DATE: January 24, 1985

REPLY TO
ATTN OF: Wildlife Management Biologist, Memphis, TN

SUBJECT: 1984 Deer Harvest Data Summary

TO: Refuge Manager, Holla Bend NWR

I have summarized the 1984 deer harvest data you provided into
the three attached tables. This year's data looks good, with
a normal composition of age and sex. Weights appear to be
normal and the average number of points (5.5) in the yearling
bucks is very good.

I have included in the tables blank spaces for comparable 1983
data if it is available. If you have it, please enter in
appropriate space and return a copy to me. Blank spaces are
also provided for Hunter Days, Hunter Hours, etc. for both
1984 and 1983. If you have this information, please also
enter it on the form. Yearly comparisons of all this data
will permit us to watch for changes that could occur over time.

Only data that were verified by a biologist were utilized in
Tables 2 and 3. I did tabulate all the data to make comparisons
to the verified sample. The only significant changes were
decreases in the 6 month age class and increases in the 1½ and
2½ age classes when all data were used. The following tables
compare the two sets of data:

Date source	Age (Percent Composition)						Total
	½	1½	2½	3½	4½	5½	
Verified	56.1	14.0	14.0	8.8	3.5	3.5	99.9
Not Verified	5.0	40.0	40.0	7.5	7.5	0	100.0
Combined	35.1	24.7	24.7	8.2	5.2	2.1	100.0

Average Weights

Age	Verified Bucks	Not Verified Bucks	Verified Does	Not Verified Does	Points Verified	Points Not Verified
½	72	NS	58	NS	-	-
1½	123	128	89*	105	5.5	5.4
2½	158	149	110	104	8.0	7.3
3½	191*	145*	102	NS	13.0*	5.5
4½	180	178*	NS	119	10.5	8.0*
5½	NS	NS	109	NS	NS	NS

NS - No sample
 * - Single sample

The only conclusion I can make of the differences in the verified and not verified ages ½, 1½, and 2½ is that by chance biologist verified most of the ½ age class (32 out of 34) and missed many (16 out of 24) of each of the 1½ and 2½ age class.

There is no evidence (based upon the 1½ age group weights) that hunters mis-aged the ½ age group as 1½. I concluded; therefore, that these differences also occured by chance.

Several of the weight entries on the forms did not indicate whether it was a live or dressed weight. This occurred for those weights verified by biologist as well as hunter entries. You might consider developing a method to improve this entry.

It appears to me that hunters do a pretty good job of entering the data requested and there's no evidence of gross mis-aging. I do suggest; however, that you continue to have a biologist or trained volunteer verify all data entries for 50 to 75 percent of the annual harvest.

If you have any questions or I can be of any further assistance please call.

Table 1. Holla Bend NWR 1984 Deer Hunt Results

Type Hunt	No. Days	Bucks	Does	Total	Hunter Days	Hunter Hours	HD per Deer	HH per Deer	HH per HD
Bow Either Sex	76	45	55	100					
1983 Totals									

Table 2. Holla Bend NWR 1984 Age and Sex Composition*

Sex				Age			
	½	1½	2½	3½	4½	5½	Total
Bucks	12	6	3	1	2	0	24
Does	20	2	5	4	0	2	33
Totals	32	8	8	5	2	2	57
1984 Percents	56.1	14.0	14.0	8.8	3.5	3.5	99.9
1983 Percents							

* Based on a sample of 57 Deer where data were verified by biologist.

Table 3. Holla Bend NWR 1984 Average Live Weight and Antler Measurements By Age Class*

Age	Bucks		Does		Points	
	1983	1984	1983	1984	1983	1984
½		72		58		–
1½		123		89**		5.5
2½		158		110		8
3½		191**		102		13**
4½		180		NS		10.5
5½+		NS		109		NS

* Based on sample of 57 deer where data were verified by biologist

** Single sample

NS No sample