 622 | 28\% | 1,049 | 47\% | 543 | 25\% | 2,214 | 1,553 | 12 | 47 | 59 | $\pm 0$ | 52 | $\pm 0$ | 32 |
| 2010 | 5,836 | 209 | 578 | 787 | 31\% | 1,234 | 49\% | 481 | 19\% | 2,502 | 1,652 | 17 | 47 | 64 | $\pm 3$ | 39 | $\pm 2$ | 24 |
| 2011 | 5,919 | 144 | 477 | 621 | 31\% | 943 | 47\% | 451 | 22\% | 2,015 | 1,776 | 15 | 51 | 66 | $\pm 5$ | 48 | $\pm 4$ | 29 |
| 2012 | 5,790 | 47 | 452 | 499 | 31\% | 827 | 51\% | 293 | 18\% | 1,619 | 1,502 | 6 | 55 | 60 | $\pm 5$ | 35 | $\pm 3$ | 22 |
| 2013 | 5,310 | 53 | 312 | 365 | 25\% | 766 | 53\% | 319 | 22\% | 1,450 | 1,145 | 7 | 41 | 48 | $\pm 4$ | 42 | $\pm 4$ | 28 |


| Hunt | Dates of Seasons |  |  | Quota | Limitations |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Area | Type | Opens | Closes |  |  |
| 62 | 1 | Sep. 13 | Oct. 31 | 40 | Limited quota; any antelope |
|  | 2 | Sep. 13 | Oct. 31 | 75 | Limited quota; any antelope valid east of the Continental Divide and north of Wise Dugout Draw |
|  | 7 | Aug. 15 | Oct. 31 | 25 | Limited quota; doe or fawn valid on private lands in the Muddy Creek drainage |
| Archery 62 |  | Aug. 15 | Sep. 12 |  | Refer to Section 3 of this Chapter |


| Hunt Area | Type | Quota change from 2013 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 62 | 1 | -35 |
|  | 2 | -25 |
|  | 6 | -50 |
|  | 7 | 0 |
| Total | $\mathbf{1 \& 2}$ | $\mathbf{- 6 0}$ |
|  | $\mathbf{6} \& \mathbf{7}$ | $\mathbf{- 5 0}$ |

## Management Evaluation

Current Management Objective: 6,500
Management Strategy: Recreation
2013 Postseason Population Estimate: 5,300

## 2014 Proposed Postseason Population Estimate: 4,930

The South Ferris pronghorn herd is managed toward a post-hunt population of 6,500, an objective last publicly reviewed in 1994. Population size is estimated using two spreadsheet models developed in 2014, one each for the western and eastern portions of the herd unit. The herd is in recreational management, with harvest quotas designed to maintain pre-hunt buck:doe ratios below 60:100. Public review of the management objectives for this herd is scheduled for 2014.

## Herd Unit Issues

Prior to 2012, population size was estimated using a Pop-II model with reasonable confidence. Attempts to develop a spreadsheet model for the entire herd since 2012 have been unsuccessful, presumably because buck:doe ratios vary widely between the lightly hunted eastern half and publicly accessible lands in the western half of the herd unit. Hunter access to much of the
eastern half of the herd has been severely limited by private landowners since the mid-1990s and has resulted in buck:doe ratios and pronghorn densities greatly skewed between the western and eastern portions.

Fawn crops have only ranged from 28 to 55:100 over the past 13 years, averaging $\sim 40: 100$. In addition to limited access for much of the herd, poor production and recruitment has reduced harvest levels the herd can support.

The large Peterson Ranch in the south-central portion of the herd has changed hands twice in as many years, and it is not known how the newest owners will handle hunter access, or the large Walk-In area along US287.

## Weather

Severe drought conditions in 2012, with almost no precipitation throughout the spring and summer, were followed by three severe late winter blizzards in April 2013. Based on low yearling ratios in 2013, losses appeared to be well above normal during the 2012-13 winter. The 2013 summer was also exceptionally dry, reducing browse availability for the 2013-14 winter. Precipitation increased in the fall, providing for some herbaceous plant growth, but appeared to be too late for most forbs and shrubs. The 2013-14 winter had numerous bitter cold spells, and high winds, but those winds also exposed forage on most winter ranges. Losses may still be above average because of the low browse production and poor body condition of animals going into the winter.

## Habitat

While no herbaceous habitat transects are established within this herd unit, herbaceous forage production is expected to have been minimal due to record drought. Only one shrub transect has been established near this herd unit, on the Morgan Creek WHMA. This transect monitored bitterbrush growth and utilization in the Seminoe Mountains but was burned in the 2012 fires. Owners of the Pathfinder Ranch, which encompasses the north-central portion of this herd, have expressed interest in looking for opportunities for improving habitat conditions for wildlife, possibly as mitigation for wind power projects in other parts of the state. Habitat issues that would benefit pronghorn include treatment of browse on winter ranges, adjustments of grazing use, and modification of sheep-tight fences.

## Field Data

Classification sample size declined again for the fourth year, to the smallest sample since 1979. Fawn production improved slightly, to $42: 100$, but was still well below normal. Fawn production was similar between the east and west portions of the herd, at 44:100 and 40:100 respectively.

Buck:doe ratio dropped from 60:100 in 2012 to only $48: 100$ in 2013. Not all of the decline was due to a shortage of yearlings, as the mature buck:doe ratio fell from 55:100 to 41:100. Buck:doe ratios have exceeded the 60:100 maximum criterion for recreational management in three of the past six years, but always due to high ratios in the east half of the herd which is largely unavailable to most hunters. Buck:doe ratios in the western portion only averaged 43:100 over
the previous five years, and remained poor at $40: 100$ in 2013, generating complaints of poor buck numbers and quality by hunters. Buck:doe ratios in the eastern portion, however, averaged 78:100 over those five years, dropping to 55:100 in 2013. The Type 2 licenses introduced in 2012 to address the disparity between buck densities between the two portions of the area have apparently been moderately successful. Not surprisingly, yearling buck:doe ratios were similar between the east and west portions, at 7:100. The eastern portion still has a significantly higher supply of mature bucks at 48:100 compared to $33: 100$ in the west.

## Harvest Data

The difference in supply of bucks between the two halves of the herd unit was also apparent when looking at hunter success for the Type 2 licenses in 2012. Hunters with these tags, restricted to the eastern third of the area with limited public access, enjoyed 94 percent success, compared to only 73 percent for hunters with Type 1 tags that were valid for the entire area. In 2013, however, success for the Type 2 hunters declined. This could indicate success in harvesting surplus bucks from that segment of the herd, but it is more likely that hunter success was affected by significant losses to EHD in that part of the herd, documented in late summer. With the reduction in license quota in 2013, success for hunters with Type 1 licenses improved in 2013 and the average number of days hunted for each animal harvested returned to a more normal level of 3.3 days.

Type 7 doe/fawn licenses were introduced in this area in 2013 to address complaints about high concentrations of pronghorn on irrigated fields along Muddy Creek. It appears few hunters took advantage of the early opening date for those licenses, but 19 does were removed. Fewer pronghorn were found on the fields, but it is not known if that was due to harvest, hunter activity, EHD losses, or more forage opportunities on native ranges because of lessening of the drought.

## Population

Efforts to develop a reasonable spreadsheet model for this herd have failed, presumably due to the highly skewed buck:doe ratios between the eastern and western portions of the herd unit. In 2012, the buck:doe ratio in the publicly available portion of the herd was only 36:100, whereas the portion with limited access had 89:100. Until 2012, half the herd unit has essentially been unhunted. As a result, when classification samples for the two halves are combined to determine herd ratios, changes in harvests do not necessarily result in predictable changes in buck:doe ratios, the key parameter used for running spreadsheet models.

A line transect survey in spring of 2013 estimated only 4,610 pronghorn in this herd, well below predictions of the best available spreadsheet model, and again found a noticeable disparity in pronghorn densities between the east and west portions.

Two separate spreadsheet models were created for the East and West portions of this herd. Classification data were sorted by drive routes, which have been relatively constant for more than 20 years. Harvests for the two halves were estimated assuming 90 percent of the area-wide harvest went to the west, and only 10 percent came from the east where access is greatly restricted. Where license restrictions limited hunters to one half or the other, all harvest from that
type went to that half. Unfortunately, splitting the herd eliminates the model's ability to use LT estimates to keep modeled herd size tied to independent estimates.

The resultant models are attached, along with a compilation of the two. The Time-Specific Juvenile \& Constant Adult Survival (TSJ,CA) spreadsheet models were chosen for both halves of the herd unit. CJ,CA models for the East and West portions of the herd were rejected because each had high (>800) AICc values, did not track trends in observed buck:doe ratios and provided population estimates that were two to three times as large as the most recent LT estimate for the entire herd. SCJ,SCA models had the lowest AICc values ( 105 for East and 97 for West) and provided lower population estimates, but population estimates from the East model were sometimes lower than classification sample sizes. Neither SCJ,SCA model tracked well with buck:doe ratios. AICc values for the TSJ,CAS models were "Fair", at 162 and 158 respectively. The East TSJ,CAS model tracked classification sample sizes well and had excellent fit with buck:doe ratios for the first half of the 20 -year model. The last 10 years followed observed trends, but did not match observed extremes. The West TSJ,CAS model tracks well with 20 years of observed buck:doe ratios, but greatly exceeds trends in classification sample sizes. It does mimic the observed downward trend in pronghorn numbers seen in LT data.

Fawn production in 2014 was projected to be similar to low 2012 and 2013 ratios for both the East and West models. Models were run with fawn survival values near the low end of their range.

Once population estimates of the two models are combined they track well with four trend counts and two of three line transect surveys, including the most recent in 2013. The combined model also tracks well with observed buck:doe ratios for the first fifteen years of the model. For the most recent six years, observed values exceed simulated values, which would be expected if classification samples were truly skewed by high ratios in the lightly hunted eastern portion. These combined models predict the herd was about 18 percent below objective in 2013. Assuming continued low fawn production in 2014, these models predict the herd will continue to decline in size, despite the reduction in harvests proposed for 2014.

Neither herd model can yet address losses to EHD that were documented in this herd in 2013. By the number of reported and observed carcasses, losses appeared to be greatest along the west shore of Seminoe Reservoir, but spanned down to Rawlins and up towards Lamont.

## Management Summary

With the population apparently well below objective, harvests need to be reduced to allow the herd to recover. The 2014 quota for Type 1 licenses, most of which are expected to be filled on public lands or Walk-In areas in the western portion of the area, is reduced by almost 50 percent. The quota for Type 2 licenses is reduced by 25 percent and the Type 6 licenses are eliminated. While no doe harvest is needed, the Type 7 doe/fawn licenses on private lands along Muddy Creek are retained to address high numbers of pronghorn on irrigated croplands in the northwestern corner of the herd. Most of these lands are enrolled in the Department's Walk-In program, so access to these private lands should not be a concern.

The expected harvest of roughly 85 bucks and 20 does and fawns from the proposed license quotas should allow some increase in herd size if fawn production or survival improves, otherwise the herd is likely to continue to decline. This herd is unlikely to reach objective size for several years without significant improvement in fawn production and survival.

Opening date falls on the traditional day of the week, is compatible with the application booklet and will synchronize with neighboring Area 61. The closing date is the same as in 2012 and 2013 and extends to the closing of the local deer season. A standardized opening date is used for the archery season, which closes the day before the opening of the regular season.
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