					and the second second		
	4027	A 1			en de la companya de		
	4VLI					1 Start	
· ·						a ser a la tradición de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la construcción de la constru	;
ľ	Jac. Nat	ional Libra	ry Biblic	sthèque na	tionale	CANAD	j
N							÷.

ANADIAN THESES

TH<mark>ÈSE</mark>S CANADIENNE SU**R MICRO**FICHE

NAME OF AUTHOR NON DE L'AUTE	EUR PENNER I	DAVID FRANK	
TITLE OF THESIS/TITRE DE LA THES		Between Masse and	
		Paridence N. W.T. Area	

UNIVERSITY/UNIVERSITE	Universit	of	Albert	Ed	monton		
DEGREE FOR WHICH THESIS WAS			「お」は「ちょう」 「「「」」 「お」 「あ」				
YEAR THIS DEGREE CONFERRED		\mathbf{v} .		1978			• • •
NAME OF SUPERVISOR/NOM DU			1.w. 1			4	

Permission is hereby granted to the NATIONAL LIBRARY OF CANADA to microfilm this thesis and to lend or sell copies of the film;

The author, reserves other publication rights, and neither the thesis nor extensive extracts from it may be printed or otherwise reproduced without the author's written permission. L'autorisation est, par la présente, accordée à la BIBLIOTHÈ-QUE NATIONALE DU CANADA de microfilmer cette thèse et de prâter ou de vendre des exemplaires du film.

L'auteur se réserve les autres droits de publication; ni la thèse ni de longs extraits de celle-ci ne doivent-être imprimés ou autrement reproduits sans l'autorisation écrite de l'auteur:

13.1978 SIGNED /SIGNE October DATED/DATE___

PERMANENT ADDRESS/RESIDENCE FIXE

her made .



National Library of Canada

Cataloguing Branch Canadian Theses Division

Ottawa, Canada K1A 0N4

NOTICE

The quality of this microfiche is heavily dependent upon the quality of the original thesis submitted for microfilming. Every effort has been made to ensure the highest quality of reproduction possible.

If pages are missing, contact the university which granted the degree.

Some pages may have indistinct print especially if the original pages were typed with a poor typewriter ribbon or if the university sent us a poor photocopy.

Previously copyrighted materials (journal articles, published tests, etc.) are not filmed.

Reproduction in full or in part of this film is governed by the Canadian Copyright Act, R.S.C. 1970, c. C-30. Please read the authorization forms which accompany this thesis.

THIS DISSERTATION HAS BEEN MICROFILMED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED

Bibliothèque nationale du Canada

Direction du catalogège Division des thèses canadiennes

AVIS

La qualité de cette microfiche dépend grandement de la qualité de la thèse soumise au microfilmage. Nous avons tout fait pour assurer une qualité supérieure de reproduction.

S'il manque des pages, veuillez communiquer avec l'université qui a conféré le grade.

La qualité d'impression de certaines pages peut laisser à désirer, surtout si les pages originales ont été dactylographiées à l'aide d'un ruban usé ou si l'université nous a fait parvenir une photocopie de mauvaise qualité.

Les documents qui font déjà l'objet d'un droit d'auteur (articles de revue, examens publiés, etc.) ne sont pas microfilmés.

La reproduction, même partielle, de ce microfilm est soumise à la Loi canàdienne sur le droit d'auteur, SRC 1970, c. C-30. Veuillez prendre connaissance des formules d'autorisation qui accompagnent cette thèse.

LA THÈSE À ÉTÉ MICROFILMÉE TELLE QUE NOUS L'AVONS REÇUE

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA

SOME RELATIONSHIPS BETWEEN MOOSE AND WILLOW IN THE FORT PROVIDENCE, N.W.T. AREA



A THESIS

SUBMITTED TO THE FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH IN PARTIAL FULFILMENT OF THE REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE

OF MASTER OF SCIENCE

· IN

RANGE MANAGEMENT

DEPARTMENT OF PLANT SCIENCE

EDMONTON, ALBERTA

FALL 1978

THE UNIVERSITY OF ALBERTA FACULTY OF GRADUATE STUDIES AND RESEARCH

The undersigned certify that they have read, and recommend to the Faculty of Graduate Studies and Research, for acceptance, a thesis entitled Some Relationships between Moose and Willow in the Fort Providence, N.W.T. Area submitted by David F. Penner in partial fulfilment of the requirements for the degree of Master of Science in Range Management.

pervisor

External Examiner

5, 1978

ABSTRACT

A study was conducted on plant communities and moose habitat use in the lowlands near Fort Providence, Northwest Territories. The purpose of this study was to examine some relationships between moose and willows on a moose winter range.

Species composition, herbage and browse production, and soil characteristics were described for five plant communities: sedge meadow, patterned fen, willow-shrub, willow savanna and aspen-willow communities. Available mean annual production ranged from 530 kg/ha in the aspenwillow to 2535 kg/ha in sedge meadow communities. Available browse production ranged from 442 kg/ha in the willow savanna to 1406 kg/ha in willow-shrub communities. Available winter browse averaged 20 percent of summer browse production in shrub communities.

Moose were found to concentrate in the willow savanna and patterned fen communities in part of the study area during winter. A density of 0.9 moose per square kilometer was recorded on willow communities used as winter range.

During winter, moose exhibited a marked browse preference for Salix candida, S. bebbiana and S. padophylla and an avoidance of S. maccalliana and S. gracilis. 'Previous browse use on individual shrubs was found to increase the probability these shrubs would be rebrowsed by moose. The degree of previous use also influenced the amount of current annual browse

removed from each shrub.

The seasonal nutrient content in the current annual growth of six willow species and two browsed conditions were examined at four dates during the growing season and once during the dormant season. Seasonal levels of moisture, crude protein, acid-detergent fiber, lignih, ash, calcium, phosphorous, magnesium, sodium and crude fats were described. Although some differences in nutrient levels were found among species and between browsed conditions within species, these were not consistent throughout the sampling period. No significant relationships were found between moose browse selection and browse nutrient content. Chemical analysis of three twig portions showed a progressive decrease in moisture, crude protein and minerals and an increase in acid-detergent fiber and lignin from the terminal to lower twig portions.

Willows subjected to simulated or natural browsing during the dormant season responded with a decrease in the number of twigs and a significant, two to four fold, increase in twig weight per secondary stem in the following growing season. It was postulated that this larger twig growth may have influenced moose preference for previously browsed shrubs. This selection may be advantageous to moose by maximizing intake of palatable and perhaps more nutritious browse (terminal twig portions) while minimizing energy expended by decreasing the time spent feeding.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I extend sincere thank to the completion of this project. for his guidance and advice during the completion of this project. I also thank Dr. P.D. Walton, Department of Plant Science and Dr. F.C. Zwickel, Department of Zoology for their comments and critical review of this manuscript.

I thank Gerry Wheeler, Bruce Morrison, Kathy Marten and John Hushagen for valuable assistance and companionship during field work. The assistance of Kay Wilson, Department of Plant Science, and Dr. Dudas, Department of Soil Science, in the chemical analysis of willow samples is gratefully acknowledged. The assistance rendered by the Alberta Soil and Feed Testing Laboratory is acknowledged.

I would like to thank the townspeople of Fort Providence and particularly Mr. and Mrs. R. Kezar, Mr. and Mrs. T. Malowski and Mr. A. Arychuk, for their cooperative spirit and assistance in enabling the completion of field studies.

Special thanks to my wife, Rita, for patience and moral support.

Financial assistance from the National Research Council of Canada and the Boreal Institute for Northern Studies, University of Alberta, is gratefully acknowledged.

vi

TABLE OF CONTENTS

PAGE

1

ł

INTRODUCTION		•••••	•••••	. 1
DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY ARE	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		•••••••••••	. 3
Location and Size				. 3
History of the Area				. 3
Geology and Soils		• • • • • • • • • • • • • •	••••••	
Climate	•		•	
Vegetation		••••		. 7
Fama	• • • • • • • • • • •	•••••		. 8
REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE	• • • • • • • • • • •	••••••••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • •	•• 11
Plant Communities		•••••	••••••	•• 11
Forest Communities		• • • • • • • • • • • • • •	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	11
Shrub Communities	•••••		••••	14
Grassland Communities.			•••••	17
Moose Population Inventor	ſ y		••••••••••••	•• 13
Aerial Surveys	,	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	•• 18
Pellet Group Counts		••••	/. • • • • • • • • • • • •	. 20
Moose Habitat Use				•• 21
Habitat Selection		· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
Moose Food Habits	••••	• • • • • • • • • • • • •		23
Forage Selection by Ungu				
Nutritive Value of Shrub	5	• • • • • • • • • • • • • •	• • • • • • • • • • • • • •	31
Shrub Response to Simula	ted and Nat	ural Browsing.	••••	34

vii

	1.4
METHODS	38
Vegetation Measurements	38
Moose Population and Habitat Use	40
Aerial Surveys	40
Pellet-group Counts	41
Moose Winter Food Habits	42
Moose Summer Food Habits	45
Investigation of Willow Nutrient Content	46
Collection of Browse Samples	46
Chemical Analysis	47
The Response of Willows to Natural and Simulated Browsing	49
Simulated Browsing	49
Natural Browsing	51
Edaphic Variables	53
RESULTS	55
Vegetation and Soils	55
Sedge Meadow Communities	55
Patterned Fen Community	.57
Shrub Communities	64
Willow Savanna Community	67
Aspen-willow Community	70
Moose Abundance	72
Winter Habitat Use	72
Use of Plant Communities	72
Moose Winter Food Habits	74

•

1

Þ

• . •

•

,

.

ν.

viii

Summer Habitat Use	85
Nutrient Content of Willow Browse	86
Moisture	86
	88
Crude Protein	
Current Annual Twigs	91
Leaves	91
Acid-detergent Fiber	
Current Annual Twigs	
Leaves	96
Acid-detergent lignin (Lignin)	. 97
Current Annual Twigs	97
Leaves	
ADL:ADF Ratio	99
Current Annual Twigs	. 99
Leaves	. 101
Cellulose	. 101
Current Annual Twigs	. 101
Leaves	. 101
Ash	
Current Annual Twigs	
Leaves	. 103
Leaves	. 106
Calcium	
Ourrent Annual Twigs	
Leaves	100
Phosphorous	108

Ourrent Annual Twigs	108
Current Annual Twigs	
LeavesCalcium-Phosphorous Ratios	110
Calcium-Phosphorous Ratios	110
Current Annual Twigs	
Leaves	112
Magnesium	112
Current Annual Twigs	112
Leaves	114
Sodium	114
Current Annual Twigs	114
Leaves	116
Ether Extract	116
Current Annual Twigs	116
Leaves	116 م
Effects of Browsing on Willow Twig Production	118
Simulated Browsing	
Salix bebbiana	
Salix discolor	
Natural Browsing	123
Salix condida	129
Salix bebbiana	131
DISCUSSION.	131
Nutritive Value of Willows for Moose	131
Crude Protein	136
Carbohydrates	· · · · ·

		2 C
Condia East		138
CIUM Fat	• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	139
	Willows to Natural and Simulated Browsing	144
Delesionshi	ps Between Moose and Willow	145
KETALIOUSII		153
BIBLIOGRAPHY.	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	156
APPENDIX A.	Scientific and common names of plant species recorded in six communities in the study area	
APPENDIX B.	Mean soil moisture and soil temperature at different depths in the wet sedge meadow community in 1973	183

xi

ġ

C

UIST OF TABLES

PAGE

P

47			
Table 1. B	trowse use classes indicating the percent of CAG removed.	43 -	
Table 2. E	Browse availability and hedging form classes	48*	
Table 3. 1	Mean annual production (kg/ha) of herbage and brows/e in f sedge dominated communities	56	د ۲
Table 4.	Canopy cover (1) and frequency of plants in the aspen- willow, willow savanna and patterned fen communities	60	
Table 5.	Mean annual production (kg/ha) of herbage and available browse in willow and forest communities	63	v 2
Table 6.	Canopy cover (%) of shrubs in two willow dominated	65	
Table 7.	Moose use of three plant communities in the Site Two study area; calculated from pellet-group counts in 1973 and 1974	73	. o
Table 8.	Percent of available CAG browsed by moose in three plant communities during two winters	75	

xii

Table 9. A comparison of the species composition and winter use of deciduous browse by moose in three plant communities. 76

Table 11. Use of willow browse in relation to shrub height (availability).....

80

94

Table 12. The relationship of previous browse use (degree of hedging) to current winter browse use patterns by moose 83

Table 13. Moisture content (mean \pm SD) in the current annual growth of six willows and two browsed conditions.....

Table 14. Seasonal nutrient content (%) in upper (U), middle (M) and lower (L) twig portions of three willow species....

Table, 16. Acid-detergent fiber content (mean ± SD) in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth in six willows and two browsed conditions..... Table 17. Acid-detergent lignin content (mean ± SD) in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth in six willows and two browsed conditions.....

100

107

Table 20. Calcium content (mean ± SD) (%) in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth of six willows and two browsed conditions.....

Table 26. Comparison of browse production on Salix bebbiana shrubs the year following simulated browsing of varying intensities and in different seasons. Production was measured by the number, total length and total weight of current annual twigs per secondary stem, by the mean length and weight of twigs and by twig weight per unit length.....

119

122

Table 27. Comparison of browse production on Salix discolor shrubs the year following simulated browsing of varying intensities and in different seasons. Production was measured by the number, total length and total weight of current annual twigs per secondary stem, by the mean length and weight of twigs and by twig weight per unit length.....

xv

Table 28.	Current annual twig production of unbrowsed and moose-	•
	browsed Salix candida shrubs	. 12
and a start Andreas and a start Andreas and a start and a start a st		-
Table 29.	Current annual twig production on browsed and unbrowsed	1
19	secondary stems within heavily browsed Salix candida	
	shrubs	. 1
Table 30.	The effect of browsing intensity on secondary stem twi	g
	production within moderately browsed Salix candida	
	shrubs	. 1

14

Table	31.	Current annual twig production on unbrowsed and moose-	
		· 전신 제품 · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	70
		browsed Salix bebbiana shrubs 1	.30

È

7

<u>م</u>

LIST OF FIGURES

s .

PAGE

٩,

• •

1.1

. .

191

c,

4

Figure 1. Map of the Fort Providence region showing the
Figure 1. Map of the fort front and Site Two study areas. 4
Figure 2. Characteristic branching of Salix bebbiana and
Salix candida shrubs, illustrating the secondary
stem units. Each secondary stem unit comprises
a major branch supporting the terminal branches
and current annual growth in the foliage zone 52
Figure 3. The patterned-fen plant, community from aerial
and ground perspectives, showing the dis-
tribution of sedge fens and intervening willow
dominated ridges 58
Figure 4. Moisture (%) and temperature (°C) in the 8 cm (A),
23 cm (B) and 38 cm (C) soil depth classes in
ridges and meadows of the patterned fen community
from May to September 59
Figure 5. The willow savanna plant community from aerial
and ground perspectives, showing the scattered
distribution of willows in a Carex atherodes-
Calamagrostis inexpansa grassland
Figure 6. Moisture (%) and temperature (°C) in the 8 cm (A),
23 cm (B) and 38 cm (C) soil depth classes in the
willow savanna and aspen-willow communities from
May to September
, , ,
n an an an an an an an ann an ann an an

Pigure 7.	The difference in browse use sustained by these
	adjacent Salix bebbiana shrubs exemplifies moose
	browse selection in the study area; the shrub on
	the right sustained repeated heavy use while the
	shrub on the left received no apparent browse
	use
	Seasonal variation of crude protein (%) in the
Figure 8.	current annual leaves and twigs of browsed and
	unbrowsed willows
 0	Seasonal variation of acid-detergent fiber (%)
Figure $\setminus 9$.	in the current annual leaves and twigs of browsed
	and unbrowsed willows
Figure 10.	
Figure 10.	in the current annual leaves and twigs of browsed
	and unbrowsed willows
Figure 11.	t unistion of ash content (%) in the
FIGULE - II.	current annual leaves and twigs of browsed and
	unbrowsed willows 105
Figure 12	, a time and da secondary stems with
, Figure 1-	different "browse histories", showing how the
	degree of browse use in previous years is evaluated
	by examining the twig branching pattern and counting
	the number of terminal bud scars and dead browsing
	plots 126
	xix
ne Menne i Standard (Standard) Status Status	



INTRODUCTION

It has been well established that moose (Alces alces) are primarily a browsing species, especially during winter. On ranges in western North America, willows (Salix epp.) are one of the most important food sources used by moose (Pimlott 1961; Peek 1974). However, due to the taxonomic complexity of the genus Salix and the difficulty in rapidly identifying willows to species, most moose food habit studies refer to willows as a collective group. Several researchers have found that moose will discriminate among species of willows by showing preferential use of some species over others (McMillan 1953; Milke 1969; Dorn 1970). Suggested factors that may influence the preferential use of a particular species include nutrient content, succulence (moisture content), shrub height and growth form, season of use and the type and abundance of associated plants (Milke 1969; Dorn 1970; Pavlov 1973; Berg and Phillips 1974).

Food habits express a fundamental relationship between moose and their environment. An understanding of moose forage preferences is a prerequisite to moose population and habitat management. This study was conducted in the northern part of moose range in North America. At this latitude, it is expected that the long and cold winters cause a considerable energy and nutritional strain on moose. Gasoway and Coady (1974) found that moose in Alaska normally experience a loss of up to 25 percent of body weight during winter. The relatively short growing season of northern latitudes would also limit the time available for

weight gain from the more nutritious summer forage. Moose are large ungulates requiring 18 to 23 kg of browse per day in winter (Verme 1970). Considerable mobility and energy expenditure would be required to obtain sufficient browse to maintain the rumen fill.

This study was initiated by observations of moose browse selection of particular species of willows and further selection of individual shrubs within a preferred species. My research on the lowland ranges near Fort Providence, Northwest Territories, seeks to quantify and relate the relationships between moose and willows on a moose winter range. The objectives of this study were:

a) to describe. the habitats available to moose in the lowlands near Fort Providence; N.W.T.,

b) to quantify moose browse selection in three plant communities,

c) to investigate the seasonal nutrient levels in six common willows in the study area,

d) to investigate the response of willows to browse utilization, and

e) to investigate the relationships among moose browse selection, browse nutrient levels, previous browse utilization, and willow growth form.

DESCRIPTION OF THE STUDY AREA

1. Location and Size

The study area was located thirteen kilometers northeast of Fort Providence, Northwest Territories (61°25'N; 117°40'W of the fifth meridian) and encompassed approximately one hundred square miles Figure 1).

Within this region, two similar sites, one with relatively low and the other relatively high moose utilization, were selected for detailed investigation. The legal land location is sections 33 and 34, township 142 and sections 2 and 3, township 143, range 20, west of the fifth meridian for Site One which sustained relatively low moose use; sections 13, 14, 23, and 24, township 143, range 19, west of the fifth meridian for Site Two which sustained relatively high moose use (Figure 1).

2. History of the Area

The wildlife of the Upper Mackenzie region have historically provided a natural resource base that dominated the lifestyle of nomadic Indian bands of the Slave tribe (Osgood 1931). Moose, bison, and fish provided a major proportion of their food supply. Archaeological evidence indicates that the Fort Providence region was inhabited by prehistoric cultures for more than 5,000 years, B.P. (Wormington 1957).



The Native people are presently localized in settlements and still depend on hunting, fishing, and trapping to supplement their incomes.

Land disposition of the Fort Providence area is controlled by the Government of the Northwest Territories. Grazing leases have been established on the sedge-grasslands along the Bluefish River and at Mills Lake. Native hay and potatoes are harvested on the alluvial flats at the mouth of the Horn River. The Mackenzie Bison Sanctuary was established in 1963 with the re-introduction of wood bison. The bison sanctuary is located north of the Mackenzie River, between Highway 3 and Great Slave Lake (Figure 1).

3. Geology and Soils 🔍

~

The study area is underlain by Upper Devonian rocks of the Simpson formation (Douglas 1959). These rocks are described as slightly calcareous, laminated shales with inclusions of calcareous sandstone and siltstone. During the Pleistocene, the Laurentide ice sheet deposited a stony, gravelly clay drift over the entire Interior Plain (Craig 1965). During deglaciation, the till was covered by stratified lacustrine deposits derived from the sedimentation of glacial Lake McConnell. The resulting topography of the Great Slave Plain is low-lying, nearly flat ground with numerous small lakes and bogs. Numerous lineaments of varying lengths transect the study area and disturb the continuity of communities with sharp changes in vegetation (Craig 1965).

The soils of the study area were developed on moderately fine to

fine textured lacustrine material that contains some stones. On welldrained sites, the vegetative cover of aspen (Populue tremuloidee), white spruce (Pioea glauoa), and willows have influenced the development of Orthic Gray and Orthic Brown Luvisolic soils. Rego-Gleysol soils have developed on poorly-drained but moderately permeable sites, and are vegetated by the aspen-willow and willow-savanna community types. Where the vegetation is largely grasses and sedges, a moderate Ah horizon has developed. Poorly drained sedge meadows and patterned fens have organic soils and are often frozen at 45 or more centimeters below the surface (Day 1968).

4. Climate

The Fort Providence region lies within the Sub-Arctic climatic zone, characterized by long, cold winters, brief warm summers and light precipitation (Thomas 1953).

The mean annual temperature is -4°C and ranges from a high mean ** " daily temperature of 16°C, in July, to a low mean daily temperature of -27°C in January. Mean daily maximum temperatures reach 23°C in July while the mean daily minimum of -32°C occurs in January. The frostfree period extends for 75 days, from about 10 June to 14 August. The mean growing season extends from 9 May to 26 September, an annual average of 140 days (Canada Department of Transport 1967).

The mean annual precipitation for the region is 26,4 cm. About one-half of the total precipitation falls during the growing season.

The mean date of drought point is reached about 22 June, forty-two days after the beginning of the growing season (Day 1968). Snowfall contributes 44 percent of the total annual precipitation. The average () snowfall of 112 cm compacts to a winter maximum of 71 cm. The snow cover lasts an average of 182 days.

5. Vegetation

1

The Fort Providence area is in the Upper Mackenzie section of the Boreal Forest region (Rowe 1972).

The better drained soils are characterized by a climax vegetation cover of white spruce, with jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*) occurring on drier sandy ridges. Due to frequent fires, most of the uplands are covered by aspen, with an understory of willow, buffalo berry (*Shepherdia canadensis*), rose (*Rosa acicularis*), and grasses.

On poorly drained sites, an association of bog birch (Betula glandulosa), willows, sedges (Carex atherodes and Carex aquatilis), and grasses (Scolochloa festucacea and Calamagrostis inexpansa¹) predominate. Black spruce (Picea mariana) muskegs with larch (Larix laricina), Labrador tea (Ledum groenlandicum) and sphagnum moss occur

¹Both Calamagrostis inexpansa and C. neglecta are found in the Fort Providence area but are indistinguishable by vegetative characteristics in the field. Both species are hereafter combined as Calamagrostis inexpansa. in localized areas. Sites of restricted drainage are characterized by patterned sidge fens² and are underlain by permafrost. The intervening ridges have an overstory of black spruce, larch, bog birch and willows. Wet "grassland" communities dominated by *Carex atherodes*, *Carex aquatilis* and *Scolochloa festucacea* occur as insular meadows and along watercourses. A willow dominated grassland (willow-savanna) occurs as a relatively stable ecotone between poorly and well-drained sites.

In riverine areas and on alluvial flats, white spruce and balsam poplar (*Populus balsamifera*) form the main cover types. In these areas, willow and alder (*Alnus tenuifolia*) occur as pioneering and successional species.

6. Fauna

The Upper Mackenzie lowlands lie on the northern fringe of the Closed Boreal Forest Life Zone (Pitelka 1941; Aldrich 1963). The Upper Mackenzie lowland region is considered one of the most productive wildlife areas in the north (Canadian Wildlife Service 1972).

Seventeen species of mammals were recorded in the study area. An additional eighteen species were recorded or reported to occur in the surrounding region.

²Hereafter referred to as the patterned fen community.

Moose were the most common and widely distributed ungulate in the lowlands. Wood bison (*Bison bison athabascae*)¹ originally inhabited the Mackenzie lowlands (Mackenzie 1801) and were re-introduced in 1963 (Monaghan 1973)². The main concentration of wood bison is located in sedge meadows to the northeast of the study area. Woodland caribou (*Rangifer tarandus*) range throughout the black spruce forests. to the north and south of Fort Providence, and are occasional transients through the study area. Black bear (*Ursus americanus*) were common throughout the area.

Common mammalian predators in the area include the wolf (Canus lupus), red fox (Vulpes vulpes), lynx (Lynx lynx), marten (Martes americana), and ermine (Mustela erminea).

Beaver (Castor canadensis) and muskrat (Ondatra zibethicus) were common along the Bluefish River. The red squirrel (Tamiasciurus hudsonicus) were found throughout the region, wherever pockets of white and black spruce had escaped previous fires. The snowshoe hare (Lepus americanus) population was at a low point of its cycle during the study period. In preceding years, browsing by snowshoe hares had killed or seriously affected much of the bog birch in the study area.

The populations of meadow vole (Microtus pennsylvanicus), Arctic shrew (Sorex arcticus), and masked shrew (S. cinereus) were found to

¹Scientific and common mammal names follow Jones *et al.*, 1973. ²Personal communication, H.J. Monaghan, October 17, 1973. be locally abundant in the willow-savanna, sedge meadow and patterned fen communities.¹ The feeding and food storage activities, of the meadow vole appeared to be removing up to a quarter of herbaceous forage production in sedge dominated communities. The northern bog lemming (Synaptomys borealis) was recorded in the patterned fen community. The deer mouse (Peromyscus maniculatus) and northern red-backed mouse (Clethrionomys rutilis) were common on drier sites under aspen, wiflow and white spruce cover.

Approximately 105 species of birds were observed during this study or were reported (Carbyn 1967) to breed in the western Great Slave Lake region. In addition, approximately 60 species were observed during this study or were reported (Carbyn 1967) as seasonal migrants and winter visitors.

A resident population of Sharp-tailed Grouse (*Pedioecetes phasianellus*) and a winter population of Willow Ptarmigan (*Lagopus lagopus*) were found in the study area. Both species wintered in willow-dominated communities and fed on the buds of willow and bog birch.

¹Small mammal populations were examined by snap trapping in three plant communities in the study area. Five hundred and six trap nights were run during 3 to 5 and 11 to 12 August, 1973.

REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE

A. Plant Communities

1. Forest Communities

White spruce is generally considered to be the climax forest vegetation for mesic sites throughout northern Alberta and the adjacent Mackenzie region (Raup 1946; Moss 1953). In northern Saskatchewan Kabzens (1952) reported black spruce as the climax species, growing on a wide range of soils and forest sites, forming pure as well as mixed stands. In the more northern parts of Alberta (Moss 1953) and adjacent Mackenzie areas (Raup 1946), black spruce is commonly found on many kinds of terrain, in pure stands or intermixed with white spruce, paper birch (Betula papyrifera), aspen and jack pine. For northern areas, Raup (1941) emphasized the difficulty of recognizing associations and of applying the climax concept. Raup (1941) suggested that the vegetation of the central part of the Mackenzie basin is "exceedingly young" and much of it appearing "as though it were in the process of being formed". He described the Mackenzie lowlands as a floodplain forest, developed on alluvial and lacustrine soils, and characterized by a succession from a Populus balsamifera, Equisetum pratense, Salix bebbiana association to a stable Picea glauca, Salix bebbiana, Viburnum edule, Cornus stolonifera association. On better drained sites, the upland mesophytic white spruce forest, characterized by Picea glauca, Salix bebbiana, Hypnum Cristacastrensis, Hypnum Schrebeni (Raup 1946) is comparable to the white spruce,

shrub-herb and feather moss faciations (Moss 1953) common to northwestern Alberta.

Periodic fires that destroy the climax stands are a common occurrence in the boreal forest, and may be frequent enough to moderate or halt the natural successional processes (Moss 1932; Rowe and Scotter 1973). In northern regions, the result of fire has been the establishment of extensive stands of *Populus tremuloides*, with occasional patches of *Picea glauca*, *P. mariana*, *Populus balsamifera* and *Pinus banksiana* (Raup 1946). In the absence of fire, the slow natural succession of aspen and balsam poplar to white spruce results in a mixedwood sere that is floristically diverse but infrequently described.

Moss (1953) divided the poplar association into Populus tremuloides and P. balsamifera consociates. He also differentiated the aspen poplar association proper from the parkland. The internal structure of a typical poplar association in northern Alberta includes a closed canopy of Populus tremuloides or P. balsamifera, a discontinuous small tree -- tall shrub stratum, characterized by willow, notably Salix bebbiana, a rich low shrub stratum, a moderate herb strata and sporadic mats of bryophytes (Moss 1953). Important associate species include Cornus stolonifera in the Populus balsamifera consociation and Shepherdia canadensis, Arctostaphylos uva-ursi and Elymus innovatus in the Populus tremuloides consociation.

Moss (1955) stated that Populus tremuloides is adaptable to wide edaphic and climatic factors. Environmental variables such as soil texture, moisture and nutrients, climate, grazing, topography and past history influence the floristic composition of the understory (Raup 1946; Moss 1955; Maini 1968). Common associate species of typical stands of *Populus tremuloides* are reported by Moss (1953) for northwestern Alberta, Raup (1946) for the Wood Buffalo region, Jeffery (1961) for the Peace River area, Moss (1932) for central Alberta and the parkland, Hilton and Bailey (1974) and Sheffler (1976) for the parkland, Maini (1968) for Saskatchewan, Lynch (1955) for Montana and Kittredge (1938) for Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Moss (1932) reported *Populus balsamifera* to be restricted in distribution, due to a greater dependency upon moisture. *Populus balsamifera* reaches its best development on moist sites such as river flats, and becomes more frequent in northern Alberta. The common associate species and successional stages of *Populus balsamifera* associations are reported by Raup (1946) for the Upper Mackenzie lowlands and Moss (1932, 1953) for central and northern Alberta.

Hilton and Bailey (1974) found that herbage production under Parkland Populus tremuloides varied between seasons and communities. In the small poplar type, herbage yield ranged from 170 kg/ha to 104 kg/ha for grasses and sedges and 120 kg/ha to 187 kg/ha for green forbs. In the large poplar type, the herbage yield was 30 kg/ha and 32 kg/ha for grasses and sedges and 25 kg/ha and 73 kg/ha of green forbs for the 1968 and 1969 seasons respectively.

13.

Satis bebbiana is described as a tall shrub or small tree (Raup 1959) that is widely distributed throughout the wooded parts of Alaska, and the Yukon (Viereck and Little 1972; Argus 1973), Athabasca-Great Slave Lake region (Raup 1946), and northern Alberta (Moss 1953). Salis bebbiana is a characteristic species of floodplain Populus balaamifera and Picea glauca associations, open Populus tremuloides forests, grassland margins and burned over upland areas (Moss 1953; Raup 1959). Populus tremuloides, Salis bebbiana communities have been described by Sheffler (1976) and Hilton (1970) for the parkland region and by Jeffery (1961) for the Peace River area. Hilton (1970) reported that in 1968, the total green herbage production in the aspen-willow community was 374 kg/ha. Of this, grasses, including Poa spp., Calamagrostis inexpansa, C. neglecta and Beckmannia syzigachne, contributed 204 kg/ha and forbs 169 kg/ha.

2. Shrub Communities

Willow dominated communities are generally recognized as pioneer or early successional stages (Raup 1946; Argus 1973). Argus (1973) emphasized the relationship of willows and habitat instability characteristic of physical disturbance (river floodplains, glacial moraines, gravel outwash plains and fires) and labile successional stages. Argus (1973), Viereck (1966), Bliss and Cantlon (1957) discussed the role of willows in the vegetative succession of physically disturbed areas in Alaska and the Yukon. These authors noted a succession of willow species that dominate each seral stage. Raup (1959) recognized the dominance of willows on wet, cool soils characteristic of the margin of muskegs, wet meadows, alpine and arctic tundra as well as the role of willows in colonizing disturbed areas. Raup (1946) described willow communities of the Upper Mackenzie lowlands as generally forming a transitional zone around slough margins and along river floodplains but which may form broad expanses on delta areas. Raup (1946) recognized two types of willow succession: 1) at slough margins, where the first willow to appear is *Salix planifolia*, followed by *S. petiolaris* and *S. bebbiana*, and 2) on river sandbars, where *Salix interior* is the colonizing species, followed by *S. lutea*, *S. lasiandra* and finally by *S. bebbiana*, which persists into the forest and becomes a primary species in the shrub layer.

Raup (1935) described the floristic composition of willow dominated shrub associations of seral stages related to lakeshore, muskeg, semiopen prairies and delta ecotypes in Wood Buffalo National Park. Salix bebbiana occurred as a leading dominant in the shrub layer of all woodlands and in nearly pure stands over vast areas between the meadow margins and the encroaching Populus tremuloides. Other studies describing the seral stages and floristic composition of willow communities include: Lewis, Downing and Moss (1928) for the Cordilleran, northern forest and parkland areas of central Alberta, Moss (1953) for the marsh and bog succession in northwestern Alberta and Bird (1961), Hilton (1970) and Sheffler (1976) for slough to forest succession in the aspen parkland of Alberta. Berg (1971) described the vegetation of 14 habitat types, six of which are dominated by willows, in a moose range study in Minnesota.

Jeglum (1972; 1973) investigated the Boreal Forest wetlands in central Saskatchewan and discussed the relationship between vegetation variation and major environmental gradients. The vægetation classification included a tall shrub fen in which willows (Salix maccalliana, S. planifolia, S. bebbiana and S. discolor) and alder (Alnus rugosa) predominated. The understory was characterized by 'Carex atheroides, C. rostrata, C. aquatilis and Calamagrostis inexpansa-neglecta. Similar tall shrub associations have been described as "shrub vegetation" on predominantly mineral sub-stratum (Ritchie 1960); "thicket" (Moss and Turner 1961); "alder swamp", (Damann 1964); "shrub carr", (White 1965); "brush-land" and "brush and alder" on various provincial forest inventory maps. White (1965) considered that a minimum of 25 percent cover of tall shrubs is required to separate his "shrub carrs" from the open aspect of "meadows".

Jeglum (1972) described a low shrub fen having a shrub strata below 135 cm in height with a 20 to 25 percent shrub cover. Leading shrub dominants in separate stands included: Salix candida, Salix pedicellaris, Andromeda polifolia and Betulua glandulifera. Common understory species included sedges (Carex aquatilis, C. chordorrhiza and others) and Calamagrostis inexpansa-neglecta. Similar associations were described as "shrub fen" on predominantly peat substrata (Ritchie 1960), and a "Drepanocladus-Carex bog" (Moss and Turner 1961; Moss 1953). Jeglum (1972; 1973) discussed the continuum of variation resulting in an intergrading of tall shrub fens, low shrub fens and sedge fens.
Washburn (1956) reviewed the suggested origins of patterned ground and attempted a system for their classification. Bogs, characterized by sedge fens separated by shrub dominated peat ridges, have been described as ribbed fens (Zoltai 1971) patterned fens (Heinselman 1963), string fens (Drury 1956; Allington 1961) and string bogs (Thom 1972). Jeglum (1973) discussed the vegetation patterns of ribbed fens in relation to surface water movement and soil nutrient regime. Permafrost peat landforms were investigated by Zoltai and Tarmoci (1971), and Sjors (1963).

3. Grassland Communities

Moss (1953) described the successional vegetation from shallow persistent water to seasonally flooded sites as: 1) real swamp, dominated by Scolochloa festucacea, and Carex atherodes; 2) marsh, dominated by Calamagrostis inexpansa, Carex aquatilis, C. rostrata and C. atherodes; and 3) wet meadow, dominated by Calamagrostis canadensis and scattered willows including Salix petiolaris (S. gracilis), S. planifolia, S. bebbiana and S. maccalliana. Other authors recognized two associations: emergent fen (Jeglum 1972) or marsh (Moss 1955; Curtis 1959) and sedge fens (Ahti and Hepburn 1967), sedge meadow (Bates and Simkim 1969) or meadow (Curtis 1959).

Thieret (1959) described three grassland communities near Fort Providence. These were *Scolochloa festucacea-Carex aquatilis-Carex atherodes* association on wet marshy sites; *Agropyron trachycaulum-Muhlenbergia richardsonis* association on mesic sites; and *Calamagrostis* neglecta-Agropyron trachycaulum-Carex atherodes association on intermediate sites. Shrubs and trees occurred as scattered individuals, particularly at the periphery of these grasslands. Jeffrey (1961) discussed a similar invasion of shrub and forest vegetation onto the xerophytic and mesophytic grassland communities in Wood Buffalo Park.

The floral characteristics of the Fort Providence grasslands are considered to have sub-arctic and temperate affinities (Raup 1941, Thieret 1959). These grassland communities are similar to those described for the upper Peace River country (Raup 1934) and for Wood Buffalo National Park (Raup 1933, 1935).

Raup (1941) discussed the origin and maintenance of Boreal Forest grasslands and suggested that the Mackenzie Basin prairies may have developed directly upon the new soils exposed by the drainage of

the post-glacial lakes.

Forage production of sedge and sedge-grass meadows were reported by Corns and Schraa (1962), McLean *et al.* (1963), Pringle and Van Ryswyk (1968), Hilton (1970), Wroe (1971), and Corns (1974).

B. Moose Population Inventory

1. Aerial Surveys

Aerial censusing has been considered the only practical way of estimating moose numbers in most of North America (Bishop 1969; Bergerud and Manuel 1969). Banfield *et al.* (1955) summarized the strip census method generally used to obtain indices of moose densities by area. The problems of determining transect width have been discussed by Saugstad (1942), DeVos and Armstrong (1954) and Timmerman (1974). Aerial surveys of randomly selected plots, commonly referred to as the intensive search or orbiting method (Trotter 1958), were first introduced by Ontario using a 25 sq mi plot (Timmerman 1974). Recently Lynch (1971) in Alberta, Evans *et al.* (1966) in Alaska, Bergerud and Manuel (1969) in Newfoundland and Mantle (1972) in Ontario have used the intensive search on randomized blocks of 1 sq mi (2.59 sq km) in size. Lynch (1971) reported that only two-thirds the number of moose observed on block surveys were spotted during the transect counts. Evans *et al.* (1966) estimated only one-fourth as many moose were seen in a given area surveyed using linear strips as compared to intensively searched quadrats.

The inability to see all animals present generally results in an underestimation of the moose population (Timmermann 1974). In areas of dense forest cover, the average sight ability may be as low as 40 percent while in more open areas, visibility may approach 70 to 30 percent (Pimlott 1961; Edwards 1954). Benson (1966), Goddard (1966) and Bergerud (1968) have reviewed the accuracy of aerial censusing techniques and have suggested that substantial errors are inherent in most. Caughley and Goddard (1972) have suggested statistical methods for estimating these errors. Siniff and Skoog's (1964) random stratified quadrat sampling method, modified by Evans *et al.* (1966), made population estimated more plausable, but these techniques still depend upon



knowing what proportion of animals flown over were actually observed.

LeResche and Rausch (1974) investigated the accuracy and precision of aerial moose censusing under ideal weather conditions and known moose densities in Alaska. They found that experienced observers, flying fifteen minutes over each fenced square mile saw 68 percent of the moose present while inexperienced observers saw only 43.percent.

Additional factors that affect visibility bias include the number of observers, observers' fatigue, weather conditions, habitat and terrain, time of day and relative moose densities (Timmermann 1974).

Alternate moose censusing methods include track counts (Semyonov 1965; Bentley 1961; Gawley and Dawson 1965 and Priklonskiy 1965), aerial photography (Banfield *et al.* 1955; Vozeh and Cumming 1960; and Passmore 1963) and infra-red thermal imagery (Croon *et al.* 1968; McCullough *et al.* 1969; Addison 1972 and Graves *et al.* 1972).

2. Pellet Group Counts

Neff (1968) reviewed the pellet group count technique used to estimate the relative numbers of big game animals, population trends and animal distribution. Timmermann (1974) suggested the major value of pellet group counts for moose was to obtain indicies for comparison among areas and among years. These indices assisted in the estimation of the moose days use in a given area and helped determine preferred habitat types and seasonal use patterns (Neff 1968). Neff (1968) assumed that the number of pellet groups counted in an area was closely related to the number of animal days spent in the area. Since pellet groups are usually deposited in a clumped rather than a random pattern, sampling is normally more efficient in areas of higher pellet group density (Neff 1968; Des Meules 1965). Problems associated with the pellet group technique include: observer bias and fatigue in counting groups, the small amount of coverage, rapid loss of pellets through insect attack and rain, visibility of groups as vegetation advances, size of plot and the type of surface microtopography (Timmermann 1974).

The average daily deposition rate of pellet groups has been a subject of considerable discussion. Suggested daily deposition rates include 14.9 in Wells Gray Park, British Columbia (Edwards 1956), 10.7 and 14.7 in Quebec (Des Meules 1968), 10.3 in Alaska (LeResche 1970), and 13.0 (Julander *et al.* 1963). Pellet group counts generally tend to give a higher estimate of population in winter concentration areas than ærial surveys done under ideal conditions (Hall 1964).

C. Moose Habitat Use .

1

1. Habitat Selection

The association of moose with sub-climax plant communities is generally accepted throughout much of its range in North America (Peterson 1955). Geist (1971) described moose habitats as: a) transient communities of deciduous trees and shrubs that are unstable, short-lived and grow on burns, and b) permanent communities of climax deciduous tree and shrub associations along watercourses, alluvial deltas and In British Columbia, Hatter and Martin (1960) avalanche slopes. emphasized "... the importance of winter range upon which there is a variety of palatable seral plants, predominantly in an early stage of growth, but with an intermixture of stands of older ages, including climax associations with some palatable coniferous species." Krefting (1974) reviewed moose habitat selection in north central North America and concluded that important habitats in the boreal forest are produced in the early seral stages of plant succession. As forest succession advances, the quality of the habitats and moose populations decrease accordingly. Berg and Phillips (1974) described moose habitat selection in relatively flat areas supporting broad expanses of marsh, willow, aspen and coniferous forests that are commonly found from northwestern Minnesota to north-central Alberta. These authors found that willow and associated willow habitats supported the greater majority of observed moose use. Seasonal use of various habitats was found to be directly influenced by snow depths.

Snow conditions have been found to influence moose winter habitat selection in most moose ranges. In Ontario, Chamberlain (1972) found that under heavy snow conditions (greater than 76 cm of snow), moose preferred higher coniferous crown cover in mixedwood habitats of ridge tops and north facing slopes. During times of light snow conditions, moose preferred a more open canopy, flatter areas and south, east and west facing slopes. Telfer (1970) noted that moose in Nova Scotia often congregated on knolls and hill tops when snow depths began hindering movements. These sites supported preferred stands of young pine and juilier and an abundance of deciduous growth that was available with a limited amount of wandering. Dorn (1970) found that wintering moose often concentrated on wet lowlands in mountainous regions in Montana. In Wyoming, Harry (1957) reported that moose moved down from the mountain summer ranges to concentrate on the willow and cottonwood communities along lowland river valleys during winter. Knorre (1959) reported that moose winter habitat selection in the Pechora-Ilych Game Preserve in the Soviet Union was dependent on the availability of browse in relation to snow depth, hardness and crusting conditions. Kelsall and Prescott (1971) reported that snow depths of 70 to 90 cm are considered to restrict moose movements. Specific studies on the effects of snow on moose habitat selection have been reported by Nasimovitch (1955), Des Meules (1964), Kelsall and Prescott (1971) and Coady (1974).

Neu et al. (1974) and Chamberlain (1972) indicate the paucity of useable information on preferred moose winter ranges. Neu et al. (1974) described a statistical method of determining preference or avoidance of a given habitat in relation to its availability. He found that moose in Minnesota selected the burn periphery areas significantly more than expected according to availability, while the central burn and unburned areas were used significantly less.

2. Moose Food Habits

Peek (1974) reviewed the major findings of forty-one moose food habitat studies and concluded that willows were the primary food source for moose on western ranges. Paper birch, aspen and balsam fir (Abies

balaamea) were the important browse species on eastern ranges. These findings were supported by Hosley (1949) and Pimlott (1961). Peek (1974) recognized the importance of local variations in browse preference; he also recognized that the use of herbaceous forage was related to the relative availability and palatability of forage in the area. Forbs and aquatic plants were considered to be regionally important during the growing season, while grass and grass-like plants generally assumed little importance. Recent investigations by Jordan *et al.* (1973), suggest that in Isle Royale, Minnesota, the seasonal use of herbaceous forage, especially aquatic plants, may supply moose with one or more essential nutrients, particularly sodium. Sodium was found to be comparatively low in woody browse.

In Alaska, Spencer and Chatelain (1953) reported willows and Kenai birch (*Setula kenaica*) as preferred species while aspen was important because of its abundance. The four willows *Salix bebbiana*, *S. scouleriana*, *S. arbusculoides* and *S. barclayi*, that grow to a small tree size, were particularly important to moose in the Kenai area (Spencer and Hakala 1964). In Mt. McKinley Park, Murie (1944) considered willows the major summer and winter food of moose and reported white and black spruce browse as unpalatable. Milke (1969) listed the important willows *Salix interior*, *S. alaxensis*, *S. arbusculoides*, *S. pulchra* and *S. niphoclada*, in a decreasing order of preference for the interior Alaska area and indicated that neither the relative abundance nor species density affected the preferential use of willows by moose.

Houston (1968) and Harry (1957) reported winter moose food habit studies for Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Harry (1957) considered red-osier dogwood (Cornus stolonifera), mountain ash (Sorbus scopulina), bog birch, snow brush (Ceanothus velutinus) and bitterbrush (Purshia tridentata) as highly palatable to moose in winter, but found their relative utilization to be less than their availability. Willows comprised about 75 percent of the winter diet and were found to contribute a greater proportion of the moose winter diets than expected from their availability. Houston (1968) found that forage preferences were related to vegetation type and reported Salix pseudocordata, S. interior, sub-alpine fir (Abies lasiocarpa) and bitterbrush as preferred species, those receiving greater than 50 percent of the observed use, in their respective communities. Knowlton (1960) reported willows as the major fall and winter food of moose in the Gravelly Mountains. While willows were the major summer browse species utilized, herbaceous forage contributed 71 percent of the total diet. In south-western Montana, Dorn_(1970) reported that browse accounted for 90.3 percent and 99.5 percent of moose summer and winter foods, respectively. In summer, Salix myrtillifolia, Betula glandulosa, Salix geyeriana, and Salix planifolia accounted for 58.1, 11.8, 9.6 and 6.7 percent of browse use, respectively, while in winter, S. myrtillifolia, S. planifolia, S. bebbiana and S. geyeriana comprised 25.0, 24.7, 15.4, and 10.5 percent of forage use, respectively. Dorn (1970) reported that the most important factor contributing to moose browse selection was the relative availability of each species. During the winter, availability was related to shrub height and snow cover. In summer, shrub growth form and species of suitable browse heights influenced browse utilization. Smith (1962)

and Stone (1971) reported that willows comprised the major proportion of moose winter diet in the Rock Creek area of western Montana. Salix discolor and S. Lemmoni were preferred over S. commutata. Although red-osier dogwood was generally accepted to be a more palatable forage species than willows, it was less abundant and therefore less important on most winter ranges (Peek 1974). In the Cypress Hills, Alberta, Barrett (1972) reported that saskatoon (Amelanchier alnifolia), aspen and wild cherry (Prionus spp.) comprised 56.0, 21.0, and 12.0 percent of the winter moose diet. Saskatoon was considered to be a more preferred species than willows.

Additional moose food habit studies from North America have been reported by Cowan *et al.* (1950) in British Columbia, Dodds (1960), and Bergerud and Manuel (1968) for Newfoundland, Telfer (1967) for Nova Scotia, Dyer (1948) for Maine, Peterson (1953) for Quebec, Aldous and Krefting (1946), and Mech (1966) for Isle Royale, Minnesota.

they

Egorov (1965) reviewed the moose nutrition in Yakutia, Soviet Union. He found moose utilized a greater proportion of the available forage species during the summer (66 percent) than during the winter (39 percent). Willow leaves, Epilobium spp. and occasionally woody shoots were considered to be the preferred summer foods. Willow contributed 38.6 percent and Epilobium spp. 32.7 percent by volume of the summer diet. During the winter, willows dominated the diet of moose, followed by *Cornue alba* and *Chosenia* spp. Winter foraging on willows was reported to be influenced by their availability in relation to their proportion of the shrub vegetation and the height and density of the groves (Egorov 1965; Borodin 1959). Willows at the periphery of thickets were found to be browsed more intensively than those within thickets.

Knorre (1959) reviewed the moose food habits of the Soviet Union and concluded that although sharply defined seasonal food preferences occurred, the importance of major browse species depended on their availability and abundance. Deciduous trees and shrubs were eaten in approximately equal quantities throughout the year while conifers, evergreen shrubs and herbaceous growth were utilized seasonally in relation to their availability due to snow cover. Moose requirement for vitamins was found to coincide with the seasonal use of conifers. The leafy coniferous growth was found to contain high levels of vitamin C and provitamin A during the winter.

D. Forage Selection by Ungulates

Different species of ungulates differ markedly in their food habits with each species showing innate preferences for certain plants, parts of plants or plants in a particular growth stage (Tribe 1952; Heady 1964). Heady (1964) 'described preference as selection mediated by innate behavior plus learning. Many factors interact to produce a selective response; some of these factors include: palatability, conditions surrounding available' forage, history of the animal and the physiological state of the animal (Cowlishaw and Alder 1960).

Heady (1964) defined palatability as plant characteristics or characters which stimulate a selective response by animals. Similar definitions, used by Young (1948), Cowlishaw and Alder (1960), NAS/NRC (1962) and Marten (1969), insist that palatability is a relative concept that is not constant for a particular food or herbivore, but depends on the type and abundance of associated plants.

Many researchers have studied the relationships between chemical composition or nutritive value of plants and their palatability. In his review of palatability, Heady (1964) reported that high positive correlations have been found between animal preference and protein content; sugars, acetic, linolenic and butyric acids and ether extract. Lignin and crude fiber often showed a negative relationship with increased preference. Tannins were described to have a high negative relationship (Wilkins *et al.* 1953) and no correlation (Hawkins 1955) with preference by cattle. Leigh (1961) reported that grasses highest in phosphate and potash were most acceptable to livestock. Milke (1969) found that moose selected willow species higher in moisture, protein and caloric contents. Radwan and Crouch (1974) reported that fermentations of cellulose and moisture content were more closely related to preference in black-tailed deer than chemical composition.

Conflicting results from various studies have led some researchers to consider positive relationships as extremes and concluded that there appears to be no consistent correlation between chemical composition of forage and its preference (Hardison *et al.* 1954; Heady 1964). The total nutrient value of food species was considered a better indicator of palatability than any single chemical compound (Hardison *et al.* 1954; Cook *et al.* 1956). Westoby (1974) postulated that an optimized diet by large generalist herbivores was contingent upon their selection of appropriate proportions of required nutrients from a relatively fixed bulk intake. Nutrients which are potentially beneficial (proteins, sugars and soluble carbohydrates, minerals and carotene) would either increase preference or would not change it. Chemicals which reduce food quality (crude fiber, cellulose and lignin) would either reduce preference or not change it. This pattern was illustrated by Marten's (1969) summary of the literature on the responses of preference to nutritional properties of foods. Ether extract or crude fat and organic acids showed only positive correlations. Vitamins exhibited no relationship to preference.

Westoby (1974) related an animal's ability to select an adequate diet to reinforcement learning through nutritional properties at digestion time and subsequent recognition by sensory properties of foods. This approach recognized the necessity and occurrence of sampling available foods, especially uncommon or novel ones. The observed variation in an individual animal's forage selection would thus relate to what an animal would consider palatable in specific physiological states of growth, pregnancy and/or maturity (Tribe 1952).

McClymont (1967) presented a model of food intake regulation that considered phagic behavior as a balance between facilitory and inhibitory stimuli which were integrated by the central nervous system. Facilitory stimuli included total energy demand, social facilitation and palatability. Inhibitory stimuli included rumenal distention and rate of food passage, fatigue through foraging, unpalatable foods,

social inhibition, psychic stress and nutritional, disease and heat stresses.

Tribe (1952) indicated that an animal's food preferences must ultimately be explained by terms of sensory reactions, mediated by the environment and metabolic conditions. Krueger et al. (1974) reported that taste was the most influential sense affecting forage selection in sheep. The other senses appeared to supplement taste. Smell was found to be of minor importance while touch and sight were related to specific plant conditions as succulence and growth form. Arnold (1966) and Longhurst and Kepner (1968) reported that olfaction was the first sense used in making selection of plant parts or specific phenological stages of plants. Healy (1967) reported that in white-tailed deer, the sense of smell played a more important role in the selection of plant species and individual leaves and twigs than the sense of sight. The recognition of foods by sensory capabilities, coupled with a memory for associated cues has been described for deer (Longhurst et al. 1968) and other animals (Freeland et al. 1974). Gordon (1970) illustrated that domestic ruminants could generally sense and select for sodium but not for cobalt, magnesium or phosphorous, when deficient in these minerals. Cowlishaw and Alder (1960) found that sheep would select plants that would most readily supply their requirements for salts and energy (carbohydrates). Factors of dung contamination, fungal attack, accessibility, forage density and toughness of the forage interfered with this relationship.

The external form and physical composition of a plant are pal-

atability factors expected to influence animal forage selection (Heady 1964). Preference may be related to presence of awns, spines, hairiness, position of leaves, stickiness and texture. Tribe (1952) described the works of Davies (1925) illustrating how palatability was influenced by the degree of harshness, hairiness and succulence in pasture grasses, and Beaumont *et al.* (1933) showing that the physical property of toughness was of importance in forage selection.

Mineral soil amendments, forage use or clipping that influence the growth and maturity of a plant also affect the relative amounts of certain chemical compounds that influence palatability (Cook *et al.* 1953; Heady 1964). Russell (1958) illustrated that nitrogen fertilization often increased the cell size without proportionate increase in cell-wall material, so the plants were more succulent and less harsh.

E. Nutritive Value of Shrubs,

Studies relating the nutritional value of shrubs to wild ruminants in northern regions are limited. Chemical analysis of forage plants, including shrubs, used by barren-ground caribou (*Rangifer tarandus* groenlandicus) were reported by Scotter (1972) and for muskoxen (*Ovibos moschatus*) by Tener (1965). Kobota *et al.* (1970) examined the mineral composition of browse plants used by moose in Alaska. Milke (1969) reported the chemical analysis of four species of willow used by moose in the interior of Alaska. The chemical composition of rumen contents, rumen fermentation and energy requirements of moose in Alaska were reported by Coady and Gasaway (1972) and Gasaway and Coady (1974). Roberts (1948) reported a survey of the carotene and ascorbic acid content of moose browse in northern British Columbia. Cowan *et al.* (1950) examined the effect of forest succession upon the nutrient values of woody plants used by moose in British Columbia. Total carbohydrates, proteins, ether extract and ascorbic acid content were found to decrease and carotene and total mineral content were found to increase as the forest approached its climax stage. Jordan *et al.* (1973) found that moose browse on Isle Royale contained extremely low levels of sodium.

Further south, studies relating the nutritional value of shrubs to white-tailed deer include reports by Alkon (1961), Hellmers (1940), Swank (1956), Urness (1969) and Swift (1948).

Ullrey et al. (1964; 1970; 1972) studied the digestability of cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*) and aspen (*Populus grandidentata*) browse for white-tailed deer in Minnesota. Short (1966) and Short and Reagor (1970) examined the effects of cellulose on cell-wall digestability of shrubs used by mule deer in Colorado. In Texas, Short *et al.* (1974) reported that the cell-wall constituents were negatively related to voluntary food consumption and the rate and extent of forage digestability in small ruminants. Ward (1971) reported in-vitro digestion coefficients of 34.6 and 37.3 for saskatoon and red-osier dogwood using bull elk (*Cervus elaphus*) rumen innoculum in Wyoming.

Seasonal changes in nutritive and mineral composition have been described for red-osier dogwood and mountain maple in Minnesota (Fashingbauer and Moyle 1963), sourwood leaves (*Oxydendrum arboreum*) in

Virginia (Harshbarger and McGinnes 1971), aspen (Populus tremuloides) in Utah (Tew 1970) and for selected shrubs used by mule deer in Colorado (Short et al. 1966; Dietz et al. 1958; 1962). Dietz (1972) illustrated the seasonal variation of nutrients and mineral content of shrubs important to deer in South Dakota. Seasonal changes of nutrients in selected shrubs used by black-tailed deer in Oregon were reported by Hines (1973).

The general trend of the above studies illustrated that protein levels were the greatest in young leaves and meristematic tissues. Protein levels in both leaves and stems decreased progressively throughout the growing season. Translocation of nitrogen from the leaves to the stems before leaf abscission was reported by Kramer and Kozlowski (1960). Protein levels remained relatively stable during the dormant season, although Dietz (1972) found that some shrubs showed an increase in protein from fall to winter. With a few exceptions, aciddetergent fiber, lignin and cellulose content of woody twigs increased from spring through winter, with the most rapid increase occurring during the transition from summer to fall. Fats tended to decrease in shrubs with seasonal progression through July, then increased in fall and winter (Dietz et al. 1962). Hines (1973) found considerable variation in crude fat levels of four shrubs at different seasons. Ash content of leaves tended to decrease through the growing season, then increase from summer to fall. Ash content of stems decreased during the growing season and appeared to reach a stable level during the dormant season (Dietz 1972). Calcium content in browse generally increased and phosphorous generally decreased through the growing season; no consistent trend was observed during the winter.

McHargue and Roy (1932) reported that in twenty-three species of deciduous trees, the young leaves contained the largest percentages of phosphorous, potassium and nitrogen. The mature leaves, at the end of the growing season, contained the largest percentages of ash, silica and calcium. Different species of trees showed considerable variation in their content of copper, manganese, zinc, iron and magnesium but showed no consistent trend through the growing season.

Hundley (1959) found a difference in the available nutrients in selected deer-browse species growing on different soils.

Fashingbauer and Moyle (1963) reported the protein, fat, nitrogenfree extract and mineral content of the upper one-third of twigs were greater than that of the lower two-thirds. The reverse was found with regard to moisture and crude fiber.

Kautz (1969), Bailey (1967) and Blair and Epps (1967) have shown that terminal sections of certain browse plants have a higher protein and lower fiber content than subterminal portions. Short *et al.* (1971) illustrated that in-vivo dry matter digestibility were greater in the terminal segment of American beauty berry (*Callicarpa americana*) twigs than in lower segments. Digestibility of the terminal twig portions were found to decrease abruptly when twig elongation neared completion.

F. Shrub Response to Simulated and Natural Browsing

Browse utilization studies and clipping projects in the Kaibab

National Forest have provided information on some effects of twig removal and the desirable level of use for quaking aspen (Populus tremuloides) and Stansbury cliffrose (Cowania stanburiana) (Julander 1937). Young and Payne (1948) provided similar information from a six year study on redstem ceanothus (Canothus sanguineus), saskatoon service berry (Amelanohier alnifolia), Utah honeysuckle (Lonioera utahensis) and rose (Rosa spp.) in northern Utah. Other simulated browsing studies to determine the optimum level of use for shrubs (Amelanohier (1959), Neff (1963) and Lay (1965).

The effects of clipping on the hardwood trees and white cedar (*Thuja occidentalis*) in the ates region were investigated by Aldous (1952). After six years of study, Aldous concluded that for white cedar, less than 15 to 20 percent of the annual growth could be removed without adverse effects. Mountain maple (*Acer spicatum*), white birch (*Betula alba*), beaked hazelnut (*Corylus cornuta*), willow (*Salix spp.*) and black ash (*Fraxinus nigra*) produced well under moderate to heavy use while mountain ash (*Sorbus americanus*), red-osier dogwood and red-berried elder (*Sambucus racemosa*) could not withstand heavy use. No attempt was made to differentiate between the species of willow used in this study.

Garrison (1953) investigated the resistance of five shrubs to various intensities of twig removal by clipping in eastern Oregon and Washington. The species studied were antelope bitter brush (*Pur-shia tridentata*), snow brush ceanothus (*Ceanothus velutinus*), rubber rabbit brush (*Chrysothamus nausaosus*), creambrush rock spirea 3Ŝ

(Holodiscus discolor) and curl-leaf mountain mahogany (Ceracarpus ledifolius). The clipping intensities used were 25, 50, 75 and 100 percent, and were conducted from four to seven years. Garrison concluded that clipping generally stimulated twig production to the detriment of flower and fruit production. Changes in shrub form and an increase in average twig lengths were reported.

Cook and Stoddart (1960) reported that the clipping of herbage from one side of big sagebush (Artemesia tridentata) plants resulted in higher lignin and cellulose concentrations, whereas clipping of half of each twig over the entire plant gave higher yields of ether extract, protein and carbohydrates. These authors also concluded that there was little or no translocation of manufactured food from one side of the plant to the other.

Krefting, Stenlund and Seemel (1966) studied the effects of simulated and natural browsing on mountain maple during an eleven year study in Minnesota. This study concluded that natural browsing and artificial clipping of mountain maple stimulated regrowth, but that browsing intensity was not a dominant factor. On natural deer-browsed shrubs, the total number of twigs and the total and average twig lengths were greater than on unbrowsed clumps. With continued moderate clipping, the total number of twigs was found to decrease and the total and average length of twigs to increase in comparison to unclipped shrubs. The weight per 1,000 inches of annual growth was found to vary between years but illustrated a direct relationship with clipping intensity. Harlow and Halls (1972) reported that yellow poplar (*Liriodendrom tulipifera*) seedlings whose terminal and lateral twigs were clipped in summer were significantly shorter, smaller in stem diameter and had shorter twigs than those clipped in winter. Dogwoods (*Cornus florida*) clipped in summer were significantly larger in stem diameter, lower in dry weight production and had shorter twigs than those clipped in winter.

The response of old bitterbrush shrubs to topping was studied on winter deer range in Idaho (Ferguson and Basile 1966). Topped shrubs produced nearly nine times as much twig growth as the control shrubs one year after manipulation. In subsequent years, topped shrubs outproduced control shrubs; but at a declining rate.

Shepherd (1971) examined the effects of clipping on key browse species during a twelve year period in Colorado. Plants of five species, including service berry, oak brush (*Quercus gambelli*), mountain mahogany, antelope bitter brush and big sagebrush, were subjected to 20, 40, 60, 80 and 100 percent clipping of the current annual growth¹ and a "destructive" level of treatment that removed all the CAG and a portion of the older growth. Browse production, in terms of number and weight of CAG stems, increased during the study for service berry, mountain mahogany and big sagebrush plants subjected to moderate and heavy clipping. Antelope bitter brush was found to be most sensitive to clipping at all intensities and decreased in both browse production by weight and number of current annual stems. The "destructive" clipping treatment was found to have a general debilitating effect on all species 'Hereafter referred to as CAG.

2

•

METHODS

A. Vegetation Measurements

5

The canopy cover and frequency of occurrence of all plant species in the sedge meadow, willow savanna, patterned fen and aspen willow plant communities were measured during 6 to 21 July, 1972 and 1973. In each plant community, two 200 x 500 m macroplots were established. In each macroplot, 40 to 200 microplots were located on a stratified random manner using a baseline and a random numbers table, following the method described by Daubenmire (1968). In each 20 cm x 50 cm (0.1 m^2) microplot, the canopy cover class midpoints (%) were recorded for each species present. The canopy cover classes used were:

Range	Midpoint	
0 - 5%	2.5%	
6 - 25%	15.5%	
26 - 50%	38.0%	
51 - 75%	63.0%	
76 - 95%	85.5%	
96 - 100%	98.0%	

Frequency of occurrence was calculated as a percentage of plots

in which each species occurred in a particular plant community.

The canopy cover of shrubs and trees (greater than 0.5 m in height) in the aspen-willow, willow-savanna, patterned fen and three shrub communities: Salix maccalliana-Betula glandulosa, Salix discolor-Salix bebbiana-Salix maccalliana and dense Salix bebbiana stands, were measured by the line intercept method. Ten transect lines, 30 m in length, were located in a random manner in each community. The canopy cover of each species was calculated as percent cover.

ction was measured at the end of Annual herbage and brock and the growing season, during 15 to 31 of August 1972 and 1973, in the sedge meadow, willow savanna, aspen-willow patterned fen and willowshrub communities. Location of production microplots within the macroplots previously established followed the stratified random method described above. Microplot sizes were 20 cm x \pm 50 cm (0.1 m²) for Perbaceous vegetation and woody seedlings less than 40 cm in height and 50 cm x 100 cm (0.5 m²) for shrubs and trees greater than 40 cm in height. Herbaceous vegetation was clipped at ground level while current annual growth (CAG) of woody vegetation was clipped from ground level to 2.1 m in height. Herbage and browse were clipped by hand, sorted to species or forage type and placed in paper bags. These samples were oven-dried within 24 hours at about 60°C and weighed to the nearest 0.1 gm. The average dry weight of each species or forage type (per microplot in each community) was converted to dry weight production per unit area (kg/ha). Woody plant production was expressed as available browse, that which was readily obtainable by moose (ground level to 2.1 m in height). Summer browse was converted to available winter browse using a coefficient of twig: "leaf ratios of

common species in each community. Twig leaf ratios were calculated from the oven-dried weights of leaves and twigs separated for determination of moisture content as described in the methods for nutrient analysis. Forage production among the three sedge-dominated communities and among the five willow and forest communities were statistically compared by analysis of variance and Duncan's new multiple range test.

B. Moose Population and Habitat Use

1. Aerial Surveys

A general reconnaissance flight was conducted on 21 January 1974 using a Cherokee 6 aircraft. The reconnaissance flight was flown at an altitude between 90 and 150 m (ag1) and an air speed of about 210 km/h. The flight covered a line between the North Channel of the Mackenzie River, the study area and Fort Providence. A brief search pattern was flown over the willow flats along the North Channel and the Site Two study area. The two observers were the pilot and the author. All moose observed and the plant community in which they were located were recorded.

A strip census of the Site Two study area was conducted on 22 January 1974 using a Cessna 180 aircraft. The strip census was flown at an altitude between 150 and 180 m (agl) and an air speed of about 140 km/h and covered 94.6 km of transect. Two observers, assisted by the pilot recorded all moose occurring within a strip 0.4 km wide on either side of the aircraft. The angle of sight to determine transect width was marked by guides: one on the observer's window and the other on the strut of the aircraft. The plant communities in which moose were observed were also recorded.

A winter moose density was calculated for the general region, using all moose observed on the two aerial surveys. Moose densities in willow-dominated communities in the Site Two study area were calculated from the observations during the strip census. Moose densities were calculated by dividing the number of moose observed by the area covered (0.8 km x transect length) in the respective

surveys.

2. Pellet-group Counts

Pellet-group counts were conducted in mid-May during 1973 and 1974. A total of 947 belt transects, 2 m x 50 m (a plot size of 0.1 ha), were located in a random manner within macroplots in the aspen-willow, willow savanna and patterned fen communities in the Site Two study area. In each transect, all moose pellet-groups of the previous winter period were recorded.

Moose utilization (expressed in days use/hectare) was calculated for each plant community in 1973 and 1974, using the following formula:

$$D = \frac{\Sigma p^{i} \times 50}{t^{i} \times 13}$$

where D = days-use/ha, $Ep^{i} = sum of pellei-groups recorded in the ith plant community, and tⁱ = number of transects surveyed in the ith plant community. The assumed moose defecation rate of 13 pellet-groups per day followed that described by Neff (1968) and Timmermann (1974).$

3. Moose Winter Food Habits

Moose winter food habits were examined in the aspen-willow, willow savanna and patterned fen communities in the Site Two study area. The relative use of available browse was determined on each macroplot shortly after leaf-flush, in mid-May in 1973 and 1974. Browse species greater than 0.4 m in height were located using the point-quarter method (Smith 1966). The availability of current annual browse and the current and past use of browse by moose was recorded using the browse use and availability-hedging form classes (Tables 1 and 2).

Browse availability was determined by observation of normal minimum and maximum browsing heights occurring on the study area. A shrub was judged to be entirely available when more than 90 percent of the current annual leader production fell between 0.4 m and 2.5 m in height, partially available when greater than 10 percent and less than 90 percent of the current annual growth fell within the browse range and unavailable when greater than 90 percent of the current annual growth was above 2.5 m in height. Use of browse outside the assigned availability range, such as the breaking of branches above 2.5 m, was recorded. Table 1. Browse use classes indicating the percent of CAG¹ removed.

	RANGE	MIDPOINT				
		•			, ,	
•	4	non-use 1-9	. 0			
•	•	10-49 50-89 90-100	30 70 95			•

¹Current annual growth.

Table 2. Browse availability and hedging form classes.

All available - no hedging.⁴
All available - lightly hedged
All available - moderately hedged
All available - heavily hedged
Partially available - no hedging
Partially available - lightly hedged
Partially available - moderately hedged
Partially available - moderately hedged
Partially available - heavily hedged
Partially available - heavily hedged
Partially available - heavily hedged
Decadent - due to overbrowsing
Unavailable

43 ·

In this study the amount of previous browse utilization on a shrub is defined as a degree of hedging. The degree of hedging is used as a measure of the extent of repeated (yearly) use of a plant. A plant was judged to be slightly hedged if less than 33 percent of the annual leader growth of one preceding growing season had been utilized. Moderate hedging was defined as browse utilization of greater than 33 percent of one previous season or repeated use of less than 33 percent of the CAG. Heavy hedging was defined as repeated use of greater than 33 percent of the available leader production.

()

Winter use of the current annual leader growth by moose was recorded as a percentage of the available browse on each shrub and assigned the midpoint values of the leader use classes in Table 1. An age classification was assigned to each shrub to differentiate availability due to shrub height, growth form and age. The age classifications used was: seedling, young, mature, decadent and resprout.

Winter browse use was analyzed by comparing the composition and relative use of each browse species in each plant community. Browse use was converted to percent of shrubs and percent of CAG browsed of each species. The Chi-square binomial distribution (Steel and Torrie, 1960) was used to determine the goodness-of-fit by comparing the overall observed and expected frequency distributions. The expected frequency distributions were obtained by multiplying total observations of use by the proportion (percent composition) of each browse species in the plant communities following the method described by Neu *et al.* (1974). If a significant difference was found

between the two distributions then it was concluded that moose were not utilizing browse species in proportion to their availability. Where a significant difference between species availability and use occurred, the Bonferroni Z statistic (Bonferroni normal statistics (Millar 1966)) was applied to the observed values, providing confidence intervals for each species (Neu *et al.* 1974). If the observed value fell within the interval, it was concluded that moose were using the species in accordance with its availability. If the observed value fell above or below the interval, moose were considered to be exhibiting an avoidance of, or preference for that browse species, respectively.

Ground observations of moose forage use during winter were recorded during 18 to 21 January, 1974. These observations were unsystematic and consisted of following recent moose tracks for approximately 100 m whenever tracks were encountered during other field work. Information recorded for each track observation included: the plant community in which they occurred, the movement pattern among shrubs during feeding, the browse species eaten, the height of browse use and other observations such as cratering activity.

4. Moose Summer Food Habits

Moose forage use during summer was recorded each time it was encountered during the May^o to September field seasons in 1972 and 1973 and in mid-August 1974. When recent tracks or evidence of browsing were encountered they were followed for about 100 m and the following information recorded: the plant community, the species of herbaceous or browse plants eaten and for shrubs, the plant portions (leaves and/or twigs) eaten, the amount of CAG removed and the previous browsed condition of the plant.

C. Investigation of Willow Nutrient Content

1. Collection of Browse Samples

The CAG from six species of willow was collected at four week intervals from 8 May to 1 September 1973 and in mid-January 1974. Samples of all species except *Salix candida*, were from the willow savanna community; *Salix candida* samples were from the patterned fen community. Six individual shrubs were selected as replicates for each of browsed and unbrowsed *Salix bebbiana* and *S. discolor* and browsed *S. candida*. Pooled samples of CAG were collected for unbrowsed *Salix candida*, *S. maccalliana*, *S. gracilis* and browsed *S. padophylla*. Pooled samples of browsed *Salix candida*, *S. bebbiana*, and *S. discolor* were collected for analysis of chemical content of twig portions (thirds).

When a sample was collected from an individual shrub, the CAG was collected to represent all aspects of lateral and terminal secondary stems within the available moose browsing range (0.4 to 2.5 m). For a pooled sample, the CAG from a minimum of ten individual shrubs was collected. Each shrub was arbitrarily divided into quadrants, and the CAG from one secondary stem at 1.5 m height was collected from each quadrant. Individual willow shrubs were selected in a random manner within a representative portion of the plant community. Where browsed and unbrowsed individuals were compared, the closest unbrowsed shrub to a designated browsed individual was selected. On subsequent sampling dates, plants were selected that had not been disturbed by previous sampling or recent moose browsing. In this part of the study, a browsed shrub was required to have been moderately to heavily browsed by moose for three years, including the preceding dormant seasons.

The CAG of each browse sample was separated to leaves and twigs and where twig portions were to be compared, the lower, mid and upper twig thirds were separated. Leaves, twigs and twig portions were then weighed, oven-dried at 65°C for 48 hours, reweighed and the percent moisture calculated.

2. Chemical Analysis

Proximate analysis of willow browse samples was conducted at the University of Alberta. A pooled sample of each species (5 - 10 individual shrubs) from the early summer and winter collections were analyzed for crude fat (ether extract) and phosphorous at the Soil and Feed Testing Laboratory, Alberta Department of Agriculture, in Edmonton.

The nitrogen content of browse samples was determined by the Dumas method, using the Coleman Model 29A, Nitrogen Analyzer. A conversion factor of 6.25 was used to convert percent nitrogen to percent protein (Maynard and Loosli 1969). Acid-detergent fiber and

acid-detergent lignin content (lignin) were obtained by the procedure described by Van Soest (1963a; 1963b). The ash content was obtained by the combustion of a 2 gm sample in a muffle furnace, following a method described by Isaac and Kerber (1971). The calcium, magnesium and sodium contents were determined with an atomic absorption spectrophotometer (Isaac and Kerber 1971).

Sample sizes of the above nutrient determinations (June to January sampling periods) were: for moisture, nitrogen, acid-detergent fiber and lignin, five or six samples each of leaves and twigs for browsed * and unbrowsed Salix bebbiana and S. discolor and browsed S. candida, and a pooled sample of leaves and twigs from ten individual shrubs for unbrowsed S. candida, S. maccalliana, S. gracilis and browsed S. padophylla and twig portions; for ash, calcium, magnesium and sodium, three samples of twigs and a pooled sample of leaves (5 - 6 shrubs) for browsed and unbrowsed S. bebbiana, S. discolor, and browsed S. candida, and a pooled sample of each leaves and twigs (from 10 individual shrubs) of unbrowsed S. candida, S. maccalliana, S. gnaci and browsed S. padophylla and twig portions. Pooled samples of twigs (10 shrubs) of each species were used from the May collection period Two replications of each sample were conducted for nitrogen, aciddetergent fiber and lignin. Only one measurement of ash, carcin magnesium, sodium, phosphorous, crude fat and moisture were conducted per sample. Nutrient levels were described by a mean and standard deviation (when given) using all replications for each species and browsed condition at a particular sampling period. Nutrient levels among species and browsed conditions at each sampling period

among sampling periods for each species and browsed condition were tested for significant differences using the analysis of variance to determine whether a significant difference occurred and Duncan's new multiple range to identify which means were significantly different.

D. The Response of Willows to Natural and Simulated Browsing

1. Simulated Browsing

Browse clipping studies, which simulate moose browse use, were conducted on two species of palatable willows to examine the effect of varying degrees of browsing on CAG production. Simulated browsing treatments were conducted on *Salix bebbiana* and *S. discolor*, in the willow savanna community of Site One. This area was chosen because of its light browse use in previous years. *Salix candida* was not included in the simulated browsing study because it could not be found in adequate density in the Site One area. *Salix candida* was abundant only in the patterned fen community of Site Two, where the distances were too great to facilitate the transport and construction of protective wire cages.

Two 150 x 175 m macroplots, were delineated within representative portions of the willow savanna community in Site One. Within each macroplot, points were located in a stratified random design (Daubenmire 1968). At each point, the four closest willows were chosen if they met the following criteria: a) appropriate species, b) between 0.5 and 2.0 m in height, c) relatively distinctly separated from other shrubs, and d) had not been browsed by moose. Measure-

49

ેપ્રવ

ments of height, crown diameter, basal diameter (15 cm above the ground) and the number of main stems recorded. Treatments of each shrub were determined in a random manner and tagged with color coded plastic flagging. Ten replications of each treatment were established.

.46

The simulated browsing treatments removed 50, 75 (hedged) and 100 percent of the CAG from the appropriate shrubs. The 50 and 100 percent treatment removed 50 or 100 percent of each current annual twig while the hedged treatment removed about 75 percent of the outer lateral and terminal leaders. The 75 percent clipping treatment, described in this study as "hedged", was included to approximate more closely the actual effect of heavy moose browsing; it normally concentrates on the outer, more available twigs. The control shrubs were measured and tagged, but not protected by wire cages. Ten replications of controls and each simulated browsing treatment were established for each species.

The dates of treatment were 21 June and 25 August 1972, to coincide with the expected low and high portions of the shrub carbohydrate cycle. Eight treatment replications were conducted on *Salix bebbiana* during the dormant season, 28 December 1972, to examine differences between early fall and winter effects of browsing. In both species, the <u>CAG</u> from the 100 percent clipping treatment was retained, ovendried and weighed.

In August 1973, the CAG of treated and control shrubs were measured. Five secondary stems were removed from each shrub in a stratified man+ ner to include one stem from each lateral quadrant and from the terminal portion of the crown. The number, lengths and oven-dried weight of the current annual twigs were measured and recorded. The diameter and age of secondary stems were measured just below the lowest branching point (Figure 2). Production and size of current annual egs, stem ages and stem diameters were compared amongotreatments analysis of variance and Duncan's new multiple range test.

In this study, a secondary stem was defined as a unit of shrub growth, comprising a major branch supporting the current annual growth and terminal branches in the foliage zone (Figure 2). Selection of this unit was based on field observations of the relatively uniform branching pattern and size of major and secondary stems that were characteristic of each willow species. This uniform branching pattern occurred in willows in both browsed and unbrowsed conditions.

2. Natural Browsing

Ð.

Two willow species in Site Two were selected to examine the effect of moose browsing on the production of current annual twigs. Salix bebbiana was the willow selected in the willow savanna community and Salix condida was the other willow selected in the patterned fen community. These species were chosen because they exhibited noticeable variation in intra-specific browse preference by moose.

Subsamples of secondary stems from moose browsed and unbrowsed shrubs, were selected in a random manner from the total available within


Figure 2. Characteristic branching pattern of Salix bebbiana and Salix candida shrubs, illustrating the secondary stem units. Each secondary stem unit comprises a major branch supporting the terminal branches and current annual growth in the foliage zone. the macroplot. Moose browsed shrubs selected, were required to have three years of moderate to heavy utilization, including the preceding dormant season.¹ The number, lengths and oven-dried weights of the corrent annual twigs per secondary stem were measured at a point immediately below the last branch. Differences in current annual twig production and diameter of secondary stems between browsed and unbrowsed shrubs were analyzed using an unpaired Student's test.

Within mature, moderately browsed Salix.candida clumps, the number and length of the current annual twigs were measured on secondary stems having different browse histories. These measurements were recorded in late August 1972. Differences in twig production among secondary stems were compared by analysis of variance and Duncan's new multiple range test.

F. Edaphic Variables

Soil temperature and soil moisture were monitored at four week intervals from 8 May to 1 September, 1973. The soil sampling data were coincident with sampling of willows for chemical and nutrient content.

Ten sampling plots were selected on a stratified random basis in the willow savanna, aspen-willow and patterned fen communities. At each sampling plot, one moisture sample and two soil temperature

¹Browse use in previous years was evaluated by examining the twig branching pattern on secondary stems and counting the number of terminal bud leaf scars and dead browsing points (Figure 12). measurements (°C) were collected at the following three depths:

Depth Class	Soil Moist	me	Temp	erature
A	0-15 a 15-30 a			8 cm 23 cm
B C	30-45 a	1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1		38 cm

Depths to frozen soil or permafrost were recorded where applicable. In the wet sedge meadow, soil temperature and soil moisture were monitored during June July and August in conjunction with forage production experiments. No measurements were taken in May because these meadows were flooded during the spring snow melt. Thirty control sampling plots were selected on a stratified random manner. Soil moisture measurements were collected at the A, B and C depth classes previously described, and soil temperature was measured at the 10 cm and 20 cm depths.

Soil moisture samples were stored in soil moisture tins, weighed, and then oven-dried (65°C) for 48 hours. Samples were reweighed and the percentage moisture calculated using the following equation:

Percent moisture = $\frac{(\text{wet weight - dry weight}) \times 100}{\text{dry weight}}$

A soil pit was dug near the center of each plant community and the soil profile was classified to the appropriate order.

A. Vegetation and Soils

1. Sedge Meadow Communities

The wet sedge meadow or *Carex atherodes-Carex aquatilis-Scolochloa festucacea* community was characteristic of lowland sites where surface water generally persisted to the middle of the growing season. The soils were Rego Gleysols overlain by 15 to 20 cm of fibrous peat. Soil moisture levels remained high during the 1972 growing season but decreased rapidly during the 1973 growing season due to an early spring thaw and limited rainfall. Soil temperatures reached a peak of 11.2°C at 8 cm and 8.7°C at 20 cm below the ground surface in mid-July 1973. The microtopography was characterized by peaty hummocks 15 to 45 cm in height (Appendix B).

RESULTS

55

Wet sedge meadows were dominated by Carex atherodes which contributed about 70 percent (1,847 kg/ha) of the mean total annual production of 2,535 kg/ha (Table 3). Carex aquatilis and Scolochloa festucacea were locally abundant and had a mean production annually of 227 kg/ha and 232 kg/ha respectively. Calamagrostis inexpansa grew mainly on peaty hummocks and contributed 180 kg/ha. Common secondary species, including Galium trifidum, Mentha arvensis, Scutellaria galericulata and Petasites sagittata, contributed to the 46 kg/ha of forb production. Less common species recorded in this community are listed in Appendix A.



Table 3. Mean annual production (kg/ha, dry weight) of herbage and browse in sedge dominated communities.

	1	PLANT COMMU	NITY
Species or Forage Group n ³ =	Wet Sedge Meadow ¹ 131	Dry Sedge Meadow ¹ 100	Patterned Fen-Meadows ² 90
Carex atherodes	1,847	846	278
Carex aquatilis	228	122	r 455
Calamagrostis inexpansa	183	191	پ
Scolochloa festucacea	2 32	152	•
Forbs	46	234	10
Salix candida			27
Salix bebbiana	1	100	
Salix maccalliana		16	
	1		
Iotal Herbaceous	2,535	1,704	742
Total Available Browse		116	27
• Total Available Production	ов ⁴ 2,535 ^а	1,820 ^b	769

¹Mean production from 1972 and 1973 growing seasons.
²Production measured only in 1973.
³n = numbers of 20 cm x 50 cm sample plots.

*

a,n a

⁴Values within the same row followed by a common letter are not significantly different (P<0.05).

١

影

A "dry" sedge meadow community was recognized on better drained sites. This community was dominated by *Carex atherodes*, and had a high cover of *Calamagrostis inexpansa* (75%) and a greater variety and a higher production of forbs (234 kg/ha) than the wet sedge meadows. Mean annual production was 1,704 kg/ha of herbage and 116 kg/ha of browse (Table 3). This community appeared to be transitional between the wet sedge meadows and the willow savanna communities.

2. Patterned Fen Community

 $\{ \}$

This community was characterized by small sedge fens or meadows separated by low dendritic ridges that paralleled the drainage pattern (Figure 3). The fens covered 75 percent and the ridges 25 percent of the community. The patterned fens were poorly drained; surface water was present in the troughs between the peat hummocks of the fens for most of the growing season. Although the ridges were somewhat drier, the organic soils retained a high moisture content throughout the frost-free season (Figure 4). The organic soils of the ridges and fens were described as Cryic Mesisols. They were underlain by permafrost which receded to about 75 cm in August. Temperature of surface soils at 8 cm and 23 cm reached a maximum of 10°C and 6°C, respectively, in early August 1973 (Figure 4). Anaerobic conditions and calcareous marl deposits were characteristic of the saturated fen soils.

Carex aquatilis was the dominant plant of the sedge fens with a



58

A. 30

<u>93</u>

Figure 3. The patterned-fen plant community from aerial (above) and ground (below) perspectives, showing the distribution of sedge fens and the intervening willow dominated ridges.



Figure 4. Moisture (%) and temperature (°C) in the 8 cm (A), 23 cm (B) and 38 cm (C) soil depth classes in ridges and meadows of the patterned fen community from May to September. (f = frozen soil conditions).

		• •			OMMUNITY			
		Willow Sa	vanna	Patte	rned Fen	M	pen-w	1110
				ridges	meado	W8		
SPECIES		• .						
							36	
Salix bebbiana	COVET	22	4 0	*			-	55
· · · · · ·	frequency cover	3	•	3	· · ·		2	2
Salix discolor	frequency	•	6	4	7.			
Salix candida	cover	. +1	+ 1	17 32	-	14		
•	frequency	2	T .	10			j.	
Salix padaphylla	cover	- ,	3	18				
<u>`</u> '	frequency cover	1		10	. +	-	/4	7
Salix maccalliana	frequency		4	14		1	/	•
Salix gracilis	cover	7	10				/	
Barra gradite	frequency		16	1 5			/ + 8	
Salix glauca	cover					•	/ 	18
	frequency	· +		30	+	-	12	24
Betula glandulosa	cover frequency	•	· +	43		1		
N	cover			18	<u>+</u>	1		
Myrica gale	frequency			+	,	•	13	
Shepherdia canadensis	cover		1		3.	e		3
	Jrequency	2	· .	. 5			· 3	
Rosa acicularis	cover	· 2	. 8		28			1
	frequency cover		-	2			+	
Ribes oxyacanthoides	frequency		۰.		4			
Ledum groenlandicus	cover			1	2			
	frequency	· _			4		35	1
Populus tremuloides	cover	1	3			•		3
	frequency		U		•		. 4	
Populus balsamifera	cover. frequency	•					9	
ni alaraa	cover	+				·	. 7	
Picea glauca	frequency		+	4	;			•
Picea mariana	cover			. 4	8			
	frequency	li i i		1	-			
Larix Larioina	COVET	,	· ·		2			
	frequency cover	13		1	. 15		1	
Carex atherodes	frequency	1	36		3 60	1 •.		
Carex aquatilis	cover	. 6		40	81	94		
	frequenci	y i i i	15		.			
Carex sartwellii	cover	5	15					
	frequency	1 1	10	1		· ·		
Carex aurea	cover frequenci		3	· · ·				
ann da Mana	COVET	7		•			1	•
Carex deflexa	frequence	y .						
Juncus balticus	COVET	. 4		*				
	- frequenc	y 74	15	20	22	2	11	
Calamagrostis inexp	ansa cover	*	95		49	40		
A 4. 19. D	frequenc ea cover	9			· 1			
Scolochloa festucac	frequeno	ny -	· .			. 4		,

Canopy cover (%) and frequency of plants in the aspen-willow, willow savanna and patterned fen communities. Table 4.

.

Value less than 0.5 percent.

 $\langle \cdot \rangle$

ę

i

Table 4. continued.

				PLANT			Aspette	-willow
		Willow	Savanna		erned		Mapen	
ECIES			,	ridges		ndows	1	
							5	23
ymus innovatus	cover frequency		an an an	1				23
ropyron trachycaulum	cover frequency	6	17		2			
nderm jubatum	cover frequency	3	11					
pa palustris	cover frequency	2	7	. .				
ster junciformis	cover frequency	- 4	40	e.			1	D
ragaria virginiana	cover frequency	. 7	31					66 1
stragalus agrestis	cover frequency	8	16	- 1	•			, 3
tachys palustris	cover	2	25		. 2	26		1
chilles millefolium	frequency cover	1	11					1 21
alium boreale	frequency cover	1		a '			•	1 19
halictrum occidentale	frequency cover	' 1			٠			
etasites sagittata	cover	1		•				1 2
entha arvensis	frequency cover	. 1				+ 		_
pilobium angustifoli	frequency un cover	1	1.1	, 1	16			5 . 34
	frequency cover	2		•		1		
tellaria spp.	frequency		15 L			20		
Iriglochin maritima	cover frequency		3	1		+ 1		4 37
Rubus acaulis	cover frequency	,		1	27	- 4	. *	4
Arotostaphylos wa-ur	JIEquences	ı			12		•	15
Linnea borealis	cover frequency	/		2	*	2	·	5
Potentilla palustris	cover frequenci	1	4 1	_	12	10		
Pyrola ascrifolia	cover frequence	y .		2	14			
Equisetum scirpoides	cover frequenc	y		1	10			
Geocailum lividum	cover frequenc	y		▲	10	2		
Polygonum amphibium	cover frequenc			. :	•	1	5	

•

Þ

canopy cover of 60 percent (Table 4) and a production of 455 kg/ha in 1973 (Table 3). Carex atherodes was locally abundant near the periphery of the sedge fens. Total shrub cover in the meadows was about 11 percent.

The low ridges varied from 0.3 to 1.5 m in height and 3 to 15 m in width. Many of the ridges had depressed centers and appeared to be formed by frost action in the adjacent fens. Black spruce and larch were apparently the climax species on the ridges, but only a few remnants had survived the former fires. Young black spruce and larch had a canopy cover of about 5 percent (Table 4).

The ridges were dominated by a variety of shrubs in two overlapping zones. Salix candida and Myrica gale predominated on the lower slope of the ridge while Betula glandulosa, Salix padophylla and Salix maccalliana shared dominance of the upper slope and top of the ridge. Secondary shrub species included: Salix discolor, Rosa acicularis and Ribes oxyacanthoides. The available browse production on the ridges was 1,239 kg/ha in 1973 (Table 5). Forage production in meadows is shown in Table 3.

The herbaceous cover was dominated by Carex aquatilis with Calamagrostis inexpansa, Potentilla palustris and Equisetum scirpoides as secondary species. Carex aquatilis produced 89 percent (223 kg/ha) of the total herbage production in 1973 (Table 5).

1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1. 1		PLANT COMMUNITY	X	
SPECIES OR FORAGE GROUP 54=	Willow Willow-shrub Savanna ¹ Communities ¹ 60	Patterned Fen Ridges ² 54	Aspen-willow Lowlands ² 60	Aspen Uplands ¹ 54 _b
HERBACEOUS Sedges Grass	143 354 279 151	1 3 4 60 5 2 5 2	1 38	158 🗞
	236 24	, ****		0
owsz Salix bebbiana Salix discolor	249 102 × 44 314	46	2 80 2 80	174
Salix maccallicna Salix gracilis	17 447 91 63	46 L	r m	
Salix padophylla Salix candida	7 22 102 -** 270	361 361) v	
Betula glandulosa Populus tremuloides	1 4		12	55
Populus balsamifera Shepherdia canadensis	12 3	60	164 21	230 122
Miscellaneous surues Total Herbaceous ⁵	678 ^a 562 ^a	250 ^b 1 239 ^b	39 ^C 491 ^a	196 535 ⁴
Available Browse ⁵ Winter Browse Available	442 1,400 87 281 1,120 ⁸ 1,968 ^b	272 272 1,480 c	47 530d	52 731°

6**3** ·

.

٠

 $u_n = number$ of 1 sq. m sample plots. Svalues within the same row followed by a common letter are not significantly different (P<0.05).

•

÷

/

. .

The total available production of the patterned fen community was 948 kg/ha. Herbaceous forage contributed 65 percent (619 kg/ha) and browse 35 percent (330 kg/ha). The available winter browse was 67 kg/ha.

3. Shrub Communities

Poorly drained lowlands on minerotrophic soils were characterized by extensive stands of willow and bog birch (*Betula glandulosa*). The soils were classified as Rego Gleysols that have an organic surface layer 10 to 15 cm thick, over a thin, dark colored organic-mineral horizon over stratified silty clay. These communities were flooded during spring run-off and the soils remained wet and cool throughout the summer. Frost cracks, up to 30 cm in depth, and low spreading hummocks were common in localized areas. The dominant overstory species varied with the site characteristics and the moisture continuum from the wet sedge meadows to the willow savarna.

The Salix maccalliana-Betula glandulosa community formed low, dense stands, 1.2 to 2.4 m in height, with a canopy cover of about 65 percent (Table 6). Secondary shrubs included: Salix discolor, S. bebbiana and S. candida. Characteristic understory species were Carex aquatilis, Calamagrostis inexpanse and Rubus acaulis.

Dense stands of a Betula' glandulosa community occurred infrequently in the study area; but formed extensive stands in the surrounding area.

	PLANT C	DMMUNITY	
Shrub Species	Salix maccalliana- Betula glandulosa	Salix discolor- Salix bebbiana- Salix maccalliàna	*
n ¹ =	10	10°	
Salix bebbiana	5.5	9.0	.
Salix discolor	7.7	6.2	
Salix gracilis	0.1	07.4	•
Salix maccalliana	22.9	9.4	
Salix padophylla	1.6	1.0	
Salix condida	3.7	1.8	
Salix spp.	0.3	0. 6	₹
Betula glandulo s a	20.2	8.7	
Populus tremuloides	2.4	3.5	
Rosa acicularis	0.3	9. 	
TOTAL SHRUB COVER	• 64.7	40.6	

Table 6. Canopy cover (%) of shrubs in two willow dominated communities.

J.)

٤.

ļ

-1

65

()

Salix discolor, S. bebbiana and S. maccalliana occurred as codominant overstory species in shrub communities characterized by numerous small sedge meadows. Betuka glandulosa was a common understory shrub. The canopy averaged three meters in height and had a 40 percent cover (Table 6). Carex atherodes and Scolochloa festucacea dominated the meadows while Carex aquatilis and Calamagrostis inexpansa were common under the willow cover. The edge effect of these small meadows appeared to increase the availability of browse for moose.

Dense stands of mature willow, 1.8 to 4.6 m in height, were dominated by Salix bebbiana. Associate shrubs were S. discolor and S. gracilis. The understory was light and characterized by Calamagrostis inexpanse and shade-tolerant forbs. The majority of browse was unavailable to moose due to the height and maturity of the stands.

The average herbage and browse production of all willow dominated communities combined from 1973 and 1974 are given in Table 5. The mean production of available browse was 1,406 kg/ha, and ranged from a high of 2,225 kg/ha in dense low shrub communities to 702 kg/ha in dense stands of mature *Salix bebbiana*. Using the average leaf to twig ratio (3.9:1) of willows in open shrub communities, approximately 280 kg/ha of browse is available to moose in winter. The mean herbage production was 562 kg/ha. *Carex aquatilis* and *C. atherodes* contributed 62 percent and grasses, primarlly *Calamagrostis inexpansa*, provided 26 percent of the total herbage production:

66 *

4. Willow Savanna Community

The willow savanna community was described as a Calamagrostia inexpansa-Carex atherodes grassland dominated by willows that are distributed relatively uniformly throughout the community (Figure 5). Willows were distributed singly or in small clusters with a mean distance of 6.5 m between shrubs greater than 0.5 m

The soils of the willow savanna community were an Orthic Gleysol with a thin organic surface layer (L-H), 3 to 8 cm thick, over a black organic mineral horizon (AH), 8 to 13 cm thick, over stratified and gleyed silty clay. The sence of a discontinuous B horizon indicates a development toward an Orthic Humic Gleysol. The soils were imperfectly drained and retained soil moisture above drought point throughout the growing season in 1973 (Figure 6). Soil temperatures rose rapidly in June and reached a maximum of 15°C at 8 cm and 12°C at 38 cm in August 1973.

Mean frequency and canopy cover of major species in the willow savanna community are listed in Table 4. The total shrub cover was savanna community are listed in Table 4. The total shrub cover was 38.6 percent and was dominated by Salix bebbiana (58 percent of the 38.6 percent and was dominated by Salix gracilis, S. discolor; S. total cover). Secondary species: Salix gracilis, S. discolor; S. padophylla and S. maccalliana contributed 19, 7, 5, and 3 percent, padophylla and S. maccalliana contributed 19, 7, 5, and 3 percent, padophylla occurred sporadically respectively, of the shrub cover. Salix candida occurred sporadically and became more frequent toward the transition zone between the willow savanna and poorly drained communities, particularly the



Figure 5. The willow savanna plant community from aerial (above) and ground (below) perspectives, showing the scattered distribution of willows in a Carex atherodes - Calamagrostis inexpansa grassland





.

patterned fen community. Scattered aspen clones were established on better drained sites. Invasion of aspen into the willow savanna community appeared to be limited by seasonal fluctuations in soil moisture conditions. The total production of browse below 2.1 m was 442 kg/ha while the winter browse was 87 kg/ha (Table 5). 70

The grassland cover was dominated by Calamagrostis inexpansa (74.3%) with Carex atherodes (12.6%), C. aquatilis (5.5%), C. eartwellii (5.4%) and Agropyron trachycaulum (6.1%) as secondary species (Table 4). Common forbs included: Astragalus agrestis, Aster inciformis, and Fragaria virginiana with a dover of 7.5, 4.2 and 6.5 percent, respectively. Total herbaceous production averaged 678 kg/ha (Table 5).

5. Aspen-willow Community

The mesophytic uplands and better drained lowlands were dominated by a Populus tremuloides-Salix bebbiana-Shepherdia canadensis-Elymus innovatus plant community. Occasional patches of white spruce occurred as relics of the former climax forest. Evidence of previous fires were observed in the form of charred logs and fire-scarred mature aspen. Young, regenerating white spruce were common but of sporadic occurrence.

The mean frequency and canopy cover of herbaceous and browse species in the aspen-willow community are given in Table 4. Both frequency and canopy cover varied between upland and lowland sites and appeared to be related to soil moisture conditions. Generally, the aspen formed a moderately open stand of trees, 15 to 20 m in height and averaged 15 cm d.b.h.,¹ while mature trees reached 30 cm d.b.h. Aspen cover varied between 35 and 47 percent. Scattered balsam poplar, generally located in moist sites, had a mean cover of 4 percent. A distinct tall shrub layer was dominated by willows, primarily Saller bebbiana, and had a canopy cover of 36 percent. Shepherdia canadensis and Rosa acicularis formed a low shrub layer. Herbaceous, cover was characterized by Elymus innovatus, Calamagrostis inexpansa, Fragaria virginiana and Epilobium angustifolium. Arctos taphylos uva-ursi formed the majority of ground cover on the

drier sites.

Total available forage production varied from 731 kg/ha in upland sites to 530 kg/ha in lowland sites (Table 5). Herbaceous production was considerably higher in upland sites (196 kg/ha) than in lowland sites (39 kg/ha). The mean browse production was 520 kg/ha, of which Shepherdia canadensis contributed 40 percent (207 kg/ha), and willows 43 percent (224 kg/ha).

Other available browse, including Rosa acicularis, Amelanchier • alnifolia, aspen and balsam poplar, had a mean production of 89 kg/ha.

1dbh = diameter at breast height

Willows in the aspen poplar community had a leaf to twig ratio of 9.4:1, reducing the palatable winter browse to about 22 kg/ha.

B. Moose Abundance

A total of 26 moose were observed over 309 km flown during aerial surveys in January, 1974. The average density of moose in the region was estimated at 0.21 moose per square kilometer.

Seventeen moose were recorded in the Site Two study area, yielding an observed density of 0.47 moose per square kilometer. The density of moose in willow dominated communities was 0.9 moose per square kilometer. No moose or moose tracks were observed in the aspen-willow or mixedwood communities.

C. Winter Habitat Use

1. Use of Plant Communities

The pellet-group survey showed moose-used the willow savanna and patterned fen communities considerably more than the adjacent aspenwillow community (Table 7). The willow savanna community sustained 3.2 and 1.3 days-use per hectare in 1973 and 1974, respectively, while the patterned fen community sustained similar use in both years (an average of 2.4 days-use per hectare). The aspen-willow community sustained low use, averaging 0.4 days-use per hectare, in both years. Table 7. Moose use of three plant communities in the Site Two study area; calculated from pellet-group counts in 1973 and 1974.

{

Moose days/hectare		3.2 1.3 2.3	2.3 2.5 2.4	0.4 0.3 0.4
Pellet-groups/ hectare		41.6 16.9 29.9	29.9 32.5 *31.2	° 5.7 3.9 4.8
Sample size ^l		230 100	200	217 217 100
Voor	TCOT	1973 1974 Mean	1973 1974 Mean	1973 1974 Mean
	Plant Community	Willow savanna	Patterned fen	Aspen-willow

lNumber of 2 m x 50 m pellet-group plots.

5

Observations of pellet-group distribution within a community showed that localized areas received greater use than other portions of the same community. Field observations also indicate a change in plant community use during the winter. In mid-winter, nearly all moose and moose feeding activities were observed in the patterned fen community. In the following spring, considerably more moose winter browse activity was observed in the willow savanna than had been observed during mid-winter. Local residents reported greater movements of moose, particularly crossing the highway near the study area, during late February and in March than during early winter periods. This increase in moose activity was also reported to generally occur when snow depths increased and began <u>crusting</u>.

The change in intensity of use of plant communities between years shown by pellet-group counts (Table 7) is also shown by the amounts of CAG browsed by moose (Table 8). The magnitude of change in total browse use in the willow savanna between the winters of 1972-1973 and 1973-1974 is similar to the decrease in days-use per hectare between these winters. This relationship between total browse use and days-use per hectare also follows for the patterned fen and aspen-willow communities (Tables 7 and 8).

2. Moose Winter Food Habits

Moose winter browse use was examined in three plant communities by comparing the composition and relative use of deciduous browse (Table 9). Goodness-of-fit comparisons showed that the expected

	J	PLANT COMMUN	IITY	
Winter	Willow Savanna	Patterned	Fen	Aspen-willow
	~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~~	·		
1972-73	12.4	5.9		2.2
1973-74	4.5	8.2		1.0
MEAN	7.8	•7.1	· ·	1.5

¥.

# Table 8. Percent of available CAG¹ browsed by moose in three plant communities during two winters.² ...

. .

,

¹Current annual growth. ²Data derived from Table 9.

	1			•			)
			1	,	(	. ,	
		Browsed	1.9	0 2.5 1.7	0.5	11.5	
by moose		browsed Browsed	7.7 6.7	0 25.0 8.3	0 14.3 1.4	44 5.6	
browse	Aspen	Composition X (X) F	52 <b>.</b> 1 3 <b>.</b> 9	3.5	15.3 6.3 9.1	976	
دً deciduous		CAG Com owsed	3.6 6.4	1.4 13.7 5.4	0•3	101 7.1	
€ er use¹ of	21	Z Shrubs' Z Browsed Br	20 <b>.</b> 0 19.9	6.6 39.8 1 14.6	9•T	309 1( 21.7	seasons -
ition and winter	PLANT COMMUNIT Patterned Fen	ti .		10.7 37.0 2.9	21.9		vinter se
			3.5 24.0			8 1,423	-1974
cies compos les.		Shrubs % CAG ² rowsed Browsed		0 0 18.3 46.3	/ 6.2 ) 12.5	95 5 7.8	3 and 19
the species communities.	Willow Savanna	<b>60</b>	24.4	0 0 36.5 68.8	20.7	248 20.5	1972-197
comparison of the species three plant communities.	<b>LIEW</b>	Composition Z (Z)	56.1 15.4	14.5 5.3 1.3	2.4 0.7	1,210	¹ Combined data from the 1972-1973 and 1973 ² Current annual growth.
A - comp		0	ana Lor	gracélis maccalliang candida vadophylla	glauca glandulosa tremiloides balsamifera	· · · · • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	ed data t annual
Table 9		Species	S. bebbiana S. discolor	S. gractlis S. maccalli S. candida S. vadophyl		Sample S Mean	¹ Combined ² Current

distribution of browse use differed significant from the occurrence of browse species in each plant community (Table 10).

•

77

In the willow savanna community, the number of Salix bebbiana, S. candida and S. padophylle shrubs browsed were significantly greater than expected according to availability. No Salix maccalliana and S. gracilis shrubs were browsed. They were considered unpalatable species avoided by moose. The number of Salix discolor, Populus tremuloides and P. balsamifera shrubs browsed fell within the range expected according to availability.

A similar trend of browse preference and avoidance is shown by the amount of CAG browsed from each species (Tables 9 and 10). Salix padophylla had the highest proportion of individual shrubs browsed (68.8%) and the most CAG browsed (46.3%), followed by Salix candida with 36.5% of the shrubs browsed and 18.3% of the CAG browsed. The amount of browse removed from both species was significantly greater than expected according to availability. Browse use of Salix bebbiana and S. discolor, 8.5% and 8.9% respectively, fell within the range expected. While the humber of Salix bebbiana shrubs browsed was significantly greater than expected, the total amount of CAG removed was not, indicating that moose removed less CAG from each browsed salix bebbiana shrubs than browsed Salix padophylla and S. candida

In the patterned fen community only Salix condida sustained significantly greater use than expected. Browsing on about 40 percent Table 10. A comparison of the observed and expected use of shrubs and CAG of different brouge species by moose in three plant communities.

**`** 

كم .

• • •

LLION hits of brown	ese ese		11. 6.8 ^{n.e.} 15.5	(0) within the range
ASPEN-WILLOW Number of Units shrubs browsed br	obs	31 1 + 1 0 0 0 + 5 1 - 1 0 0 0 + 5 1 - 1 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0	44 25.7* 15.5	<b>'p</b> <b>L</b>
ED FEN Units of CAG		2 0 4 22 0 24 2 - 11 72 + 38 2 0 3 2 0 3 1 - 22	101 58.3* 12.6	(-) significantly less
PATTERNED FEN Number of Units	shrubs promech obs exp	10 ° 11 68 ° 74 210 + 114 6 ° 9 5 - 68	309 155.9* 12.6	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·
of cAG ¹		58 ° 53 17 ° 53 10 - 14 7 + 1 1 ° 1 1 ° 1 1 ° 2 1 ° 2	95 64.7* 14.1	significantly,
WILLOW SAVANNA	a ed	166 + ⁴ 139 44 0 38 0 - 13 19 + 11 11 + 3 6 0 6 2 0 2	248 80.6* 14.1	<pre>browse was (+) availability. ess than 0.05.</pre>
	Species	<ul> <li>S. bebbiana</li> <li>S. discolor</li> <li>S. gracilis</li> <li>S. candida</li> <li>S. candida</li> <li>S. glauca</li> <li>B. glandulosa</li> <li>P. tremuloides</li> <li>P. balsamifera</li> </ul>	TOTAL Chi-square calculated: Tabular value P<0.05	<pre>ICurrent annual growth. 20bserved. ³Expected. ⁴Symbols denote where browse was (+) significantly more. ⁶'a' denotes a value less than 0.05.</pre>

of Salix candida shrubs removed about 14 percent of the CAG. Salix bebbiana, S. discolor and S. padophylla were browsed in approximate proportions of their abundance in this community. Salix maccalliana and Betula glandulosa sustained significantly less browse use* than expected according to their availability.

In the aspen-willow community, the number of Salix bebbiana and Populue tremuloides shrubs browsed were significantly greater than expected. Salix bebbiana comprised 52 percent of the available browse shrubs and contributed 66 percent of the total browse use from about 8 percent of its population. Browse use of uncommon palatable willows including Salix discolor, S. padophylla and S. glauca fell within the range of use expected according to availability. Salix maccalliana and Betula glandulosa did not sustain any browse use. Because of the small sample size of CAG browsed, 1.5% of that available in the aspen-willow community, no significant differences between observed and expected use of CAG were found.

A comparison of browse use in relation to shrub height of common willows in each community showed the use of CAG on shrubs that were all available were not greatly different from shrubs that were partially available (Table 11). However, individual shrubs of *Salix bebbiana* and *S. discolor* that were all available generally had a greater amount of the CAG browsed in the 70 percent class than shrubs that were partially available. Use of willow browse in relation to shrub height (availability). T. 110

					<b>X</b>				
	Total CAG ¹ Used (X) 11.4	7.2	15.6	30 C	0	¢	15.7	2.2 3.3	
Percent of Shrubs Browsed in Each Class	Use Classes ² 30 70 95 10 10 2		4 <u>5</u> 3 <u>1</u> 9 <u>10</u> <u>3</u>			4 8 8 4	13 16 14 <b>1</b>	4 2 2 4 4 1	
	t tion	¥ 8	46 68 6 52 62 8	49 100 47 100	66 100 33 100	52 80 ¹ 48 88 ¹	3 88 93 55 15	41 93 51 93	
	Shrub X Availability Popu	All ³ Partial ⁴	All Partial	All Partial	All Partial	All Partial	All Partial	A11 Partial	
	Species	S. bebbiana A	S. discolor A	S. maccalliana A	s. gracilis	S. discolor	Scandida	S. bebbiana	
Table 11. Use of Willow Proved	Plant Community	Willow Savanna	0			Patterned Fen		Aspen-willow	

¥

Ø Current annual growth.

⁴Partially available - greater than 10% and less than 90% of CAG between 0.4 m and 2.5 m in height ²Range of browse use classes are shown in Table 1. ³All available - greater than 90% of CAG between 0.4 m and 2.5 m in height.

80

Ъ.,

In the willow savanna and aspen-willow communities, moose were obtaining browse above the arbitrarily assigned availability height (2.5 m) by breaking down upper branches and feeding on the terminal leaders. Although a small percentage of the total shrubs were subject to this type of browse use, four or more broken upper branches was common on selected shrubs.

The degree of previous browse use of various willow shrubs was found to have a marked influence on the current winter browse use pattern (Table 12). Previously unbrowsed willows sustained very little current use while moderate to heavily hedged willows sustained much greater current use (Figure 7). In all preferred willows, the probability that a shrub would be browsed during the current winter increased with the increase in the degree of previous use. For example, in the willow savanna, only five percent of previously unbrowsed *Salix bebbiana* shrubs were browsed during the current winter while 93 percent of the shrubs that had sustained heavy use in previous years were again browsed by moose.

The degree of previous use also influenced the amount of CAG removed from a shrub (Table 12). On previously unbrowsed shrubs the intensity of current browse use was low, generally within the 5 and 30 percent use classes. On moderate to heavily hedged shrubs the current browse use removed a considerably higher proportion of the CAG, generally within the 30 and 70 percent use classes. This direct relationship of greater use of CAG on shrubs with greater levels of previous use is best illustrated by moose selection and use



.

82

Figure 7. The difference in browse use sustained by these adjacent Salix bebbiana shrubs exemplifies moose browse selection in the study area; the shrub on the right sustained repeated heavy use while the shrub on the left received no apparent browse use.

\$ Table 12. The relationship of previous browse use (degree of hedging) of individual shruha

Plant Commutty         Spectes         Frevious-Use         Browsed in Each Browse Use         Total X o           Plant Commutty         Spectes         (degree of hedding)         0         5         30         9         5         1         0         5         5           Willow Savanna         Salix bebbiama         none         95         2         2         1         0         5         5           Willow Savanna         Salix bebbiama         none         95         2         2         1         0         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5         5 <td< th=""><th></th><th></th><th></th><th>Percent</th><th>ent of</th><th>Shrubs</th><th>Currently</th><th>ntly</th><th></th><th></th><th>1 . - 7</th></td<>				Percent	ent of	Shrubs	Currently	ntly			1 . - 7
ty Species (degree of hedging) Class Shrubs by Species (degree of hedging) Class Shrubs a Salix bebbiana none 95 2 2 1 0 0 $\frac{5}{13}$ a Salix discolar none 95 2 2 1 0 $\frac{1}{13}$ bebbiana none 92 1 0 2 0 $\frac{1}{13}$ $\frac{1}$			Previous Use	Brows	sed in	Each B	LOWBE	Use			of
a Satix bebbiana none $95$ $2$ $2$ $1$ $0$ n=686 inght $71$ $17$ $8$ $4$ $0moderate 35 22 31 13 0heavy 7 9 31 44 9Salix discolor none 92 7 0 2 0n=184$ moderate $29$ $7$ $0$ $2$ $0n=184$ moderate $29$ $7$ $0$ $21$ $0heavy 0 0 18 73 9Salix discolor none 95 2 3 *1 0Salix discolor none 95 2 3 *1 0Salix candida none 95 2 2 3 *1 0n=509$ $11ght 60 12 25 0 50 +25 0Salix bebbiana none 95 2 2 1 0n=509 11ght 85 10 26 17 27 29 1heavy 1 1ght 90 6 4 0 0n=405 none 98 2 * * 0noderate 41 24 35 0 0$	Plant Community	Species (				Class				ur rently	7 Browsed
a Satix bebbiana none 95 2 2 1 0 n=686 light 71 17 8 4 0 moderate 35 22 31 13 0 heavy 7 9 31 44 9 Satix discolor none 92 7 0 2 0 n=184 light 68 16 14 3 0 n=184 none 92 7 0 2 0 Satix discolor none 95 2 3 *1 0 n=341 moderate 29 9 50 21 0 n=341 none 95 2 3 *1 0 Satix discolor none 95 2 3 40 0 heavy 25 0 50 -25 0 9 Satix bebbiana none 95 2 $\pi$ 1 0 n=509 moderate 69 16 12 4 0 n=405 none 98 2 * * 0 11ght 90 6 17 27 29 1 heavy 26 17 27 29 1 n=405 11ght 90 6 4 0 0 heavy 26 17 27 29 1 heavy 27 20 1 heavy 27 20 1 heavy 28 20 0 0 heavy 28 20 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0 0				0	2	õ	70	95		-	
$\begin{array}{cccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccccc$	Willow Savanna	Salix bebbiana	none	95	7	2	Ч	0	÷ .	Ś	•
moderate352231130salix discolarnone927931449salix discolarnone927020salix discolarnone927020salix discolarnone95231449salix discolarnone927020salix discolarnone9523 $*^1$ 0salix discolarnone9523 $*^1$ 0n=341none9523 $*^1$ 0salix condidanone9523 $*^1$ 0salix condidanone952210n=509light851033400salix bebbicananone952210n=405light92400n=405none982400n=405none9824000n=405none982400n=40511ght9038380n=40511ght916440n=40511ght91240n=40511ght91240n=40511ght913838n=405138380n=405138 </th <th></th> <th>n=686</th> <th>light</th> <th>.71</th> <th>17</th> <th>80</th> <th>4</th> <th>0</th> <th>• • •</th> <th>29</th> <th>4. </th>		n=686	light	.71	17	80	4	0	• • •	29	4. 
Salix discolorheavy7931449Salix discolornone927020 $n=184$ iight68161430 $n=184$ moderate29950210 $n=341$ none9523 $*1$ 0 $n=341$ iight60122260 $n=341$ moderate27033400 $n=341$ moderate25050250 $n=341$ moderate25033400 $n=341$ moderate25033400 $n=341$ moderate25033400 $n=341$ moderate25033400 $n=341$ moderate261727291 $n=509$ mone982**0 $n=405$ iight906400 $n=405$ moderate24038380 $n=405$ moderate24038380 $n=405$ moderate24038380 $n=405$ moderate24038380 $n=405$ moderate24038380			moderate	35	22	31	13	0	•	99	•
Salix discolornone927020 $n=184$ light68161430 $n=184$ moderate29950210heavy00187399Salix discolornone9523 $*1$ 0 $n=341$ none9523 $*1$ 0 $n=341$ none952210 $n=341$ none952210 $n=341$ none952210 $n=341$ none952210 $n=341$ none952210 $n=409$ ilght8510500 $n=405$ none982**0 $n=405$ 11243500 $n=405$ 11243500 $n=405$ none982**0 $n=405$ none982400 $n=405$ 11243500 $n=405$ none982400 $n=405$ none982** $n=405$ none982400 $n=405$ none983800 $n=405$ none91400 $n=405$ 1124350 <td></td> <td></td> <td>heavy</td> <td>7</td> <td>6</td> <td>ЗI</td> <td>44 *</td> <td>σ.</td> <td>•</td> <td>63</td> <td>· ·</td>			heavy	7	6	ЗI	44 *	σ.	•	63	· ·
n=184Iight68161430 $n=184$ moderate29950210 $neavy$ 0018739 $n=341$ none9523 $*1$ 0 $n=341$ none9523 $*1$ 0 $n=341$ none9523 $40$ 0 $n=341$ moderate27033 $40$ 0 $n=341$ moderate25050 $-25$ 0 $n=509$ light8510500 $n=509$ light8510500 $n=509$ light8510500 $n=405$ light9261727291 $n=405$ light9064000 $n=405$ none982 $*$ $*$ 00 $n=405$ none9824000 $n=405$ none9824000 $n=405$ none9824000 $n=405$ neavy24038380 $n=405$ neavy24038380 $n=405$ neavy24038380	•	Salix discolor	none	92	۰ <b>۲</b>	O,	2	0	•	<b>6</b> , 	
moderate2950210 $bayy$ 0018739 $salix discolor$ none9523*10 $n=341$ 11ght60122260 $n=341$ moderate27033400 $n=341$ moderate25050+250 $n=341$ none952210 $n=509$ light8510500 $n=509$ none9521727291 $n=405$ none982**00 $n=405$ 1ight906400 $n=405$ 112435000 $n=405$ 14906400 $n=405$ 140383800		n=184	light	68	16	14	ŝ	0		32	\ \
Salix discolorheavy0018739 $\mathbf{M}$ Salix discolornone9523 $\mathbf{*}^1$ 0 $n=341$ moderate9523 $\mathbf{*}0$ 0moderate27033 $40$ 0 $n=341$ moderate27033 $40$ 0 $n=341$ moderate27033 $40$ 0 $n=341$ moderate25050 $22$ 10 $n=509$ light8510500 $n=509$ light8510261727291 $n=405$ none982 $\mathbf{*}$ $\mathbf{*}$ 00 $n=405$ light906 $4$ 00 $\mathbf{*}$ 1612243500 $\mathbf{*}$ 9338038380		*	moderate	29	6	50	21	0	•	1	
Salix discolornone9523 $*^1$ 0 $n=341$ 11ght60122260 $moderate27033400heavy25050250n=509none952210n=50911ght8510500n=509none952240n=405none98261727291n=40511ght9064000rheavy240383800$			heavy	0	0	18	73	6		100	, , , ,
n=341light $60$ $12$ $22$ $6$ $0$ moderate $27$ $0$ $33$ $40$ $0$ heavy $25$ $0$ $50$ $-25$ $0$ $salix candidanone95221n=509light851052n=509light8510540n=509none952240n=405light851050640n=405none982**0n=405light906400n=405none982**0n=405none982*00n=4051006400n=4051024038380$	Patterned Fen	Salix discolor	none	95	2	°.	<b>1</b> #	0		و	
moderate $27$ 0 $33$ $40$ 0beavy $25$ 0 $50$ $-25$ 0 $0$ salix condidanone $95$ $2$ $2$ $1$ 0 $n=509$ none $95$ $2$ $2$ $1$ 0n=509light $85$ $10$ $5$ $0$ $0$ moderate $69$ $16$ $12$ $4$ $0$ salix bebbiananone $98$ $2$ $*$ $*$ $0$ n=405none $90$ $6$ $4$ $0$ $0$ n=405none $24$ $0$ $38$ $38$ $0$	•	n=341	light	60	12	22	9	<b>o</b>	یں	40	
Salix candidaheavy25050 $\star$ 250 $\bullet$ Salix candidanone952 $\bullet$ 10n=509light8510500moderate69161240heavy261727291 $n=405$ none982 $\star$ $\star$ 0n=405light90640n=405moderate4124330			moderate	27	0	33	40	0	•	73	
Salix candidanone $95$ $2$ $2$ $1$ $0$ $n=509$ light8510500 $n=509$ moderate69161240 $n=405$ none982 $*$ $*$ 0 $n=405$ 11ght906400 $n=405$ noderate412438380			heavy	25	0	50	- 25	0		<del>ک</del>	•
n=509light8510500moderate69161240heavy261727291Salix bebbicananone982**0n=405light906400 $\gamma$ heavy24038380	)	Salix candida	none	95	2	<b>8</b> 4	Ē	<b>*</b> 0	-	5	× ,
moderate69161240heavy261727291 $salix bebbiana$ none982**0 $n=405$ 11ght906400 $\gamma$ moderate41243500 $\gamma$ heavy24038380		n=509	light	85	10	Ś	0	0	•	12	-
Salix bebbiana       none       98       2       *       *       0         n=405       light       90       6       4       0       0         '       neavy       24       0       38       38       0			moderate	¢9	16	12	4	0		32	•
Salix bebbiana none 98 2 * * 0 n=405 light 90 6 4 0 0 moderate 41 24 35 0 0 heavy 24 0 38 38 0			heavy	26	17	27	29			74.	
light         90         6         4         0         0           moderate         41         24         35         0         0           heavy         24         0         38         38         0	Aspen-willow	Salix bebbiana	none	98	5	*	*	0	•	2	
41 24 35 0 0 24 0 38 38 0		n=405	light	06	9	4	0	0	•	9	
24 0 38 38 0		•	moderate	41	24	35	0	0	1	65	
	ŗ	Υ.	heavy	24	0	38	38	0	•	76	•
				•			*				

١

١

1

1'*' indicates value less than 0.05.

.

of Salix discolor shrubs in the willow savanna. The amount of CAG browsed by moose from previously unbrowsed or lightly hedged shrubs was generally within the same of the classes, while moderately and heaving the second second

Observations of moose track patterns in mid-winter indicated that movements between selected shrubs were not a random searching but a relatively direct movement between heavily hedged Salix candida clumps in the patterned fen community and between previously browsed shrubs of several species in the willow savanna community. Moderate to heavily hedged willows of taller species such as Salix bebbiana and S. discolor were visible to the author at distances greater than 100 m. Although many of the preferred Salix candida clumps were nearly obscured by snow cover and poorly visible, moose appeared to detect their presence and move in a direct path between clumps. In some instances a limited number of terminal shoots protruding through the snow cover may have been a visual guide used by moose to detect this low growing species.

Field observations showed that moose were cratering to obtain Salix candida browse from beneath the snow cover. Although the forelegs were used in some instances, the loose snow was normally moved aside by muzzle action to expose the current annual twigs.

#### 3. Summer Habitat Use

Moose tracks and browse use were infrequently encountered in the study area during the growing season (May to September). Only a few moose were estimated to remain in the study area during the snow-free period:

Moose activity was most frequently encountered the ecotone between the willow savanna and patterned fen communities. Use of other willow dominated communities was generally light. No moose activity was observed in the aspen-willow community in this season.

Willow browse comprised the greater portion of the observed forage use during the spring and summer. Moose commonly stripped the leaves from longer terminal leaders and rank growth but also used the upper portions of the current twig growth. Salix bebbiana and S. discolor were the major species browsed. Use of Salix candida/ was only observed on two occasions. No apparent difference in browse use was observed between previously browsed and unbrowsed willows. Use of aspen browse was recorded only once.

Small patches of seaside arrowgrass (*Triglochin maritima*) were heavily grazed by moose and appeared to be preferred to other available forage in June and July. D. Nutrient Content of Willow Browse

11. Moisture

The seasonal trend in moisture content of the total CAG in all willows declined steadily from a mean high of 63 percent in June to a mean of 53.1 percent in September (Table 13). Winter twigs averaged 46.1 percent moisture. The moisture content of overwintering twigs, collected at the onset of leaf-flush in May, averaged 8.4 percent higher than those during the dormant season.

In January, only Salix bebbiana showed a significant difference (P<0.05) in moisture content between browsed and unbrowsed plants. Moisture content in the total CAG of browsed Salix bebbiana, S. discolor and S. candida was generally higher than unbrowsed willows of the same species. This trend was most marked during June and the dormant season. The moisture content of the non-preferred willows, Salix maccalliana and S. gracilis, generally fell within the range of values obtained from preferred willows. A considerable variation in moisture content was found among individual willows within a species and browsed condition at each sampling period as revealed by the standard deviation of the mean.

The moisture content of leaves and twigs during the growing season showed the same seasonal trends described for the total CAG. However, the absolute moisture values were slightly lower than expected. This was apparently caused by desiccation during the separation of plant parts. The mean moisture content of leaves and twigs at each sampling period are given in Table 13.

.

.

n the current annual growth of six willows and octed under footnote 4).       stax willows and soled under footnote 4).         NUNE       JULY       AUGUST       SEASON         ± 0.9       56.4 ± 2.3       51.8 ± 1.6       52.5 ± 1.4         ± 0.8       55.5 ± 1.9       51.9 ± 2.1       51.5 ± 1.9         ± 0.8       55.5 ± 1.9       51.9 ± 2.5       53.7 ± 1.2         ± 2.5       60.5 ± 0.8       56.8 ± 2.5       53.7 ± 1.2         ± 2.8       57.6 ± 1.8       54.9 ± 1.5       53.7 ± 1.2         ± 2.8       57.6       1.7       52.5 ± 0.5       49.1         ± 2.8       57.6       54.1       53.7 ± 1.2         53.0       48.3       49.1       53.7 ± 1.2         53.1       55.1       .54.6       53.7 ± 1.2         55.1       .54.6       53.7 ± 1.2       57.2         55.1       .54.6       53.7       57.2         55.1       .54.6       53.7       53.7         56.9       54.0       53.7       53.7         56.9       54.0       53.5       53.7         52.1       49.6       53.5       53.5         52.1       49.6       53.5       53.5         52.1	a two browsed		JANUARY 44.4 ± 0.3 42.5 ± 1.0 48.5 ± 2.2 46.5 ± 0.3 46.4 ± 0.6 47.0 47.0 47.0 47.0 47.0 47.0 47.0 47.0	- 46.1	
n the current annual loted under footnote iUNE JULY ± 0.9 56.4 ± 2.3 ± 0.8 55.5 ± 1.9 ± 2.5 60.5 ± 0.8 ± 2.8 57.6 ± 1.8 ± 1.4 56.3 ± 1.7 53.0 63.5 60.3 55.1 57.6 55.1 57.6 52.1 52.1 4	six willows and	,	5 2 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5 5		0 shrubs).
			51.8 ± 51.8 ± 51.8 ± 56.8 ± 54.9 ± 54.9 ± 48.3 54.9 ± 48.3 54.9 ± 48.3 54.6 54.1	54.0 49.6	e sample (n= 1
	e current annı d under footno	AIDL	56.4 ± 55.5 ± 60.5 ± 57.6 ± 53.0 63.5 60.3 55.1 55.1 55.1	56.9 52.1	ingle composit
mean ± excel 55.1 ⁴ 55.1 ⁴ 56.9 56.9 52.7 - 40.8 40.8 40.8 52.7 - -	(mean ± SD) in th 6 except as noted	MAY JUNE	1 ⁴ 63.5         1       59.3         9       64.5         8       61.4         59.7       59.7         59.7       59.7         66.1       66.1         61.6       61.6         61.6       63.0		•_ ຫ
					ears. years. lard deviation a aves and twigs
Table 13. Moisture conten conditions (n=5 conditions (n=5 conditiSpeciesConditions (n=5 conditiSalix bebbiand5BR2 BR2 Salix bebbiand5BR3 BR2 BR2 Salix discolor5Salix bebbiand5UB Salix discolor5BR3 BR2 BR2 Salix adophylld5Salix candida5 Salix gracilis5UB BR2 Salix gracilis5UB BR2 BR2 BR2 BR2 BR2 Salix gracilis5MEAN LEAVESMEAN Salix gracilis5UB BR2 BR2 BR2 BR2 BR2 BR2 BR2MEAN LEAVESInstruction fresh weight. 2 Browsed in previous years. tholsture content of fresh weight.	I		Salix bebbiana ⁵ Salix bebbiana ⁵ Salix discolor ⁵ Salix discolor ⁵ Salix candida ⁵ Salix candida ⁵ Salix padophylla ⁵ Salix maccalliana ⁵ Salix gracilis ⁵ Galix gracilis ⁵ EAN ⁵	EAN LEAVES EAN TWIGS ercent of fresh weigh	² Browsed in previous years. ³ Unbrowsed in previous years. ⁴ Values without a standard deviation are from ⁵ Molsture content of leaves and twigs combined

87

/*• 2 .

٩

2

.
The moisture content in upper, middle and lower thirds of willow twigs showed the same seasonal trends described above. Moisture content was highest in the upper and lowest in the lower twig portions for all species and collection periods (Table 14).

2. Crude Protein

a. Current Annual Twigs

The seasonal content of crude protein was highest in June, averaging 10.4 percent, when willow twigs were actively developing, declined rapidly by July and reached their lowest levels, averaging 5.3 percent, in August (Table 15). A moderate increase in protein concentrations occurred before leaf abscission in September, followed by relatively stable protein levels, averaging 6.3 percent, during the dormant season. The protein content of overwintering twigs increased during the onset of leaf-flush in May. Unbrowsed Salix bebbiana willows contained considerably more protein than browsed S. bebbiana willows during this season.

Twig protein content varied considerably among individuals of a species and browsed condition at most sampling periods. Statistical differences between species within a browsed condition were found at each sampling period but these were not consistent throughout the year. No species of willow was markedly different in protein content in any collection period.

					•	W SPECIE		a	بو	* da
eason	Nutriont	Sali	: bebbig		Sally	discolo			e candi	
	• • • • •	U	м	. <b>L</b> >	Ŭ	N	L	U -	X	L
	Hoistur						4		50.5	45.7
.,	Crude Protein							12.6	7.3	124.1
	A. D. Fiber		•						49.2 23.4	53.2 24.0
	A. D. Lignin		•					22.6	2.8	2.
	Ash							0.61	0.52	
	Calcium							0.32	0.23	0.
	Nagnesium ²							3.7	3.0	2.
lune	Hoisture			•				79.1	72.1-	53.
	Crude Protein							14.6	12.7	10.
	A. D. Fiber							36.5	39.4	45.
	A. D. Lignin							13.5 5.3	16.9 6.2	19.
	Ash				,			0.56	0.48	ō.
	Calcium							0.72	0.65	<b>0</b> .
٠	Magnesium Sodium ²			•	*			8.4	3.7	5.
July	Moisture	51.1	51.4	50.9	61.4	56.6	54.7	57.3	54.4	53.
Jury	Crude Protein	7.6	5.8	5.1	8.5	5.6	4.9	8.4	-5-8	5.
	A. D. Fiber	46.4	53.0	51.5	45.2	53.1	54.6	45.4	55.3	54.
	A. D. Lignin	23.9	25.2	21.5	20.3	19.6	21.4	22.2	27.1	25. 3.
	Ash	3.7	3.1	2.9	3.4	2.3	2.3 0.40	3.9 0.55	0.45	0.
	Calcium	0.53	0.48	0.53	0.44	0.38 0.21	0.40	0.38	0.27	Ő.
	Magnesium Sodium ²	0.30 5.5	0.23 2.7	0.22 4.0	3.2	2.5	2.9	2.9	5.0	3.
August	Moisture	47.5	46.1	45.3	46.3	53.1	51.4	49.1	48.5	42.
Nugust	Crude Protein	6.4	5.0	4.1	6.2	5.1	3.9	6.2	5.0	4. 56.
	A. D. Fiber	42.3	51.8	54.8	51.5	52.8	57.4	47.5	54.6 24.8	24
	A. D. Lignin	21.3	23.3	22.9	21.0	20.4	18.5	23.6	24.8	2
	Ash	3.1	2.4	2.3	2.5	1.8 '	0.39	0.57	0.51	ō
-	Calcium	0.60	0.59 0.23	0.60	0.00	0.15	0.13	0.33	0.28	ō
÷	Magnesium Sodium ²	0.29	3.0	2.7	3.3	3.5	2.0	4.3	3.6	2
September	Moisture	46.9	46.2	45.2	47.3	45.9	45.2	46.9	46.3	45
Sebcember	Crude Protein	6.6	5.7	5.6	7.1	5.6	5.5	6.6	5.8	5
	A. D. Fiber	45.9	51.9	53.4	44.5	51.1	53.6	49.9	54.4	56 26
	A. D. Lignin	23.7	23.7	25.0	19.5	19.9	20.2	25.9 3.0	2.5	20
	Ash	3.0	2.6	2.8	1.9	1.7	0.40	0.66	0.56	ō
	Calcium	0.76	0.65	0.72 0.21	0.45 0.20	0.18	0.17	0.31	0.25	ō
	Magnesium Sodium ²	0.31 2.3	0.21 2.3	1.7	2.6	-	2.6	3.2	3.4	1
January	Moisture							47.0	47.2	46
January	Crude Protein							7.2	6.1	. 5
	A. D. Fiber							47.7	50.4	51
	^a A. D. Lignin			•				24.0	22.4	20 2
	Ash							3.0 0.67	2.8 0.64	0
	Calcium		•					0.07	0.21	Ő
~	Magnesium	•						3.0	2.5	2
	Sodium							0.12		ō
	Phosphorous Crude Fat							2.4	1.1	2

. . .

# Table 14. Seasonal nutrient content (2) in upper (3), middle (30 and lower (1) twig portions of three willow spacies.

¹Willows browsed in previous years. ²( $\% \times 10^{-2}$ ).

À

· ' }

Crude protein content¹ (mean  $\pm$  SD) in leaves and twigs of the curtent season's growth in six willows and two browsed conditions (n= 5 or 6 except as noted under footnote 4). Table 15.

MAY         JUNE         JULX         AUGUST         SETTORE $8.4 \pm 0.2$ $11.4 \pm 0.9$ $5.9 \pm 0.4$ $5.6 \pm 0.3$ $6.1 \pm 0.6$ $5.7 \pm 0.4$ $5.6 \pm 0.3$ $6.1 \pm 0.6$ $5.6 \pm 0.3$ $6.1 \pm 0.6$ $5.7 \pm 0.7$ $5.6 \pm 4.6$ $5.7 \pm 0.6$ $5.7 \pm 0.7$ $5.$	BrowsedMNYJUNEJUNEfiamaBR2 $8.4 \pm 0.2$ $11.4 \pm 0.9$ $5.9 \pm 0.3$ fiamaUB3 $13.6 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.3$ $6.3 \pm 0.3$ fidaUB $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.3$ $6.3 \pm 0.3$ fidaUB $ 9.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ fidaUB $ 9.7 \pm 0.2$ $5.6 \pm 2.0$ fidaUB $ 9.7 \pm 0.2$ $5.6 \pm 2.0$ fidaUB $  9.7 \pm 0.2$ fidaUB $  -$ <th></th> <th>SEASON</th> <th>SON</th> <th></th> <th></th>		SEASON	SON		
ICSBR2 bebriana $8.4 \pm 0.2$ $11.6 \pm 0.2$ $11.4 \pm 0.9$ $5.9 \pm 0.4$ $5.6 \pm 0.3$ $6.1 \pm 0.2$ $6.2 \pm 0.4$ bebriana $BR3$ $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $0.3$ $6.1 \pm 0.2$ $6.2 \pm 0.3$ $6.7 \pm 0.4$ bebriana $BR$ $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.3$ $5.3 \pm 0.2$ $6.2 \pm 0.3$ $6.7 \pm 0.4$ discolor $BR$ $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.8 \pm 1.2$ $5.9 \pm 0.3$ $5.4 \pm 0.3$ $6.7 \pm 0.4$ discolor $BR$ $3.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ $5.4 \pm 0.3$ $6.2 \pm 0.2$ candida $UB$ $BR$ $3.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $5.5 \pm 0.3$ $5.4 \pm 0.3$ $5.7$ candida $UB$ $BR$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.6$ $4.9$ $5.7$ candida $UB$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.6$ $4.9$ $5.7$ $5.7$ candida $UB$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.6$ $4.9$ $5.7$ $5.7$ candida $UB$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.6$ $4.9$ $5.7$ $5.7$ maceql/ticm $UB$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $5.4$ $4.5$ $5.7$ $5.7$ maced/lica $UB$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ MNES $BR11.5^410.210.210.210.210.210.2MNESBR11.611.712.112.112.29.211.2MNESBR10.210.210.21$	IGSBR2 bebbianaB.4 $\pm$ 0.2 bebbiana11.4 $\pm$ 0.9 0.35.9 $\pm$ 0.0 6.3 $\pm$ 0.0 6.3 $\pm$ 0.0 6.5 $\pm$ 0.0 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.4 7.	MAY	X10r	AUGUST	SETTOBUT	
ISS bebrianaBR2 bebriana $8.4 \pm 0.2$ $11.6 \pm 0.2$ $11.4 \pm 0.9$ $5.9 \pm 0.3$ $6.1 \pm 0.2$ $6.2 \pm 0.3$ bebrianaUB3 $13.6 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.2$ $6.1 \pm 0.2$ $6.2 \pm 0.3$ disex/orUB $13.6 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.2$ $5.2 \pm 0.2$ $6.3 \pm 0.2$ $6.2 \pm 0.3$ disex/orUB $13.6 \pm 0.2$ $9.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ $6.1 \pm 0.2$ disex/orUB $9.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ $5.4 \pm 0.3$ $6.7 \pm 0.2$ candidaUB $9.2$ $5.4$ $4.9$ $5.7$ $5.7$ candidaUB $ 9.2$ $5.4$ $4.5$ $5.7$ candidaUB $ 9.2$ $5.4$ $4.5$ $5.7$ candidaUB $  9.2$ $7.6$ $5.7$ candidaUB $  9.2$ $5.4$ $4.5$ $5.7$ candidaUB $  9.2$ $7.6$ $5.4$ $4.5$ $5.7$ candidaUB $   7.4$ $5.8$ $6.3$ $5.7$ maceollianuUB $      -$ MNS $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $5.7$ $ -$ MNS $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $5.7$ $ -$ AVISBebrianaBR $10.2$ $10.4$ $5.1.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ bebbrianaBR $10.2$ <	IGSBR2 bebbiana $8.4 \pm 0.2$ $11.4 \pm 0.9$ $5.9 \pm 0.3$ bebbiana $BR$ $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.3$ $6.3 \pm 0.3$ bebbiana $BR$ $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.2 \pm 0.3$ $6.3 \pm 0.3$ discolor $BR$ $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.2 \pm 0.3$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ discolor $BR$ $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ discolor $BR$ $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ candida $BR$ $ 9.2$ $7.8$ candida $BR$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.8$ maccellianu $UB$ $ 9.2$ $7.8$ gracilis $UB$ $ 9.2$ $7.8$ $M$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $M$ $BR$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.2$ $discolorUB  9.27.4MBR11.5^410.210.4 \pm 5.3MBR11.5^410.213.8 \pm 1.2MBR11.5^410.213.4 \pm 1.2MBR10.010.4 \pm 1.213.8 \pm 1.2MBR10.314.4 \pm 1.213.8 \pm 1.2MBR10.010.4 \pm 1.213.8 \pm 1.2MM10.010.4 \pm 1.213.8 \pm 1.2MM10.010.4 \pm 1.213.6MMM10.210.4 \pm 1.2MMMMM<$					C
bebbicanaBR* bebbicana8.4 $\pm 0.2$ 13.6 $\pm 0.2$ 10.9 $\pm 0.3$ 9.8 $\pm 1.2$ 6.2 $\pm 0.2$ 6.6 $\pm 0.3$ 6.2 $\pm 0.2$ 6.6 $\pm 0.6$ bebbicanaBR $=.3 \pm 0.2$ $1.9 \pm 0.2$ $5.9 \pm 0.3$ $5.7 \pm 0.2$ $6.6 \pm 0.6$ disoclorBR $=.3 \pm 0.1$ $9.12$ $5.9 \pm 0.5$ $5.5 \pm 0.2$ $6.6 \pm 0.6$ $=.000000000000000000000000000000000000$	bebbiana $BR^4$ $8.4 \pm 0.2$ $11.4 \pm 0.3$ $5.5 \pm 0.3$ bebbiana $BR$ $8.4 \pm 0.2$ $10.9 \pm 0.3$ $5.3 \pm 0.6$ discolor $UB$ $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.2$ discolor $UB$ $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.2$ candida $UB$ $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.2$ candida $UB$ $ 9.2$ $5.6$ candida $UB$ $ 9.2$ $7.4$ padophylla $UB$ $ 9.2$ $7.4$ gracilis $UB$ $ 9.2$ $7.4$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $M$ $UB$ $ 9.2$ $7.4$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $M$ $UB$ $ 9.2$ $7.4$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $M$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $M$ $10.2$ $10.4$	•	() + 0 v	.6 ± 0.	•1 +	5.9 ± 0
bebly and discolorUB313.6 ± 0.210.9 ± 0.3 $6.2$ $\pm 0.2$ $6.7$ $\pm 0.4$ discolorBR8.1 ± 0.112.1 ± 1.0 $6.5$ $\pm 0.3$ $5.7$ $\pm 0.3$ $6.7$ $\pm 0.3$ discolorBR8.1 ± 0.112.1 ± 1.0 $6.5$ $\pm 0.3$ $5.6$ $\pm 0.3$ $6.2$ $\pm 0.2$ discolorBR $-$ 9.7 $5.6$ $\pm 0.3$ $5.7$ $\pm 0.3$ $5.7$ $\pm 0.3$ discolorBR $-$ 9.2 $5.6$ $\pm 0.3$ $5.7$ $\pm 0.3$ acordidaUB $-$ 9.2 $7.6$ $5.7$ padophyllaUB $  7.6$ $5.7$ maccellianuUB $  7.6$ $5.7$ maccellianuUB $  9.2$ $5.9$ $\pm 0.3$ maccellianuUB $  0.2$ $10.2$ MNES $  0.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ MNES $  0.3$ $5.3$ $0.3$ AN $    -$ MNES $  0.3$ $5.3$ AN $    -$ MNES $   -$ AN $   -$ MNES $   -$ MNES $   -$ MAES $   -$ MAES $   -$ MAES $   -$ MAE	beb ManaUB313.6 $\pm$ 0.210.9 $\pm$ 0.30.30.3discolorUB $=, 5 \pm 0.2$ $9.8 \pm 1.2$ $5.9 \pm 0.3$ discolorUB $=, 12.1 \pm 1.0$ $5.5 \pm 0.3$ $5.6 \pm 0.2$ candidaUB $=, 9.7$ $5.6 \pm 0.2$ $9.7 \pm 0.5$ candidaUB $=, 9.7$ $5.6 \pm 0.2$ $7.4$ candidaUB $=, 9.7$ $5.6 \pm 0.2$ $7.4$ candidaUB $=, 9.7$ $7.8$ maccallianaUB $=, 9.2$ $7.4$ gracilisUB $=, 9.2$ $7.4$ MUB $=, 9.2$ $7.4$ AN $10.2$ $10.2$ $10.2$ fisoucilisUB $=, 10.0$ $1.2$ maccallianaUB $=, 11.5$ $1.4$ discolorUB $=, 10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ AN $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ AN $10.4$ $1.7$ $1.2$ bebbicana $BR16.21.0bebbicanaBR16.21.0discolor0.814.4 \pm 1.712.8 \pm 1.0discolor0.814.4 \pm 1.713.6discolor0.814.4 \pm 1.713.6discolor0.814.4 \pm 1.713.6discolor0.814.413.6e$	$8.4 \pm 0.2$ <b>LL.4</b> T	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	+ +	2 #	.1 +
discript discript and discript $M_{\rm B}$ BR $8.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.2$ $5.5 \pm 0.2$ $6.6 \pm 0.6$ discript discript macocylican $M_{\rm B}$ BR $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $5.5 \pm 0.3$ $5.2 \pm 0.3$ $5.2 \pm 0.2$ condida condita podophyllaBR $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $5.6 \pm 0.3$ $5.4 \pm 0.3$ $7.0$ condita podophyllaBR $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.8$ $5.6$ $4.9$ $5.7$ pacophylla gracticsUB UB $ 9.2$ $7.4$ $5.6$ $5.7$ macocylianu gracticsUB UB $ 9.2$ $7.4$ $5.8$ $6.4$ MVES gracticsUB UB $ 9.2$ $7.4$ $5.3$ $5.7$ AN $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $6.4$ ANS MVES $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $6.4$ AN $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $6.3$ AN $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $6.3$ AN $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $6.3$ AN $10.2$ $10.3$ $1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ ANS $10.2$ $16.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbiana $0.8$ $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.3$ $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbiana $0.8$ $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $10.9$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbiana $0.8$ $11.7$ $12.6$ $12.7$	discriptionBR $3.5 \pm 0.2$ $9.5 \pm 0.8$ $6.12 \pm 0.2$ discriptionUB-9.7 $5.6 \pm 0.2$ candidaUB-9.7 $5.6 \pm 0.2$ candidaUB-9.7 $5.6 \pm 0.2$ padophyllaBR11.5410.2 $7.8$ macceditianuUB-9.2 $5.4 \pm 0.2$ graciliaUB-9.2 $7.6 \pm 0.2$ graciliaUB- $7.4 \pm 0.2$ graciliaUB- $7.4 \pm 0.2$ AN10.010.4 $6.3 \pm 1.2$ AN10.010.4 $6.3 \pm 1.2$ ANESBR18.8 $1.6.2 \pm 1.0$ bebbianaUB18.4 \pm 1.7 $12.8 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB18.8 $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ discolorUB18.8 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB18.8 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB18.8 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB18.8 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB13.5 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB13.6 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB13.6 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB13.6 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB0.814.7 \pm 1.7 $13.6 \pm 1.2$ bebbianaUB0.9 $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $13.7 \pm 1.6$ bebbianaUB	13.6 ± 0.2 10.9 ±		i +	7 ± 0	6.3 ± 0
discolorUB $ 9.8 \pm 11.2$ $5.9 \pm 0.3$ $5.4 \pm 0.3$ $6.2 \pm 0.2$ eardidaBR $8.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.3$ $5.4 \pm 0.3$ $6.2 \pm 0.2$ eardidaUB $ 9.7$ $5.6$ $4.9$ $5.7$ $5.7$ padophyllaBR $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.8$ $4.9$ $5.7$ $5.7$ padophyllaUB $ 9.2$ $7.8$ $4.9$ $5.7$ $5.7$ padophyllaUB $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $5.8$ $6.3$ $5.7$ graceliseUB $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $5.3$ $6.3$ $5.7$ $graceliseUB11.5^410.27.45.36.35.7graceliseUB11.210.212.49.9 \pm 1.111.4hebbicanciBR16.2 \pm 1.013.1 \pm 1.113.4 \pm 1.313.6 \pm 1.29.9 \pm 1.2hebbicanciBR1.712.8 \pm 1.013.1 \pm 1.113.4 \pm 1.29.9 \pm 1.2hebbicanciBR1.712.8 \pm 1.013.1 \pm 1.213.4 \pm 1.29.9 \pm 1.2hebbicanciBR1.6.2 \pm 1.013.1 \pm 1.113.4 \pm 1.29.9 \pm 1.2hebbicanciBR1.61.213.6 \pm 1.212.69.6 \pm 1.7hebbicanciBR1.213.6 \pm 1.212.69.61.2hebbicanciBR1.213.6 \pm 1.212.69.61.2$	discolorUB-9.8 ± 1.25.9 ± 0. $acmdida$ UB-9.75.60.5 $acmdida$ UB-9.25.4 $acmdida$ UB-9.25.4 $padophylla$ UB-9.25.4 $maccqliana$ UB-9.27.8 $maccqliana$ UB-7.47.4 $practlis$ UB-7.47.4 $maccqliana$ UB7.4 $practlis$ UB7.4 $maccqliana$ UB7.4 $practlis$ UB7.4 $maccqliana$ UB7.4 $M$ 0.010.46.31.4 $M$ 10.010.46.3 $M$ 10.010.46.3 $M$ 15.21.013.4 $hebbiana$ UB15.21.0 $hebbiana$ UB15.21.0 $hebbiana$ UB15.21.0 $hebbiana$ UB15.21.0 $hebbiana$ UB14.41.7 $hebbiana$ UB1.11.1	8.5 ± 0.2 9.5 ± 1	₹ 7·0 8·	4 4		6.7 ± 0
AndB.RB.1 $\pm$ 0.112.1 $\pm$ 1.06.5 $\pm$ 0.35.9 $\pm$ 5.7padophyllaB.R-9.25.44.95.7padophyllaB.R-9.25.44.95.7padophyllaB.R-9.25.44.95.7macceqlianuaUB-9.27.44.95.7macceqlianuaUB9.27.44.95.7macceqlianuaUB7.45.86.4MN10.010.27.46.35.36.3MS10.010.46.35.36.36.3MSB.R18.4 $\pm$ 1.213.1 $\pm$ 1.113.4 $\pm$ 1.39.4 $\pm$ 0.7bebbicanaB.R16.2 $\pm$ 1.013.1 $\pm$ 1.113.4 $\pm$ 1.29.6 $\pm$ 1.7bebbicanaB.R15.2 $\pm$ 0.914.4 $\pm$ 0.714.2 $\pm$ 0.910.2 $\pm$ 1.1bebbicanaB.R13.514.4 $\pm$ 0.714.2 $\pm$ 0.610.2bebbicanaB.R13.514.4 $\pm$ 0.714.2 $\pm$ 0.610.2bebbicanaB.R13.6 $\pm$ 1.212.1 $\pm$ 0.57.6 $\pm$ 1.7bebbicanaB.R13.514.4 $\pm$ 0.712.29.6 $\pm$ 1.7bebbicanaB.R13.6 $\pm$ 1.712.29.6 $\pm$ 1.7bebbicanaB.R13.6 $\pm$ 1.212.1 $\pm$ 0.57.6 $\pm$ 1.7bebbicanaB.R13.6 $\pm$ 1.212.09.6 $\pm$ 1.7bebbicanaB.R13.6 $\pm$ 1.212.2	accordidaBR $B.1 \pm 0.1$ $12.1 \pm 1.0$ $6.5 \pm 0.0$ candidaUB $ 9.7$ $5.6$ $7.8$ padophyllaBR $ 9.2$ $5.4$ padophyllaUB $ 9.2$ $7.8$ maccalianaUB $  7.4$ gracilisUB $  7.4$ gracilisUB $  7.4$ ME $10.2$ $10.2$ $7.4$ M $  -$ M $-$ <td>- 9.</td> <td>5<b>.</b>9 ±</td> <td>н н 1</td> <td>6 0 + 0 0 7 + 0 0</td> <td>6.4 2 0</td>	- 9.	5 <b>.</b> 9 ±	н н 1	6 0 + 0 0 7 + 0 0	6.4 2 0
ordition $9.7$ $5.6$ $4.9$ $5.7$ condidation $0.8$ $ 9.2$ $5.4$ $4.9$ $5.7$ parabolitica $0.8$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $5.8$ $5.7$ maccoglianu $0.8$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $5.7$ maccoglianu $0.8$ $11.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $5.3$ $5.7$ $5.7$ maccoglianu $0.8$ $10.2$ $7.4$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ MN $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $6.3$ MS $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ MS $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.3$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ discolor $0.8$ $14.4 \pm 0.7$ $14.4 \pm 0.7$ $14.2 \pm 0.9$ $10.2 \pm 1.1$ discolor $0.8$ $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.2$ $12.1$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolor $0.8$ $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $12.0$ $8.0$ $6.4$ condida $0.8$ $12.4$ $13.6$ $1.2$ $0.5$ $8.0$ condida $0.8$ $12.1$ $13.6$ $1.2$ $0.5$ $7.8$ $0.6$ condida $0.8$ $0.9$ $12.1$ <t< td=""><td>candida$9.7$$5.6$candida$0.8$$9.2$$5.4$padophylla$BR$$9.2$$5.4$maccellianu$0.8$$7.4$graciiis$0.8$$7.4$<math>graciiis$0.9.2$$5.6$$7.4$<math>graciiis$0.9$$0.2$$7.4$<math>graciiis$0.9$$10.2$$7.4$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$6.3$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$6.3$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$6.3$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$6.3$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$5.1$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$5.1$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.2$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.2$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.2$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.2$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$10.4$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$1.7$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$1.7$$1.7$$MN$$10.0$$1.7$$1.7$$MN$$1.3.7$$1.3.7$$MN$$1.4.4$$1.7$$MN$$1.4.4$$1.7$$MN$$1.4.4$$1.7$<t< math=""></t<></math></math></math></td><td>8.1 ± 0.1 12.</td><td>. 6.5 ± 0.</td><td>н <b>а</b> (</td><td>+</td><td></td></t<>	candida $9.7$ $5.6$ candida $0.8$ $ 9.2$ $5.4$ padophylla $BR$ $ 9.2$ $5.4$ maccellianu $0.8$ $ 7.4$ graciiis $0.8$ $  7.4$ $graciiis0.9.25.67.4graciiis0.90.27.4graciiis0.910.27.4MN10.010.46.3MN10.010.46.3MN10.010.46.3MN10.010.46.3MN10.010.45.1MN10.010.45.1MN10.010.41.7MN10.010.41.2MN10.010.41.2MN10.010.41.2MN10.010.41.2MN10.010.41.7MN10.010.41.7MN10.010.41.7MN10.010.41.7MN10.010.41.7MN10.01.71.7MN10.01.71.7MN10.01.71.7MN1.3.71.3.7MN1.4.41.7MN1.4.41.7MN1.4.41.7$	8.1 ± 0.1 12.	. 6.5 ± 0.	н <b>а</b> (	+	
condition padephylla9.2 BR 11.545.4 7.44.5 5.8 5.75.7 5.7 5.8 5.35.7 	canada9.25.4padophyllaBR-9.25.4maccallianaUB-7.8maccallianaUB7.4gracilisUB7.4gracilisUB-10.010.46.3NN10.010.46.311.5NEBR10.010.46.3N10.010.413.11N16.21.013.11bebbianaBR16.21.013.1bebbianaBR16.21.013.61discolorUB14.41.712.81discolorUB14.11.613.61discolorUB14.11.613.61discolorUB16.113.511.9candidaUB16.113.513.8padophyllaUB16.113.511.9padophyllaUB15.413.7diraccilisUB15.413.7diraccilisUB15.413.7diraccilisUB15.413.7dercent.oven-dry weight.15.413.7tercent.oven-dry weight.15.413.7tercent.oven-dry weight.15.413.7tercent.oven-dry weight.15.413.7			4.9	0.1	
padophyllaBR maccallianu11.54 $\cdot$ 10.2 $\cdot$ 7.8 $\cdot$ 4.9 $\cdot$ 5.7 $\cdot$ maccallianuUB11.5410.27.45.86.4gracilisUB11.5410.27.45.36.3M10.010.46.35.35.36.3MS10.010.46.35.35.36.3AVESBR18.4 $\pm 1.2$ 13.8 $\pm 1.3$ 13.6 $\pm 1.4$ 9.9 $\pm 1.1$ AVESBR16.2 $\pm 1.0$ 13.1 $\pm 1.1$ 13.4 $\pm 1.2$ 9.4 $\pm 0.7$ bebbianaBR15.2 $\pm 0.9$ 14.4 $\pm 0.7$ 14.22.0bebbianaBR14.1 $\pm 1.7$ 12.8 $\pm 1.0$ 13.9 $\pm 1.2$ 9.6 $\pm 1.7$ discolorUB14.7 $\pm 1.6$ 13.6 $\pm 1.2$ 12.1 $\pm 0.5$ 7.8 $\pm 0.6$ discolorUB14.7 $\pm 1.6$ 13.6 $\pm 1.2$ 12.1 $\pm 0.5$ 7.8 $\pm 0.6$ discolorUB13.511.913.9 $\pm 1.2$ 9.6 $\pm 1.7$ discolorUB14.7 $\pm 1.6$ 13.6 $\pm 1.2$ 12.1 $\pm 0.5$ 7.8 $\pm 0.6$ candidaUBUB13.611.212.1 $\pm 0.5$ 8.1candidaUBBR13.611.212.1 $\pm 0.5$ 8.1discolorUBBR13.612.212.1 $\pm 0.5$ 8.1candidaUBBR13.612.28.113.6gracilisUBBR13.612.28.112.6gracilisUB13.413.4	padophyllaBK maccallianu $1.5^4$ $10.2$ $7.8$ $7.4$ maccallianuUB $  7.4$ gracilisUB $  7.4$ gracilisUB $  -$ gracilisUB $  -$ AN $   -$ ANESBR $  -$ ANES $   -$ ANESBR $  -$ ANESBR $  -$ ANESBR $  -$ ANESBR $  -$ ANESBR $  -$ ANESBR $  -$ AN $   -$ ANESBR $  -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $   -$ AN $  -$ <td< td=""><td></td><td>5.4</td><td>4.5</td><td>5.1</td><td></td></td<>		5.4	4.5	5.1	
maccallianUB11.510.46.35.86.4gracilisUB $-$ 7.45.86.4gracilisUB $  7.4$ 5.86.4gracilisUB $ 10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $6.3$ $6.3$ AVESAVESBR $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.3$ $13.60 \pm 1.4$ $9.9 \pm 1.1$ bebbicanaBR $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbicanaUB $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ bebbicanaBR $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUB $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUB $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUB $13.6 \pm 1.7$ $12.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUB $13.6 \pm 1.7$ $12.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUB $13.6 \pm 1.7$ $12.9 \pm 0.5$ $8.0$ candidaUB $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.0 \pm 0.5$ $8.0$ candidaUB $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.0 \pm 0.5$ $8.1$ maccallianaUB $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.0 \pm 0.5$ $8.1$ gracilisUB $13.4 + 1.7$ $12.6$ $8.6$ gracilisUB $13.4 + 12.6$ $8.6$ $8.6$ ANIntrovous years $13.4 + 12.6$ $8.6$	maccallianaUB11.510.4 $6.3$ gracilisUB $ 1.4$ $5.3$ gracilisUB $ 10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ AVESBR $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ AVESBR $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ bebbianaBR $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ bebbianaUB $14.4 \pm 2.1$ $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.00 \text{ lor}$ UB $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.1$ $disoclorUB14.7 \pm 1.712.8 \pm 1.1disoclorUB14.7 \pm 1.712.8 \pm 1.1disoclorUB13.511.9candidaUB14.7 \pm 1.712.8 \pm 1.1candidaUB13.511.9candidaUB 13.6padophyllaBR15.413.6padophyllaUB15.413.4padophyllaUB15.413.4padophylla15.413.4padophylla15.413.4padophylla15.413.4padophylla15.413.4padophylla15.413.4padophylla13.413.4padophylla15.413.4padophylla15.413.4padophylla13.413.4padophylla13.413.4padophylla13.413.4padophylla13.413.4padophylla13.4<$		• ·	4.9	5.7	
gracilisUB-6.35.36.3AVES $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $6.3$ AVES $10.0$ $10.4$ $6.3$ $5.3$ $5.3$ $6.3$ AVES $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.3$ $1356 \pm 1.4$ $9.9 \pm 1.1$ bebbiana $BR$ $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbiana $BR$ $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ bebbiana $BR$ $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolor $BR$ $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ discolor $BR$ $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ candida $UB$ $13.5 \pm 1.6$ $11.9 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ candida $UB$ $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ candida $UB$ $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ candida $UB$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ candida $UB$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.0$ $8.1$ maccalliana $UB$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $8.0$ gracilis $UB$ $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $12.6$ $8.6$ gracilis $UB$ $13.7 \pm 1.2$ $12.6$ $8.6$ gracilis $UB$ $13.7 \pm 1.2$ $12.6$ $8.6$ gracilis $UB$ $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ Broweld in previ	gracifis UB - 10.0 10.4 6.3 $\therefore$ N 10.0 10.4 6.3 $\therefore$ N NES hebbiana BR 10.0 10.4 6.3 $\therefore$ N bebbiana UB 16.2 $\pm$ 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1 discolor UB 16.2 $\pm$ 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1 discolor UB 14.4 $\pm$ 1.7 12.8 $\pm$ 1 discolor UB 14.1 $\pm$ 1.7 12.8 $\pm$ 1 discolor 11.9 $\pm$ 1.0 13.5 $\pm$ 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1 discolor UB 14.1 $\pm$ 1.7 12.8 $\pm$ 1 discolor 11.9 $\pm$ 1.0 13.5 $\pm$ 1.0 13.6 $\pm$ 1 discolor 11.0 $\pm$ 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.5 $\pm$ 1.0 13.6 $\pm$ 1 discolor 10.1 $\pm$ 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.5 $\pm$ 1.0 13.6 $\pm$ 1 discolor 10.1 $\pm$ 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.5 $\pm$ 1.0 13.5 $\pm$ 1.0 13.5 $\pm$ 1.0 13.6 {\pm} 1.0 13.6 {\pm} 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.7 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1.0 13.1 {\pm} 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.1 {\pm} 1.0 13.1 $\pm$ 1.0 13.7 {\pm} 1.0 13.1 {\pm} 1.0 13.4 {\pm} 1.0 13.1 {\pm} 1.0 13.4 {\pm} 1.	01			6.4	ø
AVES10.010.46.35.36.3AVESBR18.4 $\pm$ 1.213.8 $\pm$ 1.31360 $\pm$ 1.49.9 $\pm$ 1.1AVESbebbianaBR16.2 $\pm$ 1.013.1 $\pm$ 1.113.4 $\pm$ 1.39.4 $\pm$ 0.7AUSBR16.2 $\pm$ 1.013.1 $\pm$ 1.113.4 $\pm$ 1.39.4 $\pm$ 0.7AUSBR16.2 $\pm$ 1.013.1 $\pm$ 1.113.4 $\pm$ 1.29.4 $\pm$ 0.7AUSBR14.2 $\pm$ 1.712.8 $\pm$ 1.013.9 $\pm$ 1.29.6 $\pm$ 1.1AUSBR14.7 $\pm$ 1.613.6 $\pm$ 1.212.1 $\pm$ 0.57.8 $\pm$ 0.6AutidaBR13.511.912.013.9 $\pm$ 1.29.6 $\pm$ 1.7AutidaBR13.511.912.8 $\pm$ 1.013.9 $\pm$ 1.29.6 $\pm$ 1.7AutidaBR13.511.913.6 $\pm$ 1.212.1 $\pm$ 0.58.0AudophyllaUB13.712.810.38.1AutovilaUB13.712.08.1AutovilaUB15.413.712.68.6AustrilianUB15.413.412.68.6AustrilianUB15.413.412.68.6AustrilianKallues without a standard deviation are from an endard deviation are from an endar	AN AVES AVES bebbianabiana $bebbianabiana bebbianabiana bebbianabiana bebbianabianabiana bebbianabianabianabianabianabianabianabi$	- ED	* • •		*	
$ \begin{array}{ccccc} 10.0 & 10.4 & 10.4 & 0.9 & 11.1 \\ sbbiana & BR & 18.4 \pm 1.2 & 13.8 \pm 1.3 & 1350 \pm 1.4 & 9.9 \pm 1.1 \\ sbbiana & UB & 18.4 \pm 1.2 & 13.1 \pm 1.1 & 13.4 \pm 1.3 & 9.4 \pm 0.7 \\ sbbiana & UB & 15.2 \pm 0.9 & 14.4 \pm 0.7 & 14.2 \pm 0.9 & 10.2 \pm 1.1 \\ isoclor & BR & 1.7 & 12.8 \pm 1.0 & 13.9 \pm 1.2 & 9.6 \pm 1.7 \\ isoclor & BR & 14.7 \pm 1.6 & 13.6 \pm 1.2 & 12.1 \pm 0.5 & 7.8 \pm 0.6 \\ addida & UB & 13.5 & 11.9 & 12.0 & 8.1 \\ andida & UB & 13.5 & 11.9 & 12.0 & 8.1 \\ adophylla & BR & 13.7 & 12.0 & 8.1 \\ accalliana & UB & 13.7 & 12.0 & 8.1 \\ accolliana & UB & 13.7 & 12.0 & 8.1 \\ accolliana & UB & 13.4 & 13.7 & 12.0 & 8.1 \\ ccnt.oven-dry weight. & composite sample (n-10 shrubs). \\ \end{array}$	252810.010.4 $0.0$ 272811.213.81282816.21.013.12916.21.013.11201816.21.013.1201816.21.013.1201816.21.013.1201712.812014.31.712.82114.31.613.62113.511.9213511.9213511.92113.511.92113.513.62113.513.72215.413.42315.413.4261015.4261015.4261015.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.4261013.42613.42613.42613.42613.42	c r			6.3	6.3
AVESAVESbebbicaraBR $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.3$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbicaraUB $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbicaraUB $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ bebbicaraUB $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorBR $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.4 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ discolorUB $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ cardidaUB $13.5$ $11.9$ $12.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ cardidaUB $13.5$ $11.9$ $12.0$ $8.1$ cardidaUB $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ cardidaUB $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.0$ $8.1$ macoallianaUB $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.0$ $8.1$ macoallianaUB $13.7$ $12.0$ $8.1$ macoallianaUB $13.7$ $12.6$ $8.6$ All $13.7$ $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ All $13.4$ $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.$	AVESAVESbebbicana $BR$ $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.1$ bebbicana $UB$ $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ bebbicana $UB$ $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $14.4 \pm 2.1$ bebbicana $BR$ $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $14.4 \pm 2.1$ discolor $UB$ $14.1 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.1$ discolor $UB$ $14.1 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.1$ discolor $UB$ $BR$ $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.1$ candida $UB$ $BR$ $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.1$ candida $UB$ $BR$ $13.5$ $11.9$ candida $UB$ $BR$ $13.6$ $11.9$ candida $BR$ $13.5$ $11.9$ $13.6$ padophylla $UB$ $BR$ $16.1$ $13.6$ maccallicana $UB$ $15.4$ $13.4$ AN $15.4$ $13.4$ $4$ Stowsed in previous years. $composite sample$	·01	•	ŀ		
AVESAVESbebbianaBR $18.4 \pm 1.2$ $13.8 \pm 1.3$ $1360 \pm 1.4$ $9.9 \pm 1.1$ bebbianaUB $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbianaUB $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbianaUB $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $14.4 \pm 0.7$ $14.2 \pm 0.9$ $10.2 \pm 1.1$ discolorBR $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUBBR $14.7 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.0$ $13.9 \pm 1.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUBBR $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ condidaUB $13.5 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ condidaUB $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.2$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ condidaUB $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.7 \pm 1.2$ $12.2$ $8.0$ condidaUB $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.7 \pm 1.2$ $12.0$ $8.1$ macoallianaUB $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.7 \pm 1.2$ $8.0$ macoallianaUB $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.7 \pm 1.2$ $8.1$ macoallianaUB $13.7 \pm 1.6$ $12.0$ $8.1$ macoallianaUB $13.7 \pm 1.2$ $12.0$ $8.1$ macoallianaUB $13.7 \pm 1.3$ $12.6$ $8.6$ ManualitianaUB $13.4 \pm 1.2$ $12.6$ $8.6$ Analos $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $12.6$ $8.6$ Analos $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $12.6$ $8.6$ <tr<< td=""><td>AVESAVESbebbicanaBRbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBcondidaUBcondidaUBcondidaUBpadophyllaUBpadophyllaUBcorrelicanaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUB<td></td><td></td><td>1</td><td></td><td></td></td></tr<<>	AVESAVESbebbicanaBRbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBbebbicanaUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBdiscolorUBcondidaUBcondidaUBcondidaUBpadophyllaUBpadophyllaUBcorrelicanaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUBformationaUB <td></td> <td></td> <td>1</td> <td></td> <td></td>			1		
bebbianaBR10.4 = 1.013.1 = 1.113.4 = 1.39.4 = 0.7bebbianaUB $16.2 \pm 1.0$ $13.1 \pm 1.1$ $13.4 \pm 1.3$ $9.4 \pm 0.7$ bebbianaUB $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $14.4 \pm 0.7$ $14.2 \pm 0.9$ $10.2 \pm 1.1$ discolorBR $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $14.4 \pm 0.7$ $14.2 \pm 0.5$ $9.6 \pm 1.7$ discolorUB $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ discolorUB $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.1 \pm 0.5$ $7.8 \pm 0.6$ candidaUB $13.5$ $11.9$ $12.0$ $8.1$ candidaUB $13.6 \pm 1.2$ $12.0$ $8.1$ padophyllaUB $13.8$ $12.0$ $8.1$ maccallianaUB $13.6 \pm 13.7$ $12.0$ $8.1$ maccallianaUB $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ AN $15.4$ $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ AN $15.4$ $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ AN $15.4$ $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ AN $12.6$ $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ AN $13.4$ $12.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ Percent.oven-dry weight. $13.4$ $12.4$ $12.6$ Percent.oven-dry weight. $13.4$ $12.6$ $8.6$ Percent.oven-dry weight. $13.4$ $12$	bebbianaBR16.2 ± 1.013.1 ± 1bebbianaUB $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $14.4 \pm 0.4$ discolorBR $15.2 \pm 0.9$ $14.4 \pm 0.4$ discolorUB $14.1 \pm 1.7$ $12.8 \pm 1.4$ discolorUB $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.1$ discolorUB $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.1$ candidaUB $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.1$ padophyllaUB $14.7 \pm 1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.1$ padophyllaUB $13.5 - 1.1.6$ $13.6 \pm 1.1$ padophyllaUB $15.4 - 1.3.6$ $13.4 - 1.3.7$ gracilisUB $15.4 - 13.4$ $13.4 - 1.3.7$ AN $15.4 - 13.4$ $13.4 - 1.3.4$ Percent.oven-dry weight. $15.4 - 13.4$ Percent.oven-dry weight. $15.4 - 13.4$		1 2 1 2 8 ± 1.3	1 1.	9.9 ± 1.1	
bebbicanaUB10.2 ± 1.013.2 ± 0.914.2 ± 0.910.2 ± 1.1discolorBR15.2 ± 0.914.4 ± 0.714.2 ± 0.57.8 ± 1.0discolorUB14.7 ± 1.613.6 ± 1.212.1 ± 0.57.8 ± 0.6candidaBR14.7 ± 1.613.6 ± 1.212.1 ± 0.57.8 ± 0.6candidaUBBR13.511.910.38.0candidaUB13.511.912.08.1candidaUB13.513.812.08.1padophyllaUB-13.712.08.1maccallianaUB-13.712.08.2gracilisUB-13.413.712.68.6AN-13.712.68.66.6AN-13.413.412.68.6AN13.712.68.6AN13.712.68.6AN13.412.68.6AN13.412.68.6AN13.412.68.6AN13.412.68.6AN13.412.68.6AN13.412.68.6AN13.412.68.6Percent.oven-dry weight13.412.6Percent.oven-dry weight13.410.6 <t< td=""><td>bebbianaUB10.2 $\pm$ 1.01.1 $\pm$ 1.1discolorBR15.2 $\pm$ 0.914.4 $\pm$ 0.1discolorUB14.1 $\pm$ 1.712.8 $\pm$ 1discolorUB14.7 $\pm$ 1.613.6 $\pm$ 1candidaUB13.511.9candidaUB13.511.9candidaUB13.611.9candidaUB13.511.9candidaUB13.611.9padophyllaUB13.613.6padophyllaUB13.713.7gracilisUB15.413.4AN15.413.413.4bercent.oven-dry weight.15.413.4bercent.oven-dry weight.composite sample</td><td>10.</td><td>- T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T</td><td>13.4 ± 1.3</td><td>9.4 ± 0.7</td><td></td></t<>	bebbianaUB10.2 $\pm$ 1.01.1 $\pm$ 1.1discolorBR15.2 $\pm$ 0.914.4 $\pm$ 0.1discolorUB14.1 $\pm$ 1.712.8 $\pm$ 1discolorUB14.7 $\pm$ 1.613.6 $\pm$ 1candidaUB13.511.9candidaUB13.511.9candidaUB13.611.9candidaUB13.511.9candidaUB13.611.9padophyllaUB13.613.6padophyllaUB13.713.7gracilisUB15.413.4AN15.413.413.4bercent.oven-dry weight.15.413.4bercent.oven-dry weight.composite sample	10.	- T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T T	13.4 ± 1.3	9.4 ± 0.7	
discolorBR discolor15.2 $\pm$ 0.9 14.4 $\pm$ 1.7 12.8 $\pm$ 1.0 13.9 $\pm$ 1.29.6 $\pm$ 1.7discolorUBIA.1 $\pm$ 1.7 12.8 $\pm$ 1.0 13.9 $\pm$ 1.29.6 $\pm$ 1.7candidaUBIA.7 $\pm$ 1.6 13.6 $\pm$ 1.2 12.1 $\pm$ 0.57.8 $\pm$ 0.6candidaUBIA.7 $\pm$ 1.6 13.6 $\pm$ 1.2 12.1 $\pm$ 0.58.0candidaUBIA.7 $\pm$ 1.6 13.6 $\pm$ 1.2 12.1 $\pm$ 0.58.0candidaUBIA.7 $\pm$ 1.6 13.6 $\pm$ 1.2 12.1 $\pm$ 0.58.0candidaUBIA.7 $\pm$ 1.6 13.6 $\pm$ 1.2 12.08.1padophyllaUBIA.7 $\pm$ 1.6 13.812.08.1padophyllaUBIA.1 13.712.05.7maccallianaUBI6.113.712.05.7gracilisUBI5.413.412.68.2ANI5.413.412.68.6Fercent.oven-dry weight.composite sample (n= 10 shrubs).5.7	discolorBR discolor15.2 $\pm$ 0.9 14.4 $\pm$ 1.discolorUB14.1 $\pm$ 1.7 12.8 $\pm$ 1candidaBR14.7 $\pm$ 1.6 13.6 $\pm$ 1candidaUB13.5candidaUB13.5padophyllaUB13.6padophyllaUB13.6padophyllaUB13.6padophyllaUB13.6padophyllaUB13.6padophyllaUB13.6padophyllaUB13.7gracilisUB15.4AN15.413.4Percent.oven-dry weight.composite samplePercent.oven-dry veight.composite sample	10.2	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	+ + -	10.2 ± 1.1	
discolorUB14.1 ± 1.7 ± 1.6 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 0.57.8 ± 0.6candidaBR14.7 ± 1.6 ± 1.2 ± 0.38.0candidaUB13.5 ± 1.9 ± 1.2 ± 0.38.0candidaUB13.5 ± 1.6 ± 1.2 ± 0.38.1padophyllaUB13.6 ± 1.2 ± 0.38.1padophyllaUB13.7 ± 1.6 ± 1.2 ± 0.38.1padophyllaUB13.7 ± 1.6 ± 1.28.1padophyllaUB13.7 ± 1.6 ± 1.28.1maccallianaUB13.7 ± 1.6 ± 1.312.05.7gracilisUB15.4 ± 13.7 ± 12.58.6AN15.4 ± 13.4 ± 12.68.6AN15.4 ± 13.4 ± 12.68.6AN15.4 ± 13.4 ± 12.68.6Sourcettis15.4 ± 13.4 ± 12.68.6AN15.4 ± 13.4 ± 12.68.6Sourcettis15.4 ± 13.4 ± 12.68.6AN15.4 ± 13.4 ± 12.68.6AN15.4 ± 13.4 ± 10.812.6Sourcettis0ven-dry weight.composite sample (n= 10 shrube).	discolorUB14.1 ± 1.7 ± 0.6 ± 1.candidaBR14.7 ± 1.6 ± 13.6 ± 1.candidaUB13.5 ± 1.6 ± 13.6 ± 1.candidaUB- ± 13.8 ± 1.6 ± 13.6 ± 1.padophyllaBR- ± 13.8 ± 1.6 ± 13.6 ± 1.padophyllaUB- ± 13.8 ± 13.7 ± 1.6 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7 ± 13.7	15.2		) -   +   0	9.6 ± 1.7	
candida       BR       14.7 ± 1.6 13.6 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ± 1.2 ±	candida BR 14.7 ± 1.6 13.0 ± 1. candida UB 13.5 11.9 ± 1. candida UB 13.5 11.9 ± 1. padophylla BR 16.1 13.7 maccalliana UB 15.4 13.7 gracilis UB 15.4 13.4 ¹ AN 15.4 13.4 ¹ Percent. oven-dry weight. composite sample	14.1	·/ 12.0 1 1.		7.8 + 0.6	¥)
candidaUB13.511.91.08.1padophylla $BR$ 13.812.08.1padophylla $BR$ 16.113.712.08.2maccallianaUB $-$ 13.712.58.2gracilisUB $-$ 13.712.58.2 $MN$ $-$ 13.412.68.6 $MN$ $-$ 13.412.68.6 $MN$ $ -$ 13.412.68.6 $MN$ $    -$ troue oven-dry weight. $    -$ trowsed in previous years. $    -$	candida UB 13.5 11.9 candida UB - 13.8 padophylla UB 16.1 13.7 maccalliana UB 15.4 13.7 AN 15.4 13.4 AN	14	13.0 ± 1.	10 2 1.21	8.0 8.0	
padophyllaBR BR maccalliana13.7 UB12.0 12.55.7 8.2maccallianaUB gracilis13.7 12.512.6 8.28.2 8.2AN15.4 ercent.oven-dry weight.15.4 thout a standard deviation are from a revieweight.15.4 thout a standard deviation are from a trowsel in previous years.	padophylla BR 16.1 13.8 maccalliana UB 16.1 13.7 gracilis UB 15.4 13.7 AN 15.4 13.4 iercent.oven-dry weight. browsed in previous years.	, <b>J</b> 3	11.9			
maccallianaUB16.113.712.58.2gracilisUB-13.412.68.6AN15.413.412.68.6ANthout a standard deviation are from a composite sample (n= 10 shrubs).	maccalliana UB 16.1 13.7 maccalliana UB 15.4 13.7 AN 15.4 13.4 ercent.oven-dry weight. browsed in previous years.			0.21	5.7	
All are from a f	gracilis UB - 13.7 gracilis UB - 13.4 AN - 13.4 - 13.4 ercent.oven-dry weight + Values without a ercent.oven-dry weight	κ۳.	L3. /	2.21		
cent.oven-dry weight. vsed in previous years. 15.4 13.4 12.6 8.6 ⁴ Values without a standard deviation are from a composite sample (n= 10 shrubs).	cent.oven-dry weight. *Values without a composite sample	,	13.7	C.11	4	
cent.oven-dry weight. Vsed in previous years.	cent.oven-dry weight. Values without a veed in previous years.	L .	1 7 6 6	12.6	8.6	м ч
Values Without a standard ucvastor composite sample (n= 10 shrubs).	Values without a composite sample			and down at		single
				. 10 shrubs).		•
		•		•		

•

*،*د

¢

90

The crude protein content of browsed and unbrowsed willows of the same species differed at each collection period; however due to the variation among individual shrubs within a browsed condition, few of these were statistically different (P<0.05). Differences between browsed and unbrowsed willows were not consistent through all collection periods (Figure 8).

Crude protein levels were highest in the terminal third and lowest in lower twig portions (Table 14).

b. Leaves

Levels of crude protein in willow leaves were highest in June when leaves were actively developing and decreased steadily with maturity (Figure 8). Protein concentrations in June averaged 15.4 percent and were significantly higher (P<0.05) than the average of 8.6 percent in September (Table 15).

Differences in protein content among species occurred at each sampling period but were not consistent throughout the growing season.

3. Acid-detergent Fiber

. a.

<u>نان</u>

Current Annual Twigs

The acid-detergent fiber (ADF) content in willow twigs was generally lowest in June, averaging 38.3 percent, increased rapidly by July and reached an average maximum of 47.9 percent, during mid



Figure 8. Seasonal variation of crude protein (%) in the current annual leaves and twigs of browsed and unbrowsed willows. ---- browsed plants ..... unbrowsed plants

or late summer (Table 16). The sampling periods when maximum ADF levels were recorded varied among species and between browsed conditions. After the seasonal high, the ADF content exhibited a slight to moderate decrease and then remained relatively stable or decreased during the dormant summan (Figure 9).

Within species, all ADF levels, with the exception of Salix gracilis, were significantly lower in June than in July (P<0.05). Salix gracilis maintained a relatively constant ADF content, averaging 42.7 percent, from June to September and then showed a significant decline to 38.4 percent during the dormant season. Browsed Salix candida and S. padophylla and unbrowsed S. maccalliana also showed a significant decline in ADF, content from the September to the January collection periods.

Differences among species within a browsed condition did not exhibit a consistent pattern through the seasons. The ADF content of *Salix padophylla* maintained a relatively high level during the growing season but was significantly lower (P<0.05) than other browsed species during the dormant season. The ADF content of browsed *Salix candida* was lowest in June and highest in 'January in relation to other browsed willows (Figure 9). Of the unbrowsed willows *Salix candida* maintained the highest and *Salix maccalliana* the lowest ADF levels in nearly all seasons.

in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth (n=5 or 6 except as noted under footnote 4)Acid-detergent fiber content¹ (mean ± SD) in six willows and two browsed conditions Table 16.

0 JANUARY ++ +1 46.6 49.7 43.3 34.9 38.4 43.3 2 SEPTEMBER 1.0 0 0.1 0 6.4 4.9 +1 + +1 40.6 46.2 50.5 54.2 41.1 49.5 42.8 45.7 39.5 45.6 26.4 26.9 33.3 38.1 19.9 29.7 22.5 28.7 38.7 23.1 3.5 1.8 0.7 3.7 1.5 3.4 L.2 2. AUGUST +1 +1 47.6 48.8 44.4 39.9 49.3 38.8 52.2 47.7 45.8 26.0 25.8 35.5 43°3 26.2 24.5 19.6 37.7 19.6 21.7 26.3 SEASON 8 3.3 2.4 2.4 2.8 1.2 1.9 1.9 ÷. JULY +1 +1 +í ÷1 . +I 48.5 42.4 48.2 49.6 28.2 40.6 47.1 50.1 42.0 46.5 22.3 22.4 34.5 18.6 24.6 26.5 28.1 38.1 22.1 2.9 0.5 **1.**0 4.1 2.3 4.1 1.5 1.4 1.0 JUNE +I +1 +1 +1 ÷I, ÷ 19.3 ± 41 +i 35,8 42.9 34.3 39.0 35.3 37.4 24.0 25.4 30**.**6 42**.**6 38.3 20.0 33.7 46.7 35.5 18.8 26.5 28.7 25.8 4.9 0.8 0 0.1 0.2 MAY +1 +i +1 32.8 35.74 46.6 49.0 41.3 37.1 40.4 ł I À Condition Browsed BR² UB³ BR BR BR BR ¹Percent oven-dry weight. g B g BR UB BR BR BR an an an an maccalliana maccalliana padophy11a padophy11a S. bebbiana discolor bebbiana discolor discolor gracilis S. bebbiana bebbiana discolor candida S. gracilis candida candida candida Species LEAVES TWICS MEAN MEAN s. Ś ŝ Ś ŝ Ś Ś ŝ ŝ ŝ

²Browsed in previous years. ³Unbrowsed in previous years.

⁴Values without a standard deviation are from a single composite sample (n= 10 shrubs)





Browsed plants of Salix bebbiana and S. discolor were significantly higher in ADF content than unbrowsed plants of these species at most collection periods; an average difference in all seasons of 6.3 and 6.7 percent for Salix bebbiana and S. discolor, respectively. This relationship did not hold for browsed and unbrowsed Salix candida plants. 96_ \

The ADF content in upper, middle and lower thirds of willow twigs showed the same seasonal trends described above. ADF content was always lowest in terminal twig portions and highest in the lower twig portions (Table 14).

b. Leaves

Seasonal trends of ADF in willow leaves varied considerably among species (Table 16). ADF content in Salix bebbiana and S. padophylla planes varied little from their seasonal means of 26.2 and 19.2 percent, respectively. Salix discolor showed a marked increase in ADF from a mean of 19.7 percent in June to 31.5 percent in September. Salix candida contained the highest seasonal ADF levels, averaging 36.5 percent, and showed a moderate increase from June to September. The ADF content in Salix maccalliana and S. gracilis decreased from June to August and then increased slightly in September.

Browsed and unbrowsed willows of the same species showed similar seasonal trends in ADF content (Figure 9). Browsed Salix bebbiana and S. discolor plants were slightly higher in ADF content than unbrowsed willows of these species. The converse relationship was found in Salix candida leaves.

4. Acid-detergent Lignin (Lignin)

a. Current Annual Twigs

The seasonal trends in lignin content varied among the willows examined (Figure 10). The lignin content of Salix disgolor and S. condida was lowest in the developing twigs in June, increased, as the twigs matured, reached a maximum level in August or September and was followed by a moderate decline by January (Table 17). Salix: maccalliana and S. bebbiana showed a similar trend except for a decline in lignin content in August followed by an increase in September before decreasing or remaining relatively stable during the dormant season. The lignin content of Salix gracilis and S. padophylla was highest in June and generally decreased during the growing and dormant seasons.

Differences among species varied at each collection period. Browsed plants of *Salix candida* and *S. bebbiana* were significantly higher (P<0.05) in lignin content than other willows in the dormant season.

Few differences in lignin content were found between browsed and unbrowsed willows of the same species. Unbrowsed plants of *Salix discolor* contained slightly lower lignin levels than browsed plants at all sampling periods.



Figure 10. Seasonal variation of acid-detergent lignin (%) in the current annual leaves and twigs of browsed and unbrowsed willows. ..... unbrowsed plants The terminal third of willow twigs generally contained less lignin than sub-terminal portions during the growing season (Table 14). The middle portions contained the highest lignin content in July or August. The terminal third of *Salix candida* twigs contained the most lignin during the dormant season.

#### b. Leaves

The lignin content of Salix discolor and S. candida leaves increased steadily during the growing season (Figure 10). Salix discolor showed the greatest seasonal change in lignin, averaging 8.8 percent in June and 19.8 percent in September (Table 17). Lignin content of Salix bebbiana leaves initially increased by July, then generally declined as the leaves matured. The lignin content of Salix maccalliana and S. gracilis decreased between June and August, then increased slightly by September. The lignin content of Salix padophylla averaged 7.8 percent, varied little during the growing season and was significantly lower than other willows (P<0.05).

No significant differences were observed between leaves of browsed and unbrowsed willows of the same species.

5. ADL:ADF Ratio

.a. Current Annual Twigs

The acid detergent lignin:acid-detergent fiber (ADL:ADF) ratios in willow twigs generally remained fairly constant or increased Table 17. Acid-detergent lignin content¹ (mean ± SD) in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth in

.

six wil	six willows and two	browsed	conditions (n=5 or	r 6 except as	noted under	footnotë 4).	•
•	Browsed			SEASON			
Spectes	Condition	МАҮ	JUNE -	JULY	AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	JANUARY
TWICS				5			
Salix bebbiana	BR ²	$21.8 \pm 0.7$	•2 ± 3	23.7 ± 1.6	22.3 ± 2.3	ଖ୍ +	4 + 2
Salix bebbiana	UB ³	$21.3 \pm 0.7$	3.±2	24 <b>.</b> 3 ± 6.2	9 ± 1.	+ 5.	•
Salix discolor	BR		•5 ± 2	22.2 ± 1.4	22.3 ± 2.3	23.0 ± 1.7	18.9 ± 2.6
.Salix discolor	80	$14.8 \pm 0.4$	4 ± 1	$0.8 \pm 1.$	4 ± 1.	+ 2.	
Salix condida	BR	$25.8 \pm 1.0$	6 ± 1	23.2 ± 0.6	$24.8 \pm 1.4$	±.2.	0 +1 2
Salix condida	CUB	ľ	16.7	24.5	25.9	24.6	•
Salix padophylla	BR	ł	23.0	22.1	18.8	22.0	17.5 .
Salix maccalliana	B	19.44	14.8	22.9	20.4	22.0	17.3
Salix gracilis	۲ ۳	. 1	25.5	23.4	23.3	21.2	17.5
MEAN		- 20.1	19.0	23.0	22.2	22.9	19.6
LEAVES		۰. ۲					
Salix bebbiana	BR	-	$12.3 \pm 1.0$	14.8 ± 2.4	.13.6 ± 1.8	13.4 ± 1.9	
Salix bebbiana	<b>B</b> D		12.5 ± 2.5	14.9 ± 2.0	12.4 ± 1.4	13.8 ± 2.6	
	BR	-	• +I	0.7±1.	.+I	22.6 ± 4.1	
	<b>BB</b>		4 ± 1.	1.5 ± 1.	+	17.7 ± 4.1	
	BR		5 ± 1.	•5 ± 1.	<b>6</b> .9 ±	19.1 ± 1.2	
Salix condida	C BD		15.8	17.1	17.9	18.6	
Salix padophylla	BR		8.2	7.1	7.8	7.9	-
Salix maccalliana	ß	•	13.1	•		11.1	
Salix gracilis	ß		18.2	15.0	12.3	12.5	
MEAN			12.4	13.3	13.2	15.2	ŧ
•	-	4	•				
¹ Percentage of dry weight. ² Browsed in previous years. ³ Unbrowsed in previous years.	dry weight. vious years. revious years.				, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,		
⁴ Values without standard deviati	andard devia	ition are from	a single	composite sample	(n= 10. shrubs).	•S).	

slightly from early to late summer before declining during the dormant season (Table 18). Salix gracilie and S. padophylla showed a general decline in ADL:ADF with seasonal progression. Differences in ADL:ADF between species were not consistent at all collection periods. There was a consistent trend for the ADL:ADF ratios of browsed willows to be lower than that of unbrowsed willows of the same species.

#### b. Leaves

The ADL:ADF ratios in willow leaves showed no general trends between early and late summer collection periods (Table 18).

6. Cellulose

a. Current Annual Twigs

The cellulose content of willow twigs showed a general increase with seasonal progression; averaging 19.9 percent in early summer and 23.6 percent during the dormant season (Table 18). Previously browsed willows averaged 4 to 7 percent more cellulose than unbrowsed willows at all collection periods.

b. Leaves

Cellulose content of willow leaves remained relatively constant between early and late summer (Table 18). Salix candida leaves contained the highest cellulose levels, averaging 19.8 percent, in

Table 18. Composition of acid-detergent fiber (ADF), acid-detergent lignin (ADL), cellulose¹, and ADM:ADF ratio in leaves and twigs of willows during early summer, late summer and the dormant season. ۴

•

.

୍ତ

.

. ``

·		. *					0	SEASON					ŀ
			EARLY S	EARLY SUMMER (June)	•	L	ATE SUM	LATE SUMMER (September)	er)	8	ENANT SE	DORMANT SEASON (January)	5
SPECIES	B ROWSED CONDITION	ADF	ADL	Cellulose	ADL	ADF	ADL.	Cellulose	ADL: ADF	ADA	PDL	Cellulose	199
TWLGS							;						
Salix bebbiona	RP2	0 67	с I.C	C								•	
	2 2 2		7.12	1.12	54 ° O	40.2	.22.0	24.2	0.48	46.6	21.4	25.2	0.46
catin deputant	5 1		19.3	15.0	0.56	40.6	22.9	17.7	0.56	43.2	23.0	20.2	0.53
	BK	39.0	18.5	20.5	0.47	50.5	23.0	27.5	0.46	47-4	18.9	28.5	07 0
	, BD	35.3	17.4	17.9	0.49	41.1	21.8	19.3	0.53	42.7	18.1	24-6	
salux condida	BR	35.8	14.6	21.2	0.41	54.2	28.2	26.0	0.52	49.7	72.7	26.5	110
Saltx condida	5	37.4	16.7	20.7	0.45	45.7	24.6	21.1	0.54	1	, , ,		
Salix padophylla	BR	46.7	23.0	23.7	0.49	49.5	22.0	27.5	0.44	5.1.2	17 5	35 8	- 4 - 4
Salix maccalliana	B	<b>20.6</b>	14.8	15.8	0.48	39.5	22.0	17.5	0.56	24.9	17.2	5.00 7 F	
Salix gracilis	, gn	72.6	25.5	17.1	0.60	42.8	21.2	21.6	0.50	38.4	17.5	20. V	23
MEAN		38.3	0 01	10 2	07 0	Î.C. C							
					<b>1</b>	6°°+	6.22	C.12	16.0	43.3	19.6	23.6	0.46
LEAVES							•						
Salix bebbiana	BR	25.4	12.3	13.1	0.48	26.9	13.4	17.9	.05 0				
Salix bebbiana	ß	24.0.	12.5	11.5	0.53	26.4	13.8	11.3				,	
	BR	19.3	0.6	10.3	0.46	33-3	22.6		44.0				
Salix discolor	ß	20.0	9.4	10.6	0.47	29.7	17.7	0.11	0.60			1	
Salix candida	BR	33.7	13.5	20.2	0.40	38.1	19.1	1 01					
Salix condida	ß	35.5	15.8	19.7	0.45	38.7	18.6	20.1	87 0			,`	
Salix padophylla	BR	18.8	8.2	10.6	0.44	19.9	7.9	12.0	0.40			•	
Salix maccalliona	80	26.5	13.1	13.4	0.49	23.1		12.0	0 48				
Salix gracilis	85	28.7	18.2 *	10.7	0.63	22.5	12.5	10.0	0.56	•		.,	İ
MEAN		75 0	1 2 1										
1 		0.02	72.4	Ł3.2	0.48	28.7	15.2	13.6	0.53			ï	
lAcid_derevent 61hor													
Actu-ucceigent illuer minus lignin. ² Browsed in previous vers	naare veare	•		÷				-				•	
³ Unbrowsed in previous years	s veare												
	· Jeano.			• .				۰.			•		

.

102

ŗ

٠.

.-

43

,

ţ

comparison to all other willows which averaged 11.7 percent cellulose.

7. Ash

a. Current Annual Twigs

The seasonal levels of ash content in twigs were similar in all willows (Table 19). Ash content was highest in June, averaging 5.4 percent, decreased through the growing and dormant seasons and averaged 2.7 percent in January (Figure 11). Overwintering twigs increased in ash content at the onset of leaf-flush and averaged 3.6 percent.

Differences among species and between browsed and unbrowsed willows of the same species were not consistent through the study. Unbrowsed willows often contained slightly higher ash levels than browsed willows of the same species during the latter part of the growing season and the dormant season.

Ash content in willow twigs was always highest in the terminal third and lowest in the lower third (Table 14).

# b. Leaves

The ash content of willow leaves generally increased through the growing season from an average of 4.8 percent in June to 6.4 percent in September (Table 18). In *Salix discolor* and *S. gracilis*, the ash levels showed a marked decline in July before increasing in late

Ash content¹ (mean  $\pm$  SD)² in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth in six villows . and two browsed conditions. Table 19.

	Browend			SEASON	SON		
Species	Condition	МАҮ	JUNE	JULY	AUCUST	SEPTEMBER	JANUARY
TWIGS							
Salix bebbiana	BR ³	1	+I 0	3 ± 0	9 ± 0.	1 ± 0.	2 ±
	UB ⁴	3.5 ± 0.7	5.0 ± 0.2	3.5 ± 0.4	3.7 ± 0.6	2.9 ± 0.3	0 +1
Salix discolor	BR	3.6	+	0 +  0	2 ± 0.	2 ± 0.	+
	CUB B	5.2	+I 0	2 ± 0	6 ± 0.	5 + 0.	0 + 0
Salix condida	BR	3.1	<b>4</b> 9	8 ± 0	2 ± 0.	0 + 6	ŝ
	85	I	80	0	5	2	1
Salix padophylla	BR	1	5.1 ~	- 3.6	3.5		2.8
Salix maccalliana	UB	2.7	4.7	3.3	2.7	2.4	2.3
Salix gracilis	UB B	I	5.5	3.2	2.9	2.7	2.3
MEAN		3.6	5.4	3.4	3.1	2.7	2.3
LEAVES							
Salix bebbiona	BR		5.2	4.9	6.6	8.1	
Salix bebbiona	UB		4.7	6.6	6.3	7.8	
Salix discolor	- BR		6.0	4.5	5.3	6.2	
Salix discolor	UB B		5.2	4.2	6.2	6.5	
Salix condida	BR		2.7	4.7	5.3	4.7 *	
Salix candida	, BD		3.5	3.4	4.5	5.5	
Salix padophylla	BR		8.0	7.8	8.9	9.2	
Salix maccalliana	۹IJ.		3.3	4.6	5.2	5.2	
Salix gracilis	UB		4.9	. 3.6	4.9	4.6	
MEAN	2		4.8	4.9	5.9	6.4	

44

¹Percentage dry weight. ²Values without a standard deviation were from a single composite sample (n= 5 to 10 shrubs), othervise n= 3. * ³Browsed in previous years. ⁴Unbrowsed in previous years.



---- browsed plants

..... unbrowsed, plants

: .

summer. The ash content of Salix padophylla averaged 8.5 percent through the summer and was significantly higher (P<0.05) than other willows at all sampling periods.

#### 8. Calcium

a. Current Annual Twigs

Seasonal levels of calcium content in willow twigs were generally lowest in June and July when twigs were actively developing, reached peak levels in August or September and declined or remained relatively constant during the dormant season. Overwintering twigs of unbrowsed Salix bebbiana and browsed Salix discolor contained considerably higher calcium levels than twigs of these species during the dormant season. Calcium levels in overwintering twigs of browsed Salix candida and unbrowsed Salix maccalliana were slightly less than twigs of these species during the dormant season.

Differences among species and browsed conditions were not consistent through the study (Table 20). Calcium levels of unbrowsed preferred species ( $\bar{x} = 3.1$ %) were generally higher than the nonpreferred species Salix maccalliana and S. gracilis ( $\bar{x} = 2.3$ %). Unbrowsed Salix bebbiana, S. discolor, and S. candida generally contained higher calcium levels than browsed willows of these species.

Calcium levels were highest in the upper third and lowest in the lower third of *Salix candida*, *S. bebbiana* and *S. discolor* twigs in all collection periods (Table 14).

Calcium content¹ (mean  $\pm$  SD)² (%) in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth of six willows and two browsed conditions. ---Table 20.

....

	0.08 0.04 0.05 0.05	
JANUARY	0.50 ± 0.64 ± 0.38 ± 0.38 ± 0.52 0.78 0.52 0.52 0.51 0.55	
ER	0.21 00.13 00.13 00.13 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00.15 00	
SEPTEMBER	64 61 64 61 64 61 64 61 74 64 74 64 74 64 74 64 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 74 7	1.92 1.71 1.46 1.15 1.15 1.55 1.98 1.98
SE	09 11 12 12	
AUGUST	+1 +1 +1 +1	1.80 1.51 1.51 1.53 1.53 1.53 1.66 0.98 1.28 1.80 1.80
SEASON	0.10 0.62 0.25 0.84 0.06 0.54 0.15 0.56 0.03 0.46 0.84 0.84 0.84 0.90 0.70	
JULY SE.	. + <b>i +i +i +i +i</b>	02 63 69 86 89 89 81 48 48
5	09 0.61 10 0.69 06 0.48 06 0.52 0.56 0.57 0.55 0.55 0.53 0.55	1.02 1.63 0.72 0.69 0.89 0.81 1.48 1.48
Ë		<b>9</b> 9 9 7 5 9 7 5 9
JUNE	0.70 9.0.68 0.52 0.56 0.56 0.61 0.61 0.51 0.57	0.83 0.61 0.67 0.67 0.67 0.67 0.67 0.71 1.16 0.73
×	± •0	
MAY	- 0.90 0.88 0.88 0.49 - 0.71	
ed		
Browsed Condition	E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E E	路 路 路 路 路 路 路 路 路
	ta ana	i i ana s
	bebbiana bebbiana discolor discolor candida candida padophylla maccalliam gracilis	bebbiana bebbiana discolor discolor candida candida candida padophylla maccallian gracilis
ŝ	8888888888	ES 17:8:8: 17:8:8:17:8:8: 17:8:8:17:8:8: 17:8:8:17:8:8: 17:8:8:17:8:8: 17:8:8:17:8:8: 17:8:8:17:8:8: 17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:8:17:8:17:8:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:8:17:17:8:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:17:
Species	TWIGS Sal Sal Sal Sal Sal Sal Sal Sal Sal Sa	LEAVES Salti Salti Salti Salti Salti Salti Salti Salti

Zulues without a standard deviation were from a single composite sample (n= 5 to 10 shrubs), otherwise n= 7 ³Browsed in previous years.

"Unbrowsed in previous years.

107

.e

#### b. Leaves

The average calcium content in leaves of all willows combined showed a marked increase through the growing season from 0.73 percent in June to 1.51 percent in September (Table 20). The calcium content of *Salix gracilis* and *S. bebbiana* was significantly higher (P<0.1) than other willows at most sampling periods. Browsed willows of *Salix bebbiana* and *S. discolor* were generally higher in calcium content than unbrowsed willows of these species. *Salix and ida* showed the converse of this relationship.

# 9. Phosphorus

a. Current Annual Twigs

The phosphorous content of willow twigs averaged 0.27 percent in early summer and 0.12 percent in the dormant season (Table 21). Differences between browsed and unbrowsed willows of the same species were not consistent among Salix bebbiana, S. discolor and S. candida or between sampling periods. Salix padophylla contained the highest phosphorous content (Q.15 percent) of palatable, browsed species in the dormant season.

The phosphorous content in twig portions of browsed Salix condida during the dormant season were highest in the terminal third (0.12 percent) and lowest in the lower third (0.09 percent) (Table 14).

Species	Browsed Condition	<u>Early</u> leaves	twigs	<u>Dormant Seasor</u> twigs
Salix bebbiana	BR ³	0.38 ⁵	0.30 °	0.10
Salix bebbiana	UB 4	0.24	0.24	0.14
Salix discolor	BR	0.23	0.28	0.11
Salix discolor	UB	0.28	0.31	0.12
Salix candida	BR	0.22	0.24	0.10
Salix candida	UB	0.19	0.20	0•10
Salix padophylla	BR	0.38	0.25	-
Salix maccalliana	UB	0.32	0.28	0.15
Salix gracilis	UB	0.33	0.32	0.13 0.10
lean		0.29	0.27	0.12

Table 21. Phosphorous content (%) of willow browse during early summer¹ and the dormant season².

⁵Browsed in previous years. ⁴Unbrowsed in previous years. ⁵Values are from one determination of a pooled sample (n= 5 to 10 shrubs) (Alberta Soil and Feed Testing Laboratory).

#### b. Leaves

The phosphorous content of willow leaves in early summer averaged 0.29 percent (Table 21). Salix padophylla and browsed S. bebbiana contained the highest phosphorous levels (0.38 percent) while browsed and unbrowsed Salix candida plants contained the lowest levels (0.22 and 0.19 percent) respectively. Differences in phosphorous content between browsed and unbrowsed plants of the same species showed the same trend as willow twigs in early summer.

#### 10. Calcium-phosphorous Ratios

a. Current Annual Twigs

The calcium-phosphorous ratio in willow twigs averaged 2.1:1 in early summer and 4.9:1 in the dormant season (Table 22). Salix condida had the highest calcium-phosphorous ratios in both seasons. No consistent relationship was found between browsed and unbrowsed willows within a species.

#### b. Leaves

The calcium-phosphorous ratio of willow leaves averaged 2.7:1 in early summer (Table 22). Leaves of browsed and unbrowsed Salix candida plants contained the highest ratios (3.9:1 and 3.7:1, respectively), and Salix padophylla contained the lowest ratio (1.2:1).

	Browsed Condition	Early		Dormant Season Twigs
Species	Condition	Leaves	Twigs	IWIGS
Salix bebbiana	BR ³	2.2:1	2.3:1	5.0:1
Salix bebbiana	UB4	2.5:1	2.8:1	4.6:1
Salix discolor	BR	3.0:1	1.6:1	3.5:1
Salix discolor	UB	2.5:1	1.9:1	4.8:1
Salix candida	BR	3.9:1	3.1:1	7.8:1
Salix candida	UB	3.7:1	2.9:1	-
Salix padophylla	BR	1.2:1	1.6:1	4.2:1
Salix maccalliana	UB	1.8:1	1.3:1	4.0:1
Salix gracilis	UB	3.5:1	1.5:1	5.1:1
MEAN		2.7:1	2.1:1	4.9:1

Table 22. Average calcium-phosphorous ratios of willow browse during early summer¹ and the dormant season².

( **•** .

¹Samples collected June 6, 1973. ²Samples collected January 20, 1974. ³Browsed in previous years. ⁴Unbrowsed in previous years.

#### 11. Magnesium

#### a. Current Annual Twigs

The magnesium content of willow twigs was highest in June, averaging 0.38 percent, declined rapidly in mid-summer and reached the lowest levels, averaging 0.24 percent, in the late summer or dormant season (Table 23) A slight to moderate increase in magnesium content occurred in most unbrowsed willows in August.

The magnesium content in Salix maccalliana and S. gracilis twigs were generally hower than unbrowsed willows of palatable species. Unbrowsed Salix discolor plants contained higher magnesium levels than browsed plants of this species from mid-summer through the dormant season. Differences between browsed and unbrowsed plants of Salix bebbiana and S. candida were not considetent through the season.

The magnesium content of the terminal third of willow twigs was markedly higher than the lower two-thirds (Table 14).

#### Leaves

b.

The magnesium content in leaves of all willows except Salix can dida and browsed S. discolor showed a marked increase through the growing season. The magnesium content of all species combined averaged 0.52 percent in June and 1.04 percent in September (Table 23).

Species	Browsed Condition	МАУ	JUNE	JULY	SON AUGUST	SEPTEMBER	JANUARY
IMIGS	ç			VU V + V V	0 32 + 0 01	$0.27 \pm 0.03$	0.18 ± 0.03
	BR ³		57 + +	++ +	- - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - - -	56 H	+1
		0.2L ± 0.02	5	+ 0.07	17		$0.18 \pm 0.02$
	A A A	0.40	1+	+ 0.12	$0.31 \pm 0.04$	<b>31</b> ±	+1
	n n n	1 0 25		0.44 ± 0.08	0.28 ± 0.08	27 ±	0.25
	NA H	C7 • N	ł		0.34	0.24	1
	an an		0.23	0.22	0.18	0.20	0.25
Salix padophylla	NR N	, , , , ,		0 23	0.26	0.19	0.16
	8	0.27	•	0.74	0.21	0.23	0.18
Salix gracilis	gŋ	•					10 0
MEAN		0.23	0.38	0.29	0.29	0.24	17°0
			•	• •		:	
	;		2	0.66	0.79	1.18	
	BK			0.78	0.67	1.23	•
	an ar			1.35	0.25	:	
	BR		- <del>+</del> -	0.47	0.49	1.23	
	9 9 1			0 63	0.41	1	
	BR				0.85	0.46	
Salix condida	UB				9.6.0	1.36	J
	BR	v	0.07	0.67		0.93	
Salix maccalliana	UB			0.00	0 61	0.86	
Salix gracilis	ß						
			0.52	0.61	0.63	1.04	

• •

¹Percent of dry weight. ²Values without a standard deviation were from a single composite sample (n= 5 to 10 shrubs), otherwise n= Ì ³Browsed in previous years. ⁴Unbrowsed in previous years.

Ø

e 7

113

`ş

1

Salix padophylla and S. Bebbiana maintained the highest magnesium levels, averaging 0.97 and 0.79 percent respectively, through the growing season.

12. Sodium

a. Current Annual Twigs

Sodium content of willow twigs ranged from an average high of 0.029 percent in June to 0.014 percent in January (Table 24). Sodium levels generally showed a marked decrease by July when twigs were actively elongating, increased by August and then decreased again during the late summer and dormant seasons. The considerable variation in sodium content found within replicated treatments is shown by the standard deviation (Table 24). No differences between species or browsed conditions were evident.

Sodium content of *Salix candida* twig portions was generally highest in the terminal third and lowest in the lower two-thirds, averaging 0.042 and 0.034, respectively, through the growing season (Table 14).

b. Leaves

The average sodium content in willow leaves from all species during the summer was 0.026 percent (Table 24). The seasonal trends in sodium content varied among species. *Salix bebbiana* and *S. discolor* showed a general decline in sodium content through the growing season. Sodium content¹ (mean  $\pm$  SD)² in leaves and twigs of the current season's growth of six Table 24

.

ø

•

		4087
	JANUARY	1.4 ± 0.4 1.8 ± 1.0 1.8 ± 1.0 1.0 ± ± 1.0 1.0 0.7 1.0
	SEPTEMBER	$\begin{array}{c} 1.7 \pm 0.7 \pm 0.1 \\ 1.5 \pm 0.3 \\ 1.5 \pm 0.4 \\ 2.1 \pm 0.6 \\ 2.9 \pm 0.5 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.3 \\ 1.3 \\ 2.0 \\ 0.6 \\ 0.5 \\ 2.0 \\ 2.0 \\ 2.1 \\ 3.5 \\ 3.2 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\ 2.1 \\$
	ON AUGUST	$\begin{array}{c} 2.1 \pm 0.5\\ 2.4 \pm 0.5\\ 2.4 \pm 0.9\\ 2.1 \pm 1.0\\ 2.5\\ 2.5\\ 2.5\\ 2.5\\ 2.5\\ 2.5\\ 2.5\\ 2.5$
	SEASON JULY	1.9 ± 0.6 2.4 ± 0.3 1.1 ± 0.1 1.7 ± 0.3 3.2 ± 1.3 1.4 ± 0.3 1.4 ± 0.3 1.5 ± 1.3 1.5 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 ± 1.3 \pm
	JUNE	3.4 ± 3.2 3.4 ± 3.2 2.5 ± 0.7 2.2 ± 0.7 3.6 ± 1.8 3.6 3.6 3.7 3.3 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9 2.9
conditions.	MAY	$1.7 \pm 0.2$ $1.8 \pm 0.1$ $1.6 \pm 0.1$ $1.7 \pm 0.2$ $1.7 \pm 0.2$ $1.7 \pm 0.2$
and two browsed	Browsed Condition	张强联强强强强强强 跳动就强强强强强
Sodium C willows		IGS Salix bebbiana Salix bebbiana Salix discolor Salix discolor Salix candida Salix candida Salix gracilis Salix gracilis Salix bebbiana Salix discolor Salix discolor Salix discolor Salix discolor Salix adida Salix gracilis Salix gracilis Salix gracilis
Table 24.	Species	TWIGS Salix bebbiana Salix bebbiana Salix discolor Salix discolor Salix candida Salix padophyl Salix gracilis MEAN IEAVES Salix bebbiano Salix discolon Salix discolon Salix candida Salix padophy Salix candida Salix gracili Salix gracili

lPercent x10⁻² of dry weight. 2values without a standard deviation were from a single composite sample (n= 5 to 10 shrubs), otherwise n= 3. ³Browsed in previous years. ⁴Unbrowsed in previous years.

• •

Ŷ

These species also contained the lowest sodium levels, averaging 0.005 percent in September.

# 13. Ether Extract

a. Current Annual Twigs

Levels of ether extract (crude fat) were significantly lower (P<0.05) in young twigs ( $\bar{x} = 2.1$ %) in early summer than in mature twigs ( $\bar{x} = 4.0$ %) during the dormant season (Table 25). No contistent differences in ether extract were found between palatable and unpalatable species or between browsed conditions within species.

Ether extract in Salix candida twig portions during the dormant season was higher in the terminal third (2.4%) than in the lower two-thirds (1.7%) (Table 14).

# b. Leaves

The ether extract content in willow leaves averaged 2.4 percent in the early summer (Table 25). Little variation was found between species and browsed conditions.

E. Effects of Browsing on Willow Twig Production

The general procedure of using secondary stem units to measure current annual twig production under various degrees of natural and simulated browsing was found to be workable and soundly conceived.

Species	Browsed (Condition	Early Leaves	Summer	Dormant Season Twigs
Salix bebbiana	BR ³	2.4 ⁵	1.9	4.6
Salix bebbiana	UB ⁴	2.2	3.1	3.4
Salix discolor	BR	2.4	1.6	• 3.6
Salix discolor	UB	1.8	1.9	3.7
Salix candida	BR ()	2.2	2.2	3.4
Salix candida	UB	2.5	1.9	
Salix padophylla	BR	2.9	2.0 =	4.0
Salix maccalliana	UB	2.2	1.8	4.6
Salix gracilis	UB	2.6	2.9	. 4.6
MEAN		2.4	2.1	4.0

Ether extract (%) in leaves and twigs of six willow Table 25. species and two browsed conditions during early summer¹ and the dormant season².

²Samples collected June 6, 1973. ²Samples collected January 20, 1974. ³Browsed in previous years. ⁴Unbrowsed in previous years.

⁵Values are from one determination of a pooled sample; n=5 to 10 shrubs (Alberta Soil and Feed Testing Laboratory).

No statistical difference (P<0.05) in twig production was found between shrubs within a treatment. Some variation, found among the five secondary stem samples within a shrub, was expected due to the stratified random sampling method that included both lateral and terminal stems.

C

1. Simulated Browsing

a. Salix bebbiana

The results from the simulated browsing treatments showed that both intensity and season of clipping had a marked effect on the growth of twigs during the following season (Table 26). Season of clipping had a greater effect on twig growth than clipping intensity.

The average number of twigs per secondary stem were generally . higher on shrubs clipped in spring and lower on shrubs clipped in fall and winter than the controls. The 100 percent winter clipping ' treatment showed the most pronounced and significant (P<0.05) decrease in twig numbers while the 50 percent spring clipping treatment showed the greatest and significant increase in twig numbers.

The average length of twigs produced on shrubs subject to the 100 percent clipping intensity in spring was significantly shorter than control shrubs. The average twig length was significantly larger on the 50 and 100 percent fall clipping treatments and all winter clipping treatments than the control shrubs.

	Per
simulated leasured by dary stem,	Twig Weight Per
Table 26. Comparison of browse production on $Salix$ bebbiana shrubs the year following simulated by browsing of varying intensities and in different seasons. Production was measured by the number, total length and total weight of current annual twigs per secondary stem, by the mean length and weight of twigs and by twig weight per unit length.	
<i>d</i> nd shrubs the int seasons. Purrent annual twig weight pe	BROWSE PRODUCTION
on Salix bebbi and in differe al weight of c twigs and by	BROWSE
e production c intensities a ength and tota and weight of	
Comparison of browse browsing of varying the number, total le by the mean length	
26. Compari- browsin the num by the	
Table	

_ 〕			•	ບ
Unit Length (x10 ⁻³ ) (gm/cm)	13.5 d e	13.0 d e 11.7 e 16.0 c d	20.0 a b 20.5 a b 17.6 b c	20.9 a b 21.7 a 18.7 a b
(x10	<b>.</b>	<b>, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , </b>		
Total Twig Mean Twig Total Twig Weight Mean Twig Weight Length (cm) ¹ Length (cm) (gm) ¹ (x10 ⁻² ) (gm) (	þ	U THI O	م م م	р Брад
1 Twig k10 ⁻² )	10.9 c d	8.9 d 6.4 d 17.7 b c	23.1 a b 26.3 a ⁵ 17.6 b c	27.2 27.8 22.0
nt Mear ()		ð		
g Weigh ) ¹	1.9 c d	ο σ σ	ں ں م م ہ	ں م ب
al Twi (gm	1.9	2.2 b c 1.1 d 2.7 b c	3.6 a 2.7 b 2.6 b	3.3 a 2.5 b 2.5 c
g Tot			υ	υυ
an Twi gth (c	7.5 d e	6.0 e 5.0 c 10.0 b c	10.9 a 12.0 a b c 9.7 c d	12.5 a b 12.0 a b 11.1 a b
I Len	1	6. 10.	10. 12. 9.	
Twig (cm)	39.5 a b c	ີລູ ຫຼັ	ہ م د م د	165.1 a b 113.3 c 137.2 a b c
Total Length	139.5	172.8 a 104.6 c 168.7 a b	18.3 b c d 181.2 a 11.6 c d 125.4 b c 16.4 b c d 149.3 a b	and the second
Number of Twigs ¹ I	22.4 b c ² 1	c p D a a	ф с ф ф с ф с ф	13.9 c d 10.1 d 14.0 c d
and the second	22.4	33.4 a 25.8 a b 21.8 b c	18.3 11.6 16.4	13.9 10.1 14.0
Clipping Intensity	0	50% 100% Hedged	50% 100% Hedged	50% 100% Hedged
Clipping Season Intensity	CONTROL ³	SPRING	FALL	WINTER

¹Production per secondary stem. ²Means within the same column followed by a common letter are not significantly different (P<0.05).  $3_{n} = 8$  to 10 shrubs which provided 40 to 50 secondary stems per treatment.

÷

4

\$

с;

The total weight of twigs per secondary stem were significantly higher in the 50 percent clipping intensities in fall and winter a than in control shrubs. Willows subjected to the 100 percent clipping intensity in spring responded with a decrease in total weight of twig production but were not significantly different from the controls. The remaining treatments showed a 16 to 42 percent increase in total weight of twigs produced but were not significantly higher than the control shrubs.

The mean twig weights of the 50 and 100 percent fall and winter treatments and the hedged winter treatment were significantly higher than the controls. Hedged treatments in spring and fall responded with a moderate increase in mean twig weight. The 50 and 100 percent spring treatment showed a decrease in mean twig weight but were not significantly different from the control shrubs.

The weight-length relationship showed that 50 and 100 percent clipping treatments during spring resulted in shorter-smaller twigs than the controls. These differences however were not significant (P<0.05). Fifty and 100 percent clipping intensities in fall and winter had significantly higher weight-length ratios than the controls.

The weight-length ratios of hedged clipping intensities in all seasons were greater than but not significantly different than the controls.

The effect of simulated browsing on twig production under all clipping intensities were similar in the fall and winter treatments. Although simulated browsing in the fall and winter seasons decreased twig production, the combined effects of increased twig lengths and weights resulted in a significant increase in the available production of twigs. Simulated browsing under 50 and 100 percent clipping in spring resulted in an increase in twig numbers but a general decrease in twig production. Hedged clipping treatments responded with a moderate increase in twig production and showed the least variation among seasons.

# b. Salix discolor

١

The results from simulated browsing treatments on Salix discolor showed several effects on the growth of twigs in the following season (Table 27). However, only the 100 percent clipping intensity in fall showed a significant (P<0.05) difference from the control shrubs with an increase in mean twig weight and weight per unit length of twigs.

The average number of twigs produced per secondary stem on 100 percent and hedged spring treatments and 50 and 100 percent fall treatments were lower than the control shrubs. The 50 percent spring clipping treatment showed a 22 percent increase in twig numbers (Table 27).

All clipping treatments except the 100 percent spring and 50 percent fall treatments responded with an increase in total and mean

. Twig Weight Per Unit Length (x10⁻³) (gm/cm) υ ದ đ đ 14.8 b 17.8 14.7 18.4 17.2 the number, total length and total weight of current annual twigs per secondary stem, 12.8 16.3 Comparison of browse production on Salix discolor shrubs the year following simulated browsing of varying intensities and in different seasons. Production was measured by Total Twig Weight Mean Twig Weight (gm)¹ (x10⁻²) (gm) by the mean length and weight of twigs and by twig weight per unit length. υ U م م Д, đ đ đ υ 13.3 b 17.6 18.8 21.4 9.4 15.2 13.9 BROWSE PRODUCTION ab a, đ 1.56 a đ đ 1.67 2.13 2.11 2.02 2.07 1.17 Mean Twig Length (cm) a b a b ۵ đ đ فز م 8.7 6.9 6 10.9 9 0 8.1 8.7 Total Twig Length (cm)¹ đ đ ർ đ đ đ 101.8 97.2 110.9 122.7 85.9 124.2 136.0 Number of 14.4 a² Twigs¹ đ đ đ Ċ đ 12.5 17.6 14.4 13.2 10.1 12.7 Season Intensity Clipping Hedged Hedged 50% 100% 50% 100% 0 CONTROL³ Table 27. SPRING FALL

¹Production per secondary stem. ²Means within the same column followed by a can ³n = 10 shrubs which provided 50 secondary stem

letter are not significantly different (P<0.05) treatment.

Ð

twig length and total and mean twig weight. The 100 percent spring treatment showed a decrease in these parameters. Twig production . in the 50 percent fall treatment was slightly lower in total twig length and slightly higher in mean twig length, total and mean twig weight than the controls. (These differences were not significant P<0.05).

Fall treatments of all clipping intensities responded with an increase in twig size as expressed by the weight-length relationship. Spring treatments of 100 and 50 percent clipping intensities showed a decrease in twig size.

Hedged clipping intensities showed less variation between spring and fall treatments than other clipping intensities. One hundred percent clipping intensities showed the most variation with the greatest decrease in twig numbers in the fall treatment and greatest increase in average twig weight and length.

### 2. Natural Browsing

a. Salix candida

Woody twig production in *Salix candida* plants that were heavily browsed by moose were significantly (P<0.05) greater in mean length, total length, weight and weight per unit length than unbrowsed plants (Table 28).
BROWSE PRODUCTION	UNBROWSED SHRUBS	MOOSE-BROWSED SHRUBS
Number of twigs ¹	11.7a ²	7.6a
Total length of twigs (cm) ¹	42.7a	76.7b
Mean twig length (cm)	4.0a	11.0b
Total weight of twigs (gm) ¹	<b>∿.5.6</b> a	22.1b
Mean weight per twig (gm)	$5.4 \times 10^{-2} a$	33.6 x $10^{-2}$ b
Mean weight per unit length (gm/cm)	$13.1 \times 10^{-3}a$	° 29.0 x 10 ⁻³ b

Current annual twig production of unbrowsed and moose-browsed Salix candida shrubs. Table 28. ,

¹Production per secondary stem. ²Means within the same row followed by a common letter are not significantly different (P<0.05).

• '.

÷.

Within browsed Salix candida clumps, the intensity of previous browse use¹ also affected twig production on those secondary stems during the following season (Table 29). In heavily browsed Salix candida clumps, the total length and mean length of twigs on browsed secondary stems was significantly (P<0.05) greater than unbrowsed stems.

In moderately browsed Salix candida shrubs, the twig production of unbrowsed secondary stems were compared to three intensities of browsing¹ (Table 30). Secondary stems browsed the preceding domant season were significantly (P<0.05) higher in total twig lengths than unbrowsed stems or browsed stems that did not sustain any use in the preceding season. Average twig lengths were significantly (P<0.05) greater on secondary stems browsed only in the previous dormant season than other intensities of use. The number of twigs per secondary stem were not significantly different among treatments.

¹Determination of intensity of previous browse use is shown in Figure 12.



unbrowsed secondary stem

browsed only the previous dormant season



browsed in the last three dormant seasons



browsed in two previous seasons but not the preceeding season

Figure 12.

Comparison of Salix candida secondary stems with different "browse histories", showing how the degree of browse use in previous years is evaluated by examining the twig branching pattern and counting the number of terminal bud leaf scars and dead browsing points.

126

Table 29. Current annual twig production on browsed and unbrowsed secondary stems within heavily browsed Salix candida shrubs.

BROWSE PRODUCTION	UNB ROWSED STEMS	BROWSED STEMS
Total number of twigs per secondary stem	4.4a ¹	3.4a
Total length of twigs per secondary stem (cm) Mean length of twi	47.la	65.3Ъ
Mean length of twigs per secondary stem (cm)	10.7a	19.2b

¹Meáns within a row followed by a common letter are not significantly different (P<0.05). Table 30. The effect of browsing intensity on secondary stem twig production within moderately browsed Salix candida shrubs.

	DEGRE	E OF BROU	VSE UTILIZA	rion ¹
BROWSE PRODUCTION	A	. <b>B</b>	C	D
Number of twigs per secondary stem	16.7a ²	13.8a	18.9a	18.6a
Total length (cm) of CAG per secondary stem	.70.9a	134.2Ъ	145.6b	103.la
" Mean twig length (cm)	5.6a	10.4b	8.5a,b	7.la

¹A. No previous browsing (control).

B. Browsed only the previous dormant season.

C. Browsed in two or more dormant seasons, including the preceding season.

D. Browsed in previous dormant seasons, but not the preceding season.

²Means within same row follow by a common letter are not significantly different (P<0.05).

#### b. Salix bebbiana

Twig production in browsed Salix bebbiana shrubs was significantly different from unbrowsed shrubs (Table 31). The mean length and weight of twigs, total twig length and mean weight per unit length of current twigs per secondary stem were significantly (P<0.05) greater in browsed shrubs than unbrowsed shrubs. The total weight of twig growth per secondary stem on browsed shrubs (6.7 gm) was nearly double that of unbrowsed shrubs (3.5 gm). The difference was significant at P<0.1. Although the total length of twig production on umbrowsed shrubs averaged about 50 percent higher than browsed shrubs, this difference was not significant (P<0.1). The mean age and diameter of secondary stems at the base of the first lateral branches in unbrowsed willows were not significantly different than browsed willows.

Laure browsed Salix bebbiana shrubs. BROWSE PRODUCTION Age of secondary stems 1.9a ² 7.9a ² 7.2a	UNBROWSED N SHRUBS 7_9a ²	MOOSE-BROWSED SHRUBS 7.2a
s) r of secondary stems of twigs ¹ ]	11.0a 171.3a	11.0a 42.5b
twigs wigs	550.3a 3.2a	367.8a 9.1b
Total weight of twigs ¹ (gm)	3 <b>.</b> 5a	6.7a ³
Mean weight of twigs (gm) Mean weight of twigs per unit length	2.3 x $10^{-2}a$ 6.8 x $10^{-3}a$	$16.3 \times 10^{-2b}$ $18.1 \times 10^{-3b}$
<pre>(gm/cm) IProduction per secondary stem. ²Means within the same row followed by significantly different (P&lt;0.05). ³Significantly different at P&lt;0.1.</pre>	. 0	r are not

•

71

ŧ

4

)

130

6.

,

-.**k** 

¥

# DISCUSSION

# A. Nutritive Value of Willows for Moose

A good quality forage is considered to be highly palatable, having optimum levels of various nutrient components, a high apparent digestibility, optimum proportions of volatile fatty acids, adequate levels of minerals, vitamins and trace elements and is efficiently converted into the components necessary for the animal body (Dietz 1970). Kobota *et al.* (1970) found the seasonal availability of browse and herbaceous forage largely determined the levels of nutrient elements in the diet of moose. The level of nutrient intake is generally high in summer when many different kinds of plants are available, and low in winter when twigs are the primary source of feed.

## 1. Crude Protein

The crude protein content of willow leaves and twigs generally decreased as the current annual growth matured (Figure 3). The protein content of willow leaves declined from an average high of 15.4 percent in June to 3.6 percent in September. A more rapid decrease in leaf protein content between the August and September sampling periods coincided with a general increase in twig protein levels. Kramer and Kozlowski (1960) attributed this type of seasonal change to trans-location of nitrogenous compounds from leaves to the stems before leaf-abscission. The crude protein content of willow twigs was highest in June, averaging 10.4 percent, decreased rapidly during the period of active twig elongation in July, increased before leaf-abscission and then remained fairly constant or showed a slight increase during the domant season. Protein levels of winter twigs averaged 6.3 percent. The seasonal changes in protein levels in willows were similar to the seasonal changes reported for three Alaskan browse plants; aspen, paper birch and willow (Salix spp.) (Kobota et al. 1970). However, the Alaskan plants showed no appreciable difference in prote concentrations between summer twigs and Tew (197 winter twigs. d that the protein content of aspen leaves decreased with maturity, averaging about 17 percent in June, companed to 11.8 percent in September. Scotter (1972) found the crude protein levels in Salix glauca twigs near Inuvik, Northwest Territories, were lower during the growing season than during the dormant season.

The protein content in leaves and twigs generally showed Little variation among the six species of willow at most sampling periods. Differences among species were not consistent throughout the year. This may be due to the phenological characteristics of plant nutrients that are specific to each species (Short *et al.* 1966). The protein content of willow twigs during the dormant season ranged between 5.7 and 6.7 percent. Due to the variation among willows of the same species, few significant differences were found among species of the same browsed condition. Considerable variation in nutrient content within species has also been shown for aspen in Utah (Tew 1970). The protein content in willow twigs during the dormant season was similar to protein levels reported for willows in Alaska (Milke 1969; Kobota et al. 1970) and Wyoming (Houston 1963).

Browsing was found to have a small influence on the protein content of the CAG. Leaves of browsed willows averaged 8 percent more protein than unbrowsed willows. Twigs of browsed Salix bebbiana and S. candida shrubs contained more protein than unbrowsed willows of these species during leaf-flush (early June), however, this difference was not consistent during other seasons. These data indicate that browsing may have delayed the phenological maturity of twigs resulting in comparatively higher protein levels early in the growing season. Nutrient quality has been shown to vary directly with growth stage (Short et al. 1972). The absence of consistent differences in protein content between browsed and unbrowsed shrubs of the same species agrees with the findings of other studies. Shepherd (1971) reported no significant differences in protein content in shrubs subjected to seven years of clipping treatments. Dietz (1965) concluded that prolonged heavy browsing would probably not affect shrub nutrient content.

Examination of consecutive twig segments from browsed willow shrubs showed a progressive decrease in protein content from terminal to lower twig portions (Table 14). This trend was found at all collection periods and was most marked in the overwintering twigs in May and in the new succulent growth in early June. Short *et al.* (1972) showed the relative digestibility of current twigs is directly affected by the changing nutrient content associated with phenological change. Digestibility and nutrient quality of woody cells was shown to diminish as cells matured because cell walls thickened and became lignified and cellular protoplasm decreased. Differences in nutritional quality between terminal and lower twig portions may also be related to the relative amounts of highly digestible inner bark tissues and relatively indigestible woody tissues found in each segment. Inner bark and cambial tissues contain more minerals, sugars and proteins than woody tissues during winter (Short et al. 1972). The progressive decrease in crude protein from the apex to the distal portions of twigs has also been found in red maple (Acer rubrum), black cherry (Prunus serotina) (Cowan et al. 1970), red-osier dogwood (Fashingbauer and Moyle 1963) and Rocky Mountain juniper (Juniperus scopularum) (Kautz 1969). Cowan et al. (1970) also found that the level of drude protein increased in the terminal portions of dormant twigs as the growing season approached.

The nutritional requirements for moose have not been established, but information on the nutritional requirements for domestic ruminants (NAS-NRC 1970) and white-tailed deer (Dietz 1965) provide a comparative basis. Dietary protein levels for white-tailed deer have been suggested as 13 to 16 percent for optimum growth and as 6 to 7 percent for maintenance (French *et al.* 1955). If crude protein levels fall below 6 to 7 percent, rumen functions are seriously impaired (Dietz 1965). NAS-NRC (1970) recommend a minimum of 5.9 to 7.8 percent crude protein for maintenance of beef cattle. If moose requirements are similar, the willow browse in the study area Ch

contained adequate amounts of crude protein for growth and lactation during spring and early summer, but the winter diet of woody twigs would be marginally adequate for maintenance. The average protein in winter twigs of preferred willows (6.2%) does not reach the 7 percent level recommended as a minimum for browse on good deer range (Dietz et al. 1962; Dietz 1965).

However, the protein content of browse selected by moose may be expected to be higher than that reported for the total CAG. Terminal portions of winter Salix candida twigs contained 7.2 percent protein, about 13 percent more than the total CAG. Comparison of protein levels in the entire twigs of browsed and unbrowsed shrubs of the same species reveal that terminal portions of lessrank growth would contain an even higher crude protein content. Various food habit studies have shown that domestic and native ungulates can select forage containing more crude protein than the average available on the site (Hardison et al. 1954; Heady 1964; McClymont 1967). Dietz and Yeager (1959) found that mule deer preference for big sagebrush in late winter and early spring was due to its having higher protein levels than other species during that period. Moose have also been found to select individual plants or species containing higher protein levels than the average available in the area. Bergerud and Manuel 1968; Milke 1969; Peek 1974).

### 2. Carbohydrates

The seasonal trends of acid-detergent fiber (ADF) and acid-detergent lignin (ADL) varied among species and browsed conditions within species. The generality that ADF and ADL in current annual leaves and twigs increase with seasonal progression (Dietz et al. 1962; Van Soest, 1966; Laycock and Price 1970) did not hold for all willows examined, and ADL content in twigs of most species showed a marked increase during the summer and a moderate decline during late summer or dormant season. The leaves and twigs of Salix gracilis showed a progressive decline in ADL with seasonal progression. The cellulose content and ADL:ADF ratio in twigs also increased in most species from early to late summer then remained relatively stable or showed a slight decline in the dormant season. Cellulose content in leaves remained about the same or increased from early to late summer. Levels of ADF, ADL and cellulose were considerably higher in stems than in leaves, however, the ADL: ADF ratio was the same in both plant parts during the growing season. Seasonal levels of the fibrous carbohydrate components in willow browse were similar to those reported for other deciduous browse (Urness, 1973; Tew, 1970; Short et al., 1972). Silver (1976) reported the seasonal levels of lignin in Salix scouleriana and S. bebbiana browse generally declined from autumn to winter. Dietz (1972) found that, with the exception of aspen and fringed sagebrush (Artemisia frigida) both ADF and ADL increased markedly from spring through winter in shrubs fed upon by deer in South Dakota. Aspen showed a moderate decline in both components from summer through winter.

The data show the nutrient value of willow browse generally declines with seasonal progression through September, then increases slightly during the domant season. Urness (1973) found the consumption and nutritional value of central Arizona deer forages were primarily influenced by phenological development. He found the in-vitro digestibility of browse declined as the levels of ADF increased with seasonal progression. The digestibility of cell walls is variable and depends upon several factors of which lignin is the most important (Goering and Van Soest, 1970). Lignin acts as a barrier to micro-organisms and is negatively correlated with both dry matter and protein digestibility (Dietz, 1972). Since the digestibility of cellulose depends upon its state of lignification, the lignin fraction is best expressed as a ratio of ADF (Goering and Van Soest, 1970). Using the lignin ratio method, the estimated cell-wall digestibility of willow browse in this study varied from 13 to 21 percent. These values are lower than those reported from washed moose rumen contents in Alaska (Gasaway and Coady, 1974) and other deciduous browse (Short, 1971; Dietz, 1972).

Several factors indicate that the data may underestimate the nutritive value of willows for moose. Drying of samples at 65°C has been shown to artificially increase the acid-detergent fiber and lignin fractions through heat damage (Van Soest, 1964). Moose were also found to select plant parts and to discriminate among species of willow and among individual willow plants. The browse samples collected represent the total annual growth of leaves and twigs and do not account for selective feeding behavior or the use of only the upper portions of twigs, which contain less ADF and lignin than lower portions and are more digestible.

3. Crude Fat

The crude fat (ether extract) content of willow twigs was lower in developing twigs in early summer than in mature twigs during the dormant season. Crude fat content in shrubs generally shows a decrease with seasonal progression through July, then an increase in fall and winter (Dietz 1972). Tew (1970) found that crude fat content in aspen leaves increased greatly from spring to fall.

In this study, willow twigs in the dormant season averaged 4 percent crude fat and ranged from 3.4 to 4.6 percent. These values are comparable to the crude fat content reported for willows in Wyoming (Houston 1968) and Alaska (Milke 1969).

The nutritive value of crude fats is not considered to be as important in ruminant nutrition as they were formerly thought to be (Dietz 1972). This is because the crude fat determination includes other fractions such as terpenes, resins and essential oils which are not digestible to any extent, and may even inhibit rumen function (Nagy *et al.* 1964). It is not known whether the crude fat fraction of willow browse contains appreciable amounts of non-digestible essential oils. Smith (1950, 1952) reported the digestibility of ether extract ranged from 23.3 percent to 68.3 percent among eight shrub species of importance to wintering mule deer. Although the digestibility of crude fat in willow browse is not known, the digestible fraction may be an efficient source of metabolizable energy. This would be particularly important to moose during the long, cold winters experienced in northern regions. Essential fatty acids provide approximately 2.25 times more energy than carohydrates or protein (Morrison 1954).

4. Minerals

مانية المترجعين

Ash, calcium, magnesium, phosphorous and sodium concentrations were variable among species and between browsed conditions. The highest during the spring and generally decreased with seasonal progression. The phosphorous content of young twigs (0.27%) was more than twice that of twigs during the dormant season (0.12%). Calcium content of willow twigs was highest in late summer. In willow leaves, all minerals, except sodium, showed an increase in concentration with maturity. Sodium levels in leaves were highly variable. Similar seasonal trends for these minerals were reported for willow (*Salix* spp.) and other shrubs in Colorado (Short *et al.* 1966) and for a variety of browse species used by deer in South Dakota (Dietz 1972).

Willow browse in spring and early summer contained ample calcium levels, adequate phosphorous levels and an acceptable calcium-phosphorous ratio. In winter, willow twigs contained

ු

adequate calcium content, but appear deficient in phosphorous and had a high calcium phosphorous ratio (4.9:1). The minimum calcium and phosphorous requirements generally recommended for maintenance of domestic livestock under range conditions are 0.32 and 0.17 percent, respectively (NAS/NRC 1970). Beef cattle require 0.16 to 0.60 percent calcium and 0.16 to 0.43 percent phosphorous, depending on sex, age and condition. The desirable calcium-phosphorous ratio is 2:1 or 1:2, although ratios greater than 2:1 are permissible if sufficient vitamin D is present in the forage (Dietz 1970). McEwan *et al.* (1957) found that white-tailed deer could tolerate lower calcium levels than those recommended for domestic livestock. He concluded that the diet of deer became deficient in calcium and phosphorous at about 0.27 and 0.08 percent, respectively.

The magnesium concentration in willow twigs decreased from 0.38 to 0.21 percent and in leaves increased from 0.52 to 1.04 percent with seasonal progression. These values are considerably higher than magnesium concentrations reported for aspen leaves (0.03 to 0.25%) in Utah (Tew 1970) and for native forage plants near Inuvik (Scotter and Miltmore 1973). Short *et al.* (1966) also reported that magnesium values in willows were generally higher than those of other forage plants in Colorado. Maynard and Loosli (1969) indicated the magnesium requirements of domestic livestock for growth was in the order of 0.06 percent of the dry ration, assuming that calcium and phosphorous intakes were adequate but not excessive. If moose requirements for magnesium are similar to that reported for domestic livestock, willow browse contains ample magnesium levels.

Sodium content in willow leaves and twigs was low during all seasons. It is recommended that forage of domestic livestock contain from 0.05 to 0.15 percent sodium (NAS/NRC 1970). Sodium levels in willow leaves and twigs averaged 0.021 and 0.026 percent, respectively.

The data show considerable variation in sodium content. This may be due to contamination during handling of samples and which often is the greatest source of error in sodium determinations (Lowendorf 1974).¹ The lowest concentrations of sodium recorded are about 0.005 percent. Jordan et al. (1973) found that sodium concentrations in woody plants eaten by moose on Isle Royale were so low, averaging 0.001 percent, that he doubted moose could meet their minimum requirements from browse alone. He suggested that in order for moose to survive in this habitat, they needed specialized feeding strategies and unusual physiological adaptations for finding, storing, and conserving sodium. Jordan et al. (1973) found aquatic plants contained 50 to 500 times more sodium than terrestrial plants and felt that moose on Isle Royale and possibly in other regions where aquatics were eaten, depend in large part upon this source to meet their annual requirement for sodium.

¹Personal communication, H. Lowendorf, 1974.

100

A sodium deficiency in the browse diet of moose may explain the apparent preference shown for seaside arrowgrass in the study area. Seaside arrowgrass is noted for its relatively high salt (sodium chloride) content in comparison to other herbaceous forages (McLean and Nicholson 1958). Although seaside arrowgrass is poisonous to domestic livestock (Kingsbury 1964) there are indications that native ungulates are not as susceptible to plant poisoning (Johnston *et al.* 1965).

B. Response of Willows to Natural and Simulated Browsing

Results of the simulated browsing study indicate that Salix bebbiana and S. discolor shrubs are stimulated to greater productivity when clipped during the inactive growth period or the dormant season. Although the number of twigs was reduced by all clipping intensities, the length and weight of the new CAG was greater than unclipped (control) shrubs, resulting in an overall increase in browse production the year following simulated browsing. Removal of the terminal bud and thus the apical dominance has been shown by several researchers to stimulate twig production from the dormant lateral buds (Garrison 1953, 1972; Ferguson and Basile 1966). Ferguson and Basile (1966) found that topping of bitterbrush shrubs resulted in a nine-fold increase in twig production and speculated that topping caused an imbalance of root:shoot ratio resulting in a relative abundance of water and mineral nutrients which favors shoot growth.

The response of CAG to simulated browsing in spring was more dependent upon the intensity of clipping than were the fall and winter treatments. Fifty and 100 percent clipping intensities in spring generally resulted in an increase in the number of twigs but a decrease in the length and weight of twigs produced the next growing season. In spring the 100 percent clipping treatment had a lower twig production than other treatments. These findings are similar to those reported by Garrison (1972). Garrison concluded that browse utilization was least detrimental to shrubs during fall and winter, when non-structured carbohydrates reserves are highest, and most damaging during late spring and early summer when non-structural carbohydrate reserves are the lowest.

The response of willows to natural browsing was similar to simulated browsing during the dormant season. Salix candida and S. bebbiana shrubs which were heavily browsed by moose for two or more winter seasons had fewer twigs but a greater production (weight) of woody shoots than unbrowsed shrubs. Different growth responses to browsing were also apparent between species. Browsed Salix bebbiana shrubs had a three-fold reduction in the number of twigs produced with a two-fold increase in total twig weight while browsed Salix candida shrubs responded with a small decrease in twig numbers and about a four-fold increase in total weight of twigs produced.

Within moderately and heavily browsed Salix candida clumps, individual secondary stems responded variously to different intensities of browse use (Table 30). Browsing during the preceding dormant season stimulated the greatest twig production. Stems browsed in previous years but not the preceding season outproduced the control stems but produced less than stems browsed the preceding season. Ferguson and Basile (1966) found the increased growth response of bitterbrush shrubs to topping continued in subsequent years, but at a declining rate. Comparison of unbrowsed stems within unbrowsed (Table 28) and browsed (Table 30) Salix candida clumps in my study, indicated that browsing may have stimulated twig growth (number and length of twigs per secondary stem) throughout the shrub. Cook and Stoddart (1960) however, concluded that there was little or no translocation of manufactured food from one side of a plant to the other when clipping of CAG from one side of big sagebrush plants caused death of that half of the plant while the unbrowsed half grew vigorously.

Stimulation of new twig growth as a result of removal of the terminal bud is commonly explained by suppression of apical dominance (Garrison 1972). Suppression of apical dominance generally allows two or more lateral buds to develop as new leaders. In this study, the willows subjected to simulated or natural browsing during the dormant season generally responded with a decrease in the number of new twigs or leaders. The marked increase in total twig production following browsing may be due to the change in the shrubs root:shoot ratio causing a hormonal imbalance (Berg and Plumb, 1972). or an overabundance of water and mineral nutrients (Ferguson and

Basile, 1966), both of which may favor vigorous twig growth.

C. Relationships Between Moose and Willow

Moose were found to concentrate on willow dominated communities during winter in the lowlands near Fort Providence. Aspen and espen-willow communities were the commonest forest cover but received relatively light use. In the willow dominated communities, the willow savanna and patterned fen, willows comprised 97 and 72 percent of the available browse and 97 and 99 percent, respectively, of the browse used by moose. Similar habitat use was described by Berg and Phillips (1974) in ecologically similar areas characterized by broad expanses of willow and marsh, commonly found from northeastern Minnesota to north-central Alberta within the transition zone between prairies and northern coniferous forests. These authors found that willow and associated willow habitats were used much more than non-willow habitats.

In this study, a marked preference was noted for certain willow species (Table 10). Comparison of the relative abundance and use of willows in each community showed moose were selecting certain species of willow and avoiding other species of willow. Browse preference varied among communities but was not related to the abundance of preferred species. Salix candida was preferred in the patterned fen where it was abundant and in the willow savanna where it was scarce. Salix padophylla was uncommon in both communities but highly preferred in only the willow savanna. This indicates that willows may be ranked in order of low to high preference, the use of a particular willow dependent upon the availability of more preferred species and the site or plant community in which it was growing. Milke (1969) also listed willows in an order of preference and indicated that neither the relative abundance nor species density affected the preferential use of browse by moose in his Alaska study area.

Although preference in this study was determined on browse use throughout the winter, field observations indicated a change in the importance of plant communities and browse species used by moose as the winter progressed. The shift in moose activities from the patterned fen, where the low-growing and highly preferred Salix condida was abundant, occurred about the time of increasing snow depths and snow crusting conditions (late winter). Spring observations showed the use of tall shrubs, Salix bebbiana and Salix discolor, in the willow savanna had increased in late winter. Several authors (Kelsall and Prescott; 1971; Coady, 1974; Krefting, 1974) have shown the importance of snow cover as a factor influencing the availability of browse, the distribution of moose and moose use of plant communities. Dorn (1970) found that as the snow depths increased during winter, the importance of tall species increased while that of short species decreased. While snow conditions may have influenced the use of Salix candida in the study area during late winter, mid-winter observations of moose cratering activities illustrate the high preference or importance attributed to this species, considering the apparent effort expended in obtaining this browse from beneath the snow.

The high degree of browse selectivity shown by moose in the study area is exemplified by their discrimination among individual shrubs within palatable species, notably a selection for those willows which had been browsed in previous seasons (Figure 7). The direct relationships between the degree of current and previous use of individual willow shrubs indicates that browsing influenced some "palatability" factor of the next season's growth which, in turn, stimulated a selective response by moose. Several other studies have also noted preferential browsing of selected shrubs within a species (Bergerud and Manuel 1968; Houston 1968). Bergerud and Manuel (1968) found moose preferred individual balsam fir with dark green needles over chlorotic, light green colored balsam fir. These authors found that protein levels in dark green fir were higher than in chlorotic fir and suggested that moose were selecting the most nutritious plants. Houston (1968) reported individual subalpine fir trees were often heavily browsed by moose and suggested that differences in palatability may occur among individual trees.

Other workers (Hardison et al., 1954; Marten, 1969; Milke, 1969; Westoby, 1974) have examined the relationships between preference and palatability factors. Specifically, Heady's (1964) review of palatability showed that high positive correlations have been found between forage preference and protein content, sugars and ether extract while lignin and crude fiber often showed a negative relationship with increased preference. In my study, no significant relationships between chemical composition and browse preference of willows were found. Although differences in average nutrient content between preferred and non-preferred species of willow and between browsed and unbrowsed willows of the same species was not great, the general trend indicated that moose were selecting browse of lower nutrient content. Twite to browsed willows were generally lower in crude protein, ash the ether extract and higher in acid-detergent fiber and lignin than willows of non-preferred species of unbrowsed individuals of the same species. Only moisture content showed a positive, although non-significant, relationship with selection for previously browsed individuals of preferred species. Moisture content of non-preferred species were similar to unbrowsed shrubs of preferred species. The influence of succulence on palatability of pasture grasses for domestic livestock was illustrated by Davies (1925). Swank (1956) found that forage with a consistent high moisture content was preferred by deer and cattle. Milke (1969) found that willows most preferred by moose also contained the highest moisture content. Pavlov (1973) suggested moose preferred balsam fir and willows during the winter because moisture does not freeze in the twigs of these species.

In this study, moose showed a marked preference for individual shrubs of palatable species that had been browsed in previous seasons. Willows browsed during the domant season were shown to respond with a decrease in twig numbers and a dramatic, 2 to 4 fold increase in the size, length and weight, of twigs produced the next season. Descriptions of moose browsing behavior indicate that moose will often select individual twigs and manipulate them so they can be consumed butt first (Geist 1963). During mid-winter collections

of browse samples and simulated browsing treatments in this study, a greater difficulty was encountered in manipulating short twigs without breakage of older wood than in manipulating longer twigs from terminal leaders or from previously browsed shrubs. These observations indicate it would be difficult for moose to select the relatively short current year's twig growth from unbrowsed shrubs without obtaining quantities of older wood. Such selection would be particularly difficult in cold weather when twigs are brittle. 149

Since moose consume 18 to 23 kg of browse, (wet weight) per day in winter (Verme 1970), considerable mobility and energy expenditure would be required to obtain sufficient browse to maintain the rumen fill. Selection of larger twigs from previously browsed shrubs would reduce browsing time and feeding movements required to maintain rumen fill and thus be more efficient than browsing of smaller twigs from unbrowsed shrubs (Figure 13). A similar concept was described by Des Meules (1965), who postulated that heavy utilization of balsam fir shoose in late winter may save energy, since fir twigs weigh eight to thirteen times more than deciduous twigs of similar length and therefore require less time and effort to consume equivalent amounts.

In this study, moose were consuming only the upper half to two thirds of selected twigs. Chemical analysis of lower, middle and terminal twig portions showed that the terminal third contained higher concentrations of crude protein, crude fat, and minerals and



lower levels of acid-detergent fiber and lignin than lower twig portions or the total twigs from unbrowsed shrubs. In browsed *Salix condida* shrubs the crude protein content of terminal twig portions in January exceeded the 7 percent level considered necessary for ruminant maintenance. Selection of higher quality^b browse by moose may also increase food intake, digestibility and passage rate through the gut (Gasoway and Coady, 1974).

These observations lend evidence that moose in the study area were selecting for the more available as well as the more nutritious browse that was readily obtainable from previously browsed shrubs. This preference for longer twig growth may also explain why moose expended additional effort in cratering through snow to obtain browse from low growing Salix candida clumps or in breaking the upper branches of Salix bebbiana shrubs to obtain the terminal leaders.

Examination of moose food habits in this study indicates that browse abundance was probably not a limiting factor to the moose population in the Mackenzie lowlands area. In willow dominated communities where moose congregated during winter, only 7 to 8 percent of the available browse was utilized by moose; other areas and plant communities examined sustained even less use during winter. It is expected that, at this latitude, the duration and severity of winter conditions may cause a considerable energy and nutritional strain on moose. Moose normally experience a loss of up to 20-25 percent of body weight between fall and spring (Gasoway and Coady

1974). The relatively short growing season at this latitude would also limit the time available for weight gain from the more nutritious summer forage. The marked selection of winter browse, particularly from previously browsed shrubs, observed in this study may be a behavioral adaptation to maximize intake of the more palatable and perhaps the more nutritious browse available while minimizing energy expended during feeding. Energy conservation through forage efficiency may be extremely important for moose survival through the long and severe northern winters. Because of the growth response of willows to browsing and moose selection of previously browsed shrubs, this relationship also acts to perpetuate a source of preferred and perhaps important winter browse.

#### SUMMARY

A study was conducted to examine the plant communities and moose habitat use in the lowlands near Fort Providence, Northwest Territories. The primary objective was to examine the relationship between moose and willows on a moose winter range.

Species composition, herbage and browse production and soil characteristics were described for five plant communities: sedge meadow, patterned fen, willow-shrub, willow savanna and aspen-willow communities. Willows were the dominant browse species in all but the sedge meadow community. Mean annual production ranged from 530 kg/ha in the aspen-willow to 2535 kg/ha in the sedge meadow community. Browse production in shrub dominated communities ranged from 442 kg/ha in the willow savanna to 1406 kg/ha in the willowshrub communities. Available winter browse averaged about 20 percent of summer browse in all shrub communities and about 10 percent in the aspen-willow community.

Moose abundance was estimated at 0.21 moose per square kilometer in the general lowland area and 0.90 per square kilometer in the willow communities used as winter range in the study area. Total browse use and pellet-group counts showed moose used the willow savanna and patterned fen communities about six times more than the aspen-willow communities. During winter, moose exhibited a marked selection of browse from particular species of willows and from individual shrubs within preferred species. In the willow savanna community, *Salix bebbiana*, *S. candida* and *S. padophylla* shrubs received significantly more use while *Salix gracilis* and *S. maccalliana* shrubs received significantly less use than expected. Similar trends of preference or avoidance of particular browse species were also found in the patterned fen and aspen-willow communities. The degree of previous browse use (hedging) of individual palatable willow shrubs was found to have a positive influence on the probability that the shrub would be again browsed by moose. The degree of previous use also had a direct relationship with the amount of current annual growth (CAG) browsed by moose in subsequent years.

The seasonal nutrient content of six species of willows and two browsed conditions (browsed and unbrowsed shrubs of palatable species) were examined at four dates during the growing season and once during the dormant season (January). Crude protein and moisture levels were greatest in young leaves and twigs and generally decreased progressively through the growing season. A general increase in twig protein levels ( $\bar{x} = 1$ % of dry weight) occurred before leaf abscission at the end of the growing season. Aciddetergent fiber and lignin levels in willow twigs increased sharply early in the growing season before showing a slight general decline in the latter part of the growing season and in the dormant season. Acid-detergent fiber and lignin levels in willow leaves showed a moderate increase throughout the growing season. Ash, calcium and magnesium levels in willow twigs showed a progressive decline and in leaves a progressive increase with seasonal progression. Phosphorous content of twigs showed a two fold decline between early summer and the dormant season. Calciumphosphorous ratios increased from 2.7:1 in early summer to 4.9:1 in the dormant season. Sodium levels were low in willow twigs and leaves ( $\bar{x} = 0.026$  and 0.021, respectively) in all seasons. Average crude fat levels in willow twigs showed a two fold increase from 2.1 percent in early summer to 4.0 percent during the dormant season. Differences in nutrient levels were found among species of the same browsed condition but these differences were generally not consistent throughout the sampling period. Browsed willows generally contained lower levels of crude protein, ash and minerals and higher levels of acid-detergent fiber, lignin and moisture than unbrowsed willows of the same species. Variation among replicated samples resulted in few significant differences between species or between browsed conditions within species. I found no relationship between browse selection by moose and browse nutrient content.

Chemical analyses of consecutive twig segments showed a progressive decrease in moisture, crude protein, ash, calcium and magnesium and an increase in acid-detergent fiber and lignin from the terminal to distal twig portions.

Willows subjected to simulated or natural browsing during the dormant season responded with a decrease in the number of twigs and a significant (two to four fold) increase in production

155

(total weight) of twigs per secondary stem in the following growing season. The response of shrubs to simulated browsing early in the growing season had variable results and depended upon the intensity of clipping. The 100 percent clipping treatment had the greatest debilitating effect: an increase in twig numbers and a decrease in total weight of twigs produced per secondary stem. Simulated browsing of shrubs in late summer (August) and in the dormant season had similar effects on twig production in the following growing season.

It was postulated that moose selection of browse from previously browsed shrubs of palatable species may be related to the relative ease of obtaining sufficient quantities of the current year's twig growth to maintain the rumen fill. Selection of the longer twig growth may be a behavioral adaptation to maximize intake of palatable and perhaps more nutritious browse (terminal twig portions) available while minimizing energy expended during feeding. Energy conservation through forage efficiency may be extremely important for moose survival through the long and severe northern winters.

#### BIBLIOGRAPHY

Addison, R.B. 1972. The possible use of infrared thermal imagery for wildlife census. Eighth N. Am. Moose Conf. and Workshop. Thunder Bay, Ont. pp.301-325.

Ahti, T. and R.L. Hepburn. 1967. Preliminary studies on woodland caribou range, especially lichen stands in Ontario. Ontario Dept. Lands and Forests, Research Paper 74:1-134.

Aldous, S.E. 1952. Deer browse clipping study in the Lake States region. J. Wildl. Manage. 16(4):401-409.

Aldous, S.E. and L.W. Krefting. 1946. The present status of moose on Isle Royale. Trans. N. Am. Wildl. Conf. 11:296-308.

Aldrich, J.W. 1963. Geographic orientation of American Tetraonidae. J. Wildl. Manage. 27(4):529-545.

Alkon, P.U. 1961. Nutritional and acceptability values of hardwood slash as winter deer browse. J. Wildl. Manage. 25(1):77-81.

Allington, K.R. 1961. The bogs of central Labrador - Ungava, an examination of their physical characteristics. Geografiska Annaler, 43:401-417.

Argus, G.W. 1973. The genus *Salix* in Alaska and Yukon. Publications in Botany, No. 2. National Museums of Canada. 279pp.

Arnold, G.W. 1966. The special senses in grazing animals. II. Smell, taste and touch and dietary habits in sheep. Aust. J. Agr. Res. 17:531-542.

Bailey, J.A. 1967. Sampling deer browse for crude protein. J. Wildl. Manage. 31(3):437-443.

Banfield, A.W.F., D.R. Flook, J.P. Kelsall and A.G. Loughreg. 1955. An aerial survey technique for northern big game. Trans. N. Am. Wildl. Conf. 20:519-530.

Barrett, M.W. 1972. A review of the diet, condition, diseases and parasites of the Cypress Hills moose. Eighth N. Am. Moose Conf. and Workshop. Thunder Bay, Ont. p.60-79.

Bates, D.N. and D. Simkin. 1969. Vegetation patterns of the Hudson Bay lowlands. Res. Br., Ont. Dept. Lands Forests, Map 3269.

- Beaumont, A.B., R.E. Stitt and R.S. Snell. 1933. Some factors affecting the palatability of pasture plants. J. Amer. Soc. Agron. 25:123-128.
- Benson, D.A. 1966. 'Use of aerial surveys by the Canadian Wildlife Service. Can. Wildl. Serv. Pap. No. 3. 40pp.
- Bentley, W.W. 1961. Moose population inventories: Interior and Arctic Alaska. Alaska Dept. of Fish and Game, Job Completion Rept., Fed. Aid Proj. W-8-R-2. Alaska Wildl. Investigations. P.R. Proj. Rept., 2(2):161-171.
- Berg, A.R. and T.R. Plumb. 1972. Bud activation for regrowth, Pages 279-286, *In:* Wildland shrubs - their biology and utilization. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-1, 494pp.
- Berg, W.E. 1971. Habitat use, movements and activity patterns of moose in Northwestern Minnesota. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Minnesota. 98pp.
- Berg, W.E. and R.L. Phillips. 1974. Habitat use by moose in northwestern Minnesota with reference to other heavily willowed areas. Naturaliste Can. 101:101-116.
- Bergerud, A.T. 1968. Numbers and density. Pages 21-42 In F.B. Golley and H.K. Buechner, eds. A practical guide to the study of the productivity of large herbivores. IBP Handb. 7, Oxford. 308pp.
- Bergerud, A.T. and F. Manuel. 1968. Moose damage to balsam fir-white birch forests in central Newfoundland. J. Wildl. Manage. 32(4):728-747.
- Bergerud, A.T. and F. Manuel. 1969. Aerial census of moose in central Newfoundland. J. Wildl. Manage. 33(4):910-916.
- Bird, R.D. 1961. Ecology of the aspen parkland of western Canada. Can. Dept. Agr. Publ. 1066. Queen's Printer, Ottawa. 153pp.
- Bishop, R.H. 1969. Moose report. Fed. Aid in Wildl. Rest. Proj., Segment Rep. W-15-R-3. Vol. 10. Work Plan K. Alaska. 152pp.
- Blair, R.M. and E.A. Epps, Jr. 1967. Distribution of protein and phosphorous in spring growth of rusty blackhaw. J. Wildl. Manage. 31:188-190.
- Bliss, L.C. and J.E. Cantlon. 1957. Succession on river alluvium in northern Alaska. Amer. Midland Natur. 52:452-469.

Borodin, L.P. 1959. In regard to the role of elk in forest management Akad. Nauka SSSR. Inst. Lesa Soobsheh., 13:102-110.

Canada Department of Transport. 1967. Temperature and precipitation tables for the north - Yukon Territory and Northwest Territory, Canada Dept. of Transport, Toronto.

Canadian Wildlife Service. 1972. Arctic ecology map series, critical wildlife areas, descriptive reports. Environment Canada. Can. Wildl. Serv. 324pp.

Carbyn, L.F.N. 1967. The abundance and distribution of passerine birds in the boreal forest habitats of the western Great Slave Lake region. M.Sc. Thesis. Univ. of Alberta. 81pp.

Carbyn, L.F.N. 1968. Overwintering birds observed along the Mackenzie - Great Slave Lake Highways. Arctic 21(4):294-297.

Caughley, G. and J. Goddard. 1972. Improving the estimate from inaccurate censuses. J. Wildl. Manage. 36(1):135-140.

- Chamberlain, L.C. 1972. Some aspects of preferred winter moose range. Eighth N. Am. Moose Conf. and Workshop, Thunder Bay, Ont. pp.138-165.
- Coady, J.W. 1974. The influence of snow on behavior of moose. Naturaliste Can. 101:417-436.
- Coady, J.W. and W.C. Gasaway. 1972. Rumen function and energy production of moose in interior Alaska. Eighth N. Am. Moose Conf. Workshop, Thunder Bay, Ont. p.80-104.
- Cook, C.W. and L.A. Stoddart. 1960. Physiological responses of big sagebrush to different types of herbage removal. J. Range Manage. 13(1):14-16.
- Cook, C.W., L.A. Stoddart, and L.E. Harris. 1953. Effect of grazing intensity upon the nutritive value of range forage. J. Range Manage. 6:51-54.

Cook, C.W., L.A. Stoddart, and L.E. Harris. 1956. Comparative nutritive value and palatability of some introduced and native forage plants for spring and summer grazing. Utah Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 385. 39pp.

Corns, W.G. 1974. Influence of time and frequency of harvests on productivity and chemical composition of fertilized and unfertilized awned sedge. Can. J. Plant Sci. 54:493-498.
Corns, W.G. and R.J. Schraf. 1962. Seasonal productivity and chemical composition of marsh reed grass (Calamagrostis canadensis) (Michx.) Beaux. harvested periodically from fortilized and unfertilized native sod. Can. J. Plant Sci. 42:651-659.

Cowan, I. McT., W.S. Hoar, and J. Hatter. 1950. The effect of forest succession upon the quantity and upon the nutritive values of woody plants used as food by moose. Can. J. Research, D, 28:249-271.

Cowan, R.L., J.S. Jordan, J.L. Grimes and J.D. Gill. 1970. Comparative nutritive values of forage species. Pages 48-56 In: Range and wildlife habitat evaluation, a research symposium. U.S. For. Serv. Misc. Publ. 1147. -220pp.

Cowlishaw, S.J. and F.E. Alder. 1960. The grazing preferences of cattle and sheep. J. Agri. Sci. 54:257-265.

Craig, B.G. 1965. Glacial Lake McConnell, and the surficial geology of parts of Slave River and Redstone River map areas, District of Mackenzie. Geological Survey of Canada Bull. 122.

Croon, G.W., D.R. McCullough, E. Olson, Jr. and L.M. Queal. 1968. Infrared scanning techniques for big game censusing. J. Wildl. Manage. 32(4):751-759.

Ourtis, J.T. 1959. The vegetation of Wisconsin. The Univ. Wis. Press, Madison. 657pp.

Damann, A.W.H., 1964. Some forest types of central Newfoundland and their relation to environmental factors. Forest Sci. Monogr. 8:1-62.

Daubenmire, R. 1968. Plant communities: A textbook of plant synecology. Harper and Row, New York, 300pp.

Davis, W. 1925. The relative palatability of pasture plants. J. Ministry Agr., 32:106.

Day, J.H. 1968. Soils of the upper Mackenzie River area. Canada Department of Agriculture, Queen's Printer, Ottawa. 77pp.

Des Meules, P. 1964. The influence of snow on the behavior of moose. Proc. N.E. Wildl. Conf., Harford, Connecticut, 18pp. (Mimeogr.).

Des Meules, P. 1965. Hyemal food and shelter of moose (Alces alces americana) in Laurentide Park, Quebec. M.Sc. Thesis. Univ. of Guelph. 138pp.

- Des Meules, P. 1968. Determination du nombre de tas de crottins rejetés et du nombre reposés établies, par jour, par l'orignal (Aloss aloss), en hiver. Service de la Faina du Quebec, Naturaliste Can., 95:1153-1157.
- DeVos, A. and G.C. Armstrong. 1954. Aerial censusing of moose at Black Bay Peninsula, Ontario. Tech. Bull. No. 3. Ontario Dept. of Lands and Forests, Toronto. 12pp.
- Dietz, D.R. 1965. Deer nutrition research in range management. Trans. N. Am. Wildl. Conf. 30:268-274.
- Dietz, D.R. 1970. Animal production and forage quality. Pages 1-9. In: Range and wildlife habitat evaluation - a research symposium. U.S. For. Serv. Misc. Publ. 1147. 220pp.
- Dietz, D.R. 1972. Nutritive value of shrubs. Pages 289-302. In Wildland shrubs - their biology and utilization. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT'1, 494pp.
- Dietz, D.R., R.H. Udall, H.R. Shepherd, and L.E. Yeager. 1958. Seasonal progression in chemical content of fiwe key browse species in Colorado. Soc. Amer. Forest. Proc. pp.117-122.
- Dietz, D.R., R.H. Udall, L.E. Yeager. 1962. Chemical composition and digestibility by mule deer of selected forage species, Cache la Poudre Range, Colorado. Colorado Game and Fish Dept. Tech. Publ. 14. 89pp.
- Dietz, D.R. and L.E. Yeager. 1959. The apparent role of sagebrush in the management of mule deer winter range. West. Assoc. State Game and Fish Comm. Proc. 39:151-158.
- Dodds, D.G. 1960. Food competition and range relationships of moose and snowshoe hare in Newfoundland. J. Wildl. Manage: 24(1):52-57.
- Dorn, R.D. 1970. Moose and cattle food habits in southwestern Montana. J. Wildl. Manage. 34(3):559-564.
- Douglas, R.J.W. 1959. Great Slave and Trout River map areas, N.W.T. Geological Survey of Canada, 58-11.
- Drury, W.H. 1956. Bog flats and physiolographic processes in the upper Kushokwim River Region of Alaska. Contrib. of the Gray Herbarium, Harvard Univ. No. 178, 130pp.
- Dyer, H.J. 1948. Preliminary plan for wildlife management on Baxter State Park. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Maine, 79pp.

Edwards, R.Y. 1954. Comparison of an aerial and ground census of moose. J. Wildl. Manage. 18(3)403-404.

- Edwards, R.Y., 1956. Moose pellet group data, Wells Gray Park, British Columbia. Parks and Recreation Div., B.C. Forest Serv., Victoria, B.C., 3pp. (unpubl.).
- Egorov, O.V. 1965. Wild ungulates of Yakutia. Tranlsated from Russian by M. Fleishman. Israel Prog. for Sci. Trans., Jerusalem, 1967.
- Evans, D.D., W.A. Troyer, and C.J. Lensink. 1966. Aerial census of moose by quadrant sampling units. J. Wildl. Manage. 30(4):767-776.
- Fashingbauer, B.A. and J.B. Moyle. 1963. Nutritive value of redosier dogwood and mountain maple as deer browse. Minnesota Acad. of Sci. 31(1):73-77.
- Ferguson, R.B. and J.V. Basile. 1966. Topping stimulates bitterbrush twig growth. J. Wildl. Manage. 30(4):839-841.
- Freeland, W.J. and D.H. Janzen. 1974. Strategies in herbivory by mammals: the role of plant secondary compounds. Amer. Natur. 108:269-289.
- French, C.E., L.C. McEwen, and N.D. Magruder. 1955. Nutritional requirements of white-tailed deer for growth and antler development. Pa. Agr. Exp. Sta. Bull. 600, 50pp.
  - Garrison, G.A. 1953. Effects of clipping on some range shrubs.
- Garrison, G.A. 1972. Carbohydrate reserves and response to use. Pages 271-278. In: Wildland shrubs - their biology and utilization. USDA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-1, 494pp.
- Gasoway, W.A. and J.W. Coady. 1974. Review of energy requirements and rumen fermentation in moose and other ruminants. Naturaliste Can. 101:227-262.
- Gawley, D.J., and J.B. Dawson. 1965. An evaluation of the track density system of estimation relative moose population densities in Gogoma district, January 1964. Ontario Dept. Lands and Forests, Res. Manage. Rep. 80:13-28.
- Geist, V. 1963. On the behavior of the North American moose (Alces alces andersoni Peterson 1950) in British Columbia. Behavior 20:377-416.

- Geist, V. 1971. Fluctuating habitat and the evolution of moose. Pages 121-127. In: Mountain sheep - A study in behavior and evolution. Univ. of Chicago Press, Chicago and London.
- Goddard, J. 1966. The validity of censusing black rhinocerus populations from the air. East Afr. Wildl, J. 5(1):18-23.
- Goering, H.K., and Van Soest, P.J. 1970. Forage fiber analysis (apparatus, reagents, procedures, and some applications). USDA Agr. Handbook No. 379, 20pp.
- Gordon, J.C. 1970. Food selection by ruminants. Proc. Nutr. Soc. 29:325-330.
- Graves, H.B., B.D. Bellis, and W.M. Knuth. 1972. Censusing whitetailed deer by air-borne thermal infrared imagery. J. Wildl. Manage. 36(3):875-884.
- Hall, R.B. 1964. Moose browse survey and pellet group count, Kenora district, 1963. Ontario Dept. Lands and Forests, Res. Manage. Rep. 76:5-18
- Hardison, W.A., J.T. Reid, C.M. Martin, and P.G. Woolfolk. 1954. Degree of herbage selection by grazing cattle. J. Dairy Sci. 37:89-102.
- Harlow, R.F. and L.K. Halls. 1972. Response of yellow poplar and dogwood seedlings to clipping. J. Wildl. Manage. 36(4):1076-1080.
- Harry, G.B. 1957. Winter food/habits of moose in Jackson Hole. Wyoming. J. Wildl. Manage. 21(1):53-57.
- Harshbarger, T.J. and B.S. McGinnes. 1971. Nutritive value of sour-, wood leaves. J. Wildl. Manage. 35(4):668-673.
- Hatter, J. and P.W. Martin. 1960. Management of moose in British Columbia. Proc. 40th Ann. Conf. W. Assoc. State Game and Fish Comm. pp.205-210.
- Hawkins, G.E. 1955. Consumption and digestibility of Lespedeza sericea hay and alfalfa hay plus gallotannin. J. Dairy Sci. 38:237-243.
- Heady, H.F. 1964. Palatability of herbage and animal preference. J. Range Manage. 17:76-82.
- Healy, W.M. 1967. Forage preferences of captive deer while free ranging in the Allegheny National Forest. M.Sc. Thesis, Pennsylvania State Univ. 93pp.

Heinselman, M.L. 1963. Forest sites, bog processes, and peatland types in the glacial Lake Agassiz region, Minnesota. Ecol. Monogr. 33: 327-374. 164

Hellmers, H. 1940. A study of monthly variations in the nutritive value of several natural deer foods. J. Wildl. Manage. 4(3):315-325.

Hilton, J.E. 1970. Forage production and utilization in the aspen parkland of Alberta following aerial application of 2,4-D and 2,4,5-T. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Alberta, Edmonton. 122pp.

Hilton, J.E., and A.W. Bailey. 1974. Forage production and utilization in a sprayed aspen forest in Alberta. J. Range Manage. 25(5):375-380.

Hines, W.W. 1973. Black-tailed deer populations and douglas fir reforestation in the Tillamook Burn, Oregon. Game Res. Rep. No. 3.; Oregon State Game Comm., 59pp.

Hosley, N.W. 1949. The moose and its ecology. U.S. Fish and Wildl. Serv. Leaflet 312. 51pp.

Houston, D.B. 1968. Thiras moose in Jackson Hole, Wyoming. Tech. Bull. Grands, The Nat. Hist. Assoc. 1:1-110.

Hundley, L.R. 1959. Available nutrients in selected deer-browse species growing on different soils. J. Wildl. Manage. 23(1):81-

Isacc, R.A. and J.D. Kerber. 1971. Atomic absorption and flame photometry: techniques and uses in soil, plant, and water analysis. Pages 17-32 In L.M. Walsh (ed.). Instrumental methods for a malysis of soils and plant tissue. Soil, Sci. Soc. of America. Inc. Madison, Wisconsin.

Jeffrey, W.W. 1961. A prairie to forest succession in Wood Buffalo Park, Alberta. Ecology 42(2):442-444.

Jeglum, J.K. 1972. Boreal forest wetlands, near Candle Lake, central Saskatchewan. I. Vegetation. The Musk-ox 11:41-58.

Jeglum, J.K. 1973. Boreal forest wetlands, near Candle Lake, central Saskatchewan. II. Relationships of vegetational variation to major environmental gradients. The Musk-ox 12:32-48.

Johnston, A., S. Smoliak and R.J. Avery. 1965. Veterinarian's handbook of poisonous and injurious plants of the prairie provinces. C.D.A. Research Station, Lethbridge, Alberta.

- Jones, J.K., D.C. Carter and H.H. Genoways. 1973. Checklist of North American mammals north of Mexico. Occasional Papers, Museum Texas Tech. Univ., 12:1-7.
- Jordan, P.A., D.A. Botkin, A.S. Dominski, H.S. Lowendorf and G.E. Belovsky. 1973. Sodium as a critical nutrient for the moose of Isle Royale. Ninth N. Am. Moose Conf. and Workshop, Quebec City. pp.13-42.
- Julander, O. 1937. Utilization of browse by wildlife. Trans. N. Amer. Wildl. Conf. 2:276-287.
- Julander, O., B. Ferguson and J.E. Dealy. 1963. Measure of animal range use by signs. Pages 102-108. In U.S. Forest Serv., Range Research Methods. U.S. Dept. Agr., Misc. Publ. 940. 172pp.
- Kabzems, A. 1952. Stand dynamics and evelopment in the mixedwood forest. Forestry Chronicle 28:7-22.
- Kautz, J.E. 1969. Nutrient composition of juniper in relation to twig form and length. Pages 1-7 In J.A. Bailey and J.G. Nagy (eds.), Recent advances in wildlife nutrition.
- Kelsall, J.P. and W. Prescott. 1971. Moose and deer behavior in snow. Can. Wildr: Serv. Rep. Series No. 15, 25pp.
- Kingsbury, J.M. 1964. Poisonous plants of the United States and Canada. Prentice-Hall Inc., New Jersey. 626pp.
- Kittredge, J. 1938. The inter-relationship of habitat, growth rate and associated vegetation in the aspen community of Minnesota and Wisconsin. Ecol. Monogr. 8(2):151-246.
- Knorre, E.P. 1959. Ecology of the moose. Transactions of the Pechorailych State Game Preserve, U.S.S.R. No. 7. G.A. Novikov (ed.). 240pp. (mimeo.)
- Knowlton, F.F. 1960. Food habits, movements and populations of moose in the Gravelly Mountains, Montana. J. Wildl. Manage. 24(2):162-170.
- Kramer, P.J. and T.T. Kozlowski. 1960. Physiology of trees. McGraw Hill, New York. 642pp.
- Krefting, L.W. 1974. Moose distribution and habitat selection in North Central North America. Naturaliste Can. 101:81-100.

- Krefting, L.W., M.H. Stenlund, and R.K. Seemel. 1966. Effect of simulated and natural deer browsing on mountain maple. J. Wildl. Manage. 30(3):481-488.
- Krueger, W.C., W.A. Laycock and D.A. Price. 1974. Relationships of taste, smell, sight and touch to forage selection. J. Range Manage. 27(4):258-261.
- Kubota, J., S. Rieger and V.A. Lazar. 1970. Mineral composition of herbage browsed by moose in Alaska. J. Wildl. Manage 34(3):565-569.
- Lay, D.W. 1965. Effects of periodic clipping on which of some common browse species. J. Range Manage. 18(3) 11 11 11 11 11
- Laycock, W.A. and D.A. Price. 1970. Environment of the influence of nutritional value of forage plants. and wildlife habitat evaluation - a restored symposium. U.S. Fora Serv. Misco Dil. 1147. 220pp.
- Leigh, J.H. 1961. The palatability of various varieties of weeping love grostis curvula (Schrad.) Nees). J. Brit. Grassl. Soc. 5-140.
- LeResche, R.E. 1970. Rep. report. Fed. Aid in Wildl. Restor., An. Proj. Seg. Rep. W-17-2:1-3. Juneau, Alaska, 13pp.
- LeResche, R.E. and R.A. Rausch. 1974. Accuracy and precision of aerial moose censusing. J. Wildl. Manage. 38(2):175-182.
- Lewis, F.J., E.S. Downing and E.H. Martine 1928.' The vegetation of Alberta. II. The swamp, moor and bog forest vegetation of central Alberta. J. Ecol. 16:19*70.
- Longhurst, W.H., H.K. Oh, M.B. Jones and R.E. Kepner. 1968. A basis for the palatability of deer forage plants. Trans. N. Am. Wildl. and Nat. Res. Conf. 33:181-192.
- Lynch. B.D. 1955, Ecology of the aspen groveland in Glacier County, Montana. Ecol. Monogr. 25:321-344.
- Lynch, G.M. 1971. Ungulate population surveys conducted in the Edson region. Unpublished data, Alberta Dept. of Lands and Forests, Edmonton. 37pp.

Mackenzie, A. 1801. Voyages from Montreal to the river St. Lawrence, through the continent of North America, to the Frozen and Pacific Oceans: in the years 1778 and 1793. New York edition 1802. 296pp. In: J.S. Maini and J.H. Cayford, eds. Growth and utilization

Maini, J.S. 1968. Silvics and ecology of Populus in Canada.

of poplars in Canada. For. Br. Publ. 1205:20-69.

Ν.,

given .

Mantle, E.F. 1972. A special moose inventory, 1971. Aubinadong moose study area, Ontario. Eighth N. Am. Moose Conf. and Workshop, Thunder Bay, Ont. pp.124-137. Marten, G.C. 1969. Measurement and significance of forage palatability. Proc. Nat. Conf. on Forage Quality, Evaluation and Utilization. Nebraska Center for Continuing Education, Lincoln. 55pp. Maynard, L.A. and J.K. Loosli. 1969. Animal Nutrition. 6th Ed. McGraw-Hill Book Co. New York. 613pp. McClymont, G.L. 1967. Selectivity and intake in the grazing ruminant. Sect. 32: Alimentary Canal. Pages 129-137 In: Handbook of Physiology. American Physiology Soc., Wash. D.C. McCullough, D.R., C.E. Olson, Jr., and M. Queal. 1969. Progress in large animal census by thermal mapping. Pages 138-147. In: P.L. Johnson (ed.), Remote sensing in ecology. University of Georgia Press, Athens. 244pp. McEwen, L.C., C.E. French, N.D. Magruder, R.W. Swift and R.H. Ingram. 1957. Nutrient requirements of the white-tailed deer. Trans. N. Am. Wildl. Conf. 22:119-132. McHargue, J.S. and W.R. Roy. 1932. Mineral and nithen content of the leaves of some forest trees at different times in the growing season. Botan. Gaz. 94:381-393. McLean, A. and H.H. Nicholson. 1958. Stock-poisoning plants of the British Columbia Ranges. Canada Dep. Agr., Pub. 1037. 30pp. McLean, A., H.H. Nicholson and A.L. Van Ryswyk. 1963. Frowth, productivity and chemical composition of a sub-alpine meadow in interior British Columbia. J. Range Manage. 16:235-240. McMillan, J.F. 1953. Some feeding habits of moose in Yellowstone National Park. Ecology 34(1):102-110. Mech, D.L. 1966. The wolves of Isle Royale. United States National Park Fauna Series 7, 210pp. Milke, G.C. 1969. Some moose-willow relationships in the interior of Alaska, M.Sc. Thesis. Univ. of Alaska, College, 79pp. Miller, R.G. 1966. Simultaneous statistical inferences. McGraw-Hill, New York. 272pp.

Morrison, F.B. 1954. Feeds and feeding. 21 ed. The Morrison Publ. Co. Ithaca N.Y. 1207pp.

Moss, E.H. 1932. The vegetation of Alberta. IV. The poplar association and related vegetation of central Alberta. J. Ecol. 20:380-415.

Moss, E.H. 1953. Marsh and bog vegetation in northwestern Alberta. Can. J. Botany 31:448-470.

Moss, E.H. 1955. The vegetation of Alberta. Botanical Rev. 21:493-567.

Moss, E.H. and G.H. Turner. 1961. Bryophytes from the Edmonton region, Alberta. Can. J. Botany 39:1177-1193.

Minte, A. 1944. The wolves of Mount McKinley. Fauna of the National Parks of the United States, Fauna Series No. 5, pp.182-188.

Nagy, J.G., H.W. Steinhoff, and G.M. Ward. 1964. Effects of essential oils of sagebrush on deer rumen microbial function. J. Wildl. Manage. 28(4):785-790.

- NAS/NRC. 1962. Range research. Nat. Acad. Sci. //Nat. Res. Council Pub. 890. 331pp.
- NAS/NRC. 1970. Nutrient requirements of beef cattle. Nat. Acad. Sci./Nat. Res. Council. Publ., 55pp.

Nasimovitch, A.A. 1955. The role of the regime of snow cover in the life of ungulates in the U.S.S.R. Moskva Akademiya Nauk SSSR. 403pp. (Transl. from Russian by Can. Wildl. Serv., Ottawa) 373pp. Typewritten.

Neff, D.J. 1963. The effects of clipping on the vigor of big game browse plants and related studies in the Arizona chaparral. Ph.D. Thesis. Oreg. State Univ. 128pp.

Neff, D.J. 1968. The pellet-group count technique for big game trend, census, and distribution: A review. J. Wildl. Manage. 32(3):597-614.

Neu, C.W., C.R. Byers and J.M. Peek. 1974. A technique for analysis of utilization-availability data. J. Wildl. Manage. 38(3):541-545.

Osgood, C.B. 1931. The ethnography of the Great Bear Lake Indians. National Museum of Canada. Ann. Rep. Bull., 70:31-98.

Passmore, R.C. 1963. Experimental use of aerial photography in censusing moose. Ontario Dep. Lands and Forests, Res. Mgmt. Rep. 71:30-33.

avlov, M.B. 1973. Moose aerial surveys in the taigs of Viata (USSR). Paper presented at Ninth North. Am. Moose Workshop. Int. Symp. on Moose Ecology. Univ. Laval. (from abstract). eek, J.M. 1974. A review of moose food habit studies in North America. Naturaliste Can. 101:195-215. Peterson, R.L. 1953. Studies of the food habits and the habitat of moose in Ontario. Contrib. Royal Ont. Mus. Zool. and Paleontol., Toronto. No. 36, 49pp. 1955. North American moose. Univ. Toronto Press, Peterson, R.L. Toronpo: 280pp. Pimlott, D.H. 1961. The ecology and management of moose in North America. La Terre et la Vie, 2:246-265. - **1**5 - **4**8.0 Pitelka, F.A. 1941 Distribution of birds in relation to major biotic communities. Am. Midland Natur. 25(1):113-137. Prescott, N.H. 1968. A study of winter concentration areas and food hoits of moose in Nova Scotia. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Acadia, 194pp. Priklonskiy, S.G. 1965. Conversion coefficients for processing data of the winter transect method of census taking of game animals by their tracks. Byulleten'Mio-va Isp. Prirody, Otd. Biologii, LXX(6); (Unedited Draft Transl. from Russian by Can. Wildl. Serv. < Ottawa), 21pp. Pringle, W.L. and A.L. Van Ryswyk. 1968. Carry-over effects of high fertilizer rates on native sedge bog vegetation in interior British Columbia. Can. J. Plant Sci. 48:49-55. Radwan, M.A. and G.L. Crouch. 1974. Plant characteristics related to feeding preference by black-tailed deer. J. Wildl. Manage. 38(1)132-41. Raup, H.M. 1933. Range conditions in Wood Buffalo Park of Western Canada, Spec. Pub. Am. Conf. for International Wildlife Protection. 1(2):1-52. Raup, H.M. 1935. Botanical investigations in Wood Buffalo Park. Natl. Museum Can., Bull. No. 74. 174pp. Raup, H.M. 1941. Botanical problems in boreal America. Botan. Rev.

Raup, H.M. 1946. Phytogeographic studies in the Athabaska-Great Slave Lake region, II. J. Amald. Arboretum, Harvard Univ. 27:1-85.

7:147-248.

Raup, H.M. 1959. The willows of boreal western America. Contrib. Gray Herb., Harvard Univ. 185:1-95.

- Rausch, R.A. and A.E. Bratlie. 1965. Annual assessments of moose calf production and mortality in south central Alaska. 45th Ann. Conf., West. Ass. State Fish and Game Commissioners. pp.140-146.
- Ritchie, J.C. 1960. The vegetation of northern Manitoba. VI. The Lower Hayes River region. Can. J. Bot. 38:769-788.
- Roberts, L.W. 1948. A survey of the carotene and ascorbic acid content of moose browse. M.A. Thesis. Univ. of British Columbia. Vancouver. 78pp.

Rowe, J.S. 1972. Forest Regions of Canada. Canada Dept. of Environment. Can. For. Serv. Publ. No. 1300. 172pp.

- Rowe, J.S. and G.W. Scotter. 1973. Fire in the boreal forest. Quaternary Research. 3:444-464.
- Russell, E.J. 1958. Soil conditions and plant growth. 8th Ed. Longman, Green and Co. Toronto. 635pp.
- Saugstad, S. 1942. Aerial census of big game in North Dakota. Trans. N. Am. Wildl. Conf., 7:343-356.
- Scotter, G.W. 1972. Chemical composition of forage plants from the Reindeer Preserve, Northwest Territories. Arctic 25(1):21-27.
- Scotter, G.W. and J.E. Miltmore. 1973. Mineral content of forage plants from the Reindeer Preserve, Northwest Territories. Can. J. Plant Sci., 53:263-268.
- Semyonov, B.T. 1965. Numerical census of European elk by survey of tracks from the air. (Transl. from Russian by J.M. MacLennan, Can. Wildl. Serv.) 22pp.
- Scheffler, E.J. 1976. Aspen forest vegetation in a portion of the east central Alberta parklands. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Alberta. 160pp.

Shepherd, H.R. 1971. Effects of clipping on key browse species in southwestern Colorado. Colorado Div. of Game, Fish and Parks, Tech. Pub. No. 28. 104pp.

- Short, H.L. 1966. Effects of cellulose levels on the apparent digestibility of feeds eaten by mule deer. J. Wildl. Manage. 30(1):163-167.
- Short, H.L. 1971. Forage digestibility and diet of deer on southern upland range. J. Wildl. Manage. 35(4):698-706.

R)

- Short, H.L., R.M. Blair and L. Burkart. 1972. Factors affecting nutritive values, Pages 311-318. Me Wildland shrubs their biology and utilization. USUA For. Serv. Gen. Tech. Rep. INT-1, 494pp.
- Short, H.L., R.M. Blair and C.A. Segelquist. 1974. Fiber composition and forage digestibility by small ruminants. J. Wildl. Manage. 38:197-209.
- Short, H.L., D.R. Dietz, and E.E. Remmenga. 1966. Selected nutrients in mule deer browse plants. Ecology 47(2):222-229.
- Short, H.L. and J.C. Reagor. 1970. Cell wall digestibility affects forage value of woody twigs. J. Wildl. Manage. 34(4):964-967.
- Silver, R.S. 1976. Ecological features of moose (Alces alces *andersoni) winter Bubitat in the boreal white and black spruce zone of northeastern British Columbia. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of British Columbia. 278pp.
- Siniff, D.B. and R.O. Skoog. 1964. Aerial censusing of caribou using random stratified sampling. J. Wildl. Manage. 28(2):391-401.
- Sjors, H. 1963. Bogs and fens on Attawapiskat Topotherm Ontario. Nat. Mus. Can. Bull. 186:45-133.
- Smith, A.D. 1950. Sagebrush as a winter feed for mule deer. J. Wildl. Manage. 14(3):285-289.
- Smith, A.D. 1952. Digestibility of some native forages for mule deer. J. Wildl. Manage. 16(3):309-312.
- Smith, N.S. 1962. The fall and winter ecology of Shiras moose in Rock Creek drainage. Granite County, Montana. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. Montana, Missoula. 52pp.
- Smith, R.L. 1966. Ecology and field biology. Harper and Row, New York. 686pp.
- Spenser, D.L. and E.F. Chatelain. 1953. Progress in the management of the moose of southentral Alaska. Trans. N. Am. Wildl. Conf. 18:539-552.
- Spenser, D.L. and J. Hakala. 1964. Moose and fires on the Kenai. Proc. 3rd Tall Timbers Fire Ecol. Conf. Tallahasee, Florida. 3:11-33.

Steel, R.G.D. and J.H. Torrie. 1960. Principles and procedures of statistics. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Toronto. 481pp.

Steinhoff, H.W. 1959. Some effects of clipping bitter brush at different intensities. Trans. 4th Ann. Summer Conf. Central Mountains and Plains Sec. Wildl. Soc. 4:23-24.

Stone, J.L. 1971. Winter movements and distribution of moose in upper Rock Creek drainage, Granite County, Montana. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. Montana, Missoula. 80pp.

Swank, W.G. 1956. Protein and phosphorous content of browse plants
 as an influence on southwestern deer herd levels. Trans.
 N. Am. Wildl. Conf. 21:141-158.

Swift, R.N. 1948. Deer select most nutritious forages. J. Wildl. Manage. 12:109-110.

Telfer, E.S. 1967. Comparison of moose and deer winter range in Nova Scotia. J. Wildl. Manage. 31(3):418-425.

Telfer, E.S. 1970. Winter habitat selection by moose and whitetailed deer. J. Wildl. Manage. 34(3):553-558.

Tener, J.S. 1965. Muskoxen - a biological and taxonomic review. Canadian Wildl. Serv. Monog. No. 2. Queen's Printer, Ottawa. 166pp.

Thom, B.G. 1972. The role of spring thaw in string bog genesis. Arctic 25(3):236-239.

Thomas, M.K. 1953. Climatological atlas of Canada: National Research Council, Publ. No. 3151.

Timmerman, H.R. 1974. Moose inventory methods: a review. Naturaliste Can: 101:615-629.

Thieret, J.W. 1959. Grassland vegetation near Fort Providence, N.W.T. Can. Field Nat. 73:161-167.

Tew, R.K. 1970. Seasonal variation in the nutrient content of aspen foliage. J. Wildl. Manage. 34(2):475-478.

Tribe, D.E. 1952. The relation of palatibility to nutritive value and its importance in the utilization of herbage by grazing animals. Sixth Intern. Grassland Cong. Proc. II: 1265-1270.

Trotter, R.H. 1958. An aerial census technique for moose. Proc. N.E. Sect. Wildl. Soc. 10 pp. Mimeo.

Ullrey, D.E., W.G. Youatt, H.E. Johnson, P.K. Ku, and L.D. Fay. 1964. Digestibility of cedar and aspen browse for white-tailed deer. J. Wildl. Manage. 28(4):791-797.

Ullrey, D.E., W.G. Yotatt, H.E. Johnson, L.D. Foy, B.L. Schoepke, and W.T. Magee. 197. Digestible and metabolizable energy requirements for winter maintenance of Michigan white-tailed does. J. Wildl. Manage. 34:863-869. Ullrey, D.E., W.G. Youatt, H.E. Johnson, R.L. Covert, and W.T. Magee. 1972. Digestibility and estimated metabolizability of aspen browse for white-tailed deer. J. Wildl. Manage. 36(3):285-291.

Urness, P.J. 1973. Chemical analysis and in vitro digestibility of seasonal deer forages. Part II. Pages 39-52 In Deer nutrition in Arizona chaparral and desert habitats. Spec. Rep Fed. Aid Wildl. Restor. W-78-R. 68pp.

Urness, P.J. 1969. Nutritional analysis and in-vitro digestibility of mistletoes browsed by deer in Arizona. J. Wildl. Manage. 33:499-505.

• Van Soest, P.J. 1963a. The use of detergents in the analysis of fibrous feeds: I. Prepration of fiber residues of low nitrogen content. J. Assn. Official Agr. Chem. 46:825.

Van Soest, P.J. 1963b. The use of detergents in the analysis of fibrous feeds. II. A rapid method for the determination of fiber and lignin. J. Assn. Official Agr. Chem. 46:829.

Van Soege, P.J. 1964. Symposium on nutrition and forage and pastures: new chemical procedures for evaluating forages. J. Animal Sci. 23:838-845.

Van Soest, P.J. 1966. Non-mutritive residues: A system of analysis for the replacement of crude fiber. J. Assoc. Offic. Agr. Chem. 49:546-551.

Verme, L.J. 1970. Some characteristics of captive Michigan moose. J. Mammal. 51(2):403-405.

Viereck, L.A. 1966. Succession and soil development on gravel outwash of the Muldrow Glacier, Alaska. Ecol. Monogr. 36:181-199.

Viereck, L.A., and E.L. Little. 1972. Alaska trees and shrubs. U.S.D.A. Forest Service. Washington, D.C., Agr. Handbook. No. 410, 265pp.

Vozeh, G.E., and H.G. Cumming. 1960. A moose population census and winter browse survey in Gogoma District, Ontario. Unpub. Rep. Ontario Dept. of Lands and Forests, Toronto, 31pp.

Ward, L.A. 1971. In vitro digestibility of elk winter forage in southern Wyoming. J. Wildl. Manage. 35(4):681-688.

Washburn, A.L. 1956. Classification of patterned ground and a review of suggested origins. Bull. Geol. Soc. Amer., 67:823-865.

Westoby, M., 1974. An analysis of diet selection by large generalist herbivores. Amer. Natur. 108:290-304.

- White, K.L. 1965. Shrub-carrs of putheastern Wisconsin. Ecology 46:286-304.
- Wilkins, H.L., R.P. Bates, P.R. Henson, I.L. Lindahl and R.E. Davis. 1953. Tannin and palatability in Seriosa-Lespedera. L. oursata. Agron. Journ. 45:335-336.
- Wormington, H.M. 1957. Ancient man in North America. Denver Museum of Natural History, Popular Series No. 4, 322pp.
- Wroe, R.A. 1971. Synecology of a Festusa soabrella Torr. grassland. M.Sc. Thesis, Univ. of Alberts, Edmonton. 126pp.
- Young, P.T. 1948. Appetite, palatability and feeding habit: a critical review. Psychol. Bull. 45:289-320.
- Young, V.A. and G.F. Payne. 1948. Utilization of "key" browse species in relation to proper grazing practices in cut-over western white pine lands in northern Idaho., J. Forestry, 46(1):35-40.
- Zoltai, S.C. and C. Tarmoci. 1971. Properties of a wooded palsa in northern Manitoba. Arctic and Alpine Res. 3:115-129.
- Zoltai, S.C. 1971. Southern limit of permafrost features in peatland forms, Manitoba and Saskatchewan. Geol. Assoc. Can., Spec. Pap. No. 9:505-310.

Scientific and common names¹ of plant species recorded in six communities in the study area. The prevalence of each species is indicated by the following symbols²: d, dominant; æ Y a, abundant; f, frequent; s, scattered and r, rare. Appendix A.

Nane	Name	Spruce Willow	WILLOW	Savanna	Bog Birch	ridges meadows	B Meadows
TREES AND SHRUBS							
Alnus tenuifolia	river alder			•	<b>L</b>		
Ame lanchier alnifolia	saskatoon		σ 4	a.	τ.	* * 1	
Betula glandulosa	bog birch		н I	ай 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 1 11111111	J	J	•
Betula papyrifera Comus stolonifera	paper birch red-osier dogwood		и Ч	•			•
leagnus commutata	silverberry		Ø	• • • •			•
Larix laricina	larch	<b>.</b>	Ļ			¢)	
Ledum groenlandicum Iomicera divisa	Labrador tea ruining honevauckle	ທ •	σh	H		80	
Murica gale					•	3	
Picea glauca	white spruce	<b>.</b>	Ś	60	ß	ند بر ا	
Picea mariana	black spruce '	s,		Ľ	H	, ס	
rinus banksiana	jack pine		<b>0</b> , '	ייי ע יי	Â,		
Populus balsamifera	balsam poplar	c	ι. γ	ס, מס	н б	•	
Populus tremuloides Potentilla fruiticosa	aspen shrubby cinquefoil	â	ອ່ຫ	o vo	ò		
			, °.			1	

.`

...continued

Best (1964). ²Adapted from Moss (1953).

.

Appendix A. continued.

. . .

l

Ô

Ribes americanaWild black currantTRibes americanawild black currantTRibes americananortherm gooseberrysRibus strigosusnortherm gooseberrysRibus strigosuswild red raspherrysRaitz arbusouloideswilld red raspherrysSaitz arbusouloideswillowaSaitz arbusouloideswillowaSaitz bebbianawillowaSaitz bebbianawillowaSaitz bebbianawillowaSaitz gebbianawillowaSaitz gracifiswillowsSaitz gracifiswillowSaitz gracifiswillowSaitz marbusichinawillowSaitz gracifiswillowSaitz marbusichinawillowSaitz marbusichinawillow	Name	Name	Spruce	Willow	Sayanna	Bog Birch	ridges meadows	ws Meadows	
ides northern gooseberry s s s s s r prickly rose a s s s r wild red raspherry s s s s r willow a d d d d d d d d d d d s s willow s s s a r hoary willow s s a a r willow s s s a s s r willow s s s a a r willow s s s a a r willow s s s s a a r willow s s s s a r willow s s s s a a r willow s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s		3							
ides northerm gooseberry s s s s s s f f f f s prickly rose a s s s s s rickly rose a s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s	Ribes americana	wild black currant		<i>а</i> Ц ¹	a				
prickly rose wild red raspherry willow willow beaked willow buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush	Ribes oxyancanthoides	nor therm's gooseberry	S	<b>*</b> 00	Ø	<b>)</b>	×* .00		
<ul> <li>wild red raspherry</li> <li>willow</li> <li>willow<td>Rosa acicularis</td><td>prickly rose</td><td>đ</td><td>60</td><td>Ø</td><td>8</td><td><b>1</b></td><td></td><td></td></li></ul>	Rosa acicularis	prickly rose	đ	60	Ø	8	<b>1</b>		
<pre>% willow is willow beaked willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush</pre>	Rubus strigosus	wild red raspherry		8	Ø	00	ч		
is ¹ willow beaked willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow buffalo-berry buffa	Salix arbusculoides	willow	- 1 - 1 - 1	σ	•	•			
beaked willow willow hoary willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow s a a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c a a c c a a c c a a c c a a c c a a c c a c c a c c a c c a c c a c c a c c a c c c a c c c c a c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c c	Saltix athabascensis ¹	willow							,
villow hoary willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow buffalo-berry s r s s a a a canadian buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush	Salix bebbiana	beaked willow	9	p	q	P	8	¢0	
hoary willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow s a a r s a a r s a a d r s a a d r r s a a d r r s a a b r r s a a s r s a a d r r s a a d r r s a a b uffalo-berry buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush low-bush cranberry s a bilberry	Salix calicola	willow							
<pre>pussy willow buffalo-berry s buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush low-bush cranberry s </pre>	Salix condida	hoary willow			Ø	ġ	р р		
<pre>willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow willow s r s s a a d d a f f a f f s s r s s r s s r s s r s s r s s r s s r s s s s s r r s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s s</pre>	Salix discolor	pussy willow	       	<b>თ</b>	æ	đ	f 8		•
willow willow willow willow willow willow s a a b r a b r a b r a b r a b r a b r b r b r b r b r b r b r b uckbrush buckbrush	Salix glauca	(willow	ß	57		H *			
villow ta willow willow nsis Canadian buffalo-berry buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush buckbrush	Salix gracilis	willow		8	ಹ	H			
ia willow ia willow nsis Canadian buffalo-berry a a s r s buckbrush buckbrush bilberry s r low-bush cranberry s	Salix padophylla	willow		S	ល	Ø	٩		
foltia willow adensis Canadian buffalo-berry buckbrush buckbrush bilberry low-bush cranberry s	Salix maccalliana	willow		00	đ	q	8	8	•
zdensis Canadian buffalo-berry buckbrush bilberry low-bush cranberry s	Salix myrtillifolia	willow	•		L	ß	Ĺ		
buffalo-berry buckbrush bilberry low-bush cranberry s	Shepherdia canadensis	Canadian		• 				1	, , , ,
buckbrush bilberry low-Bush cranberry		buffalo-berry	7	60	8	Ļ	8	. •	4
buckbrush bilberry low-bush cranberry s	Symphoricarpos		•	· · · · ·					
bilberry . low-bush cranberry s	occidentalis	buckbrush ·			ŝ		<b>(</b>		-
low-bush cranberty 8		. bilberry		80		<b>o</b> , <b>i</b>	r		
	Viburnum edule	low-bush cranberry	Ø	L		)			
			, . , .						

... continued

1 s

Z

					•			1	
Codimit fi	common	till-to	Acron-	11 oct	11 min-	Patteri	Patterned Fen	Saina	4
Name ·	Name	Sprace	Willow	Savanna	Bog Birch	ridges	meadows	Meadows	• • • •
HERBS							•		, N
Achillea millefolium common yarrow	common yarrow Manv-flowered varrow	<b>1</b>	<b>ч</b> - р	<b>44 5</b>		. <b>H</b>		•	
Agropyron trachycaulum	slender wheat grass		00	1 <b>4</b> 41		•		м	•
Agrostis scabra Allium schoenoprasum	hair grass wild chives		Ø	<b>u</b> .	ц	• • •	) 	<b>.</b>	
Anemone canadensis	Canada anemone		Ø			•			
Antennarra nitida	small flowered everlastfno			00 ·	<b>u</b> .		•	•	•
Anternaria rosea	rosy everlasting		ຶ່	) 0)					, ¹⁹ <b>4</b>
Arceuviorum. americanum	dwarf mistletoe	0				-			• .
Arctostaphylos rubra Arctostaphylos vva-	alpine bearberry		Ø		9	- - - - - -			1
18un	common bearberry	đ	ų	S		ų			•
Arenamia lateriflora	sandwort		H.	Ø. (	ц Ч	a			
Arnica ampressicatives Aster alpinus	arnıca aster			на.	•	з <u>н</u>		• • •	· · · ·
Aster conspicuus	showy aster		ß	ų, c	٩	* * * *	H	<b>0</b> 4,	
Aster pansus	prairie aster			чч	J	•	•	0	•
Astragalus agrestis	milkvetch		Ø	d.		5			•
Astragalus struatus	milkvetch			Ø				•	
			••• cont	continued				₽ 	•
									17
							•		7

l		
	Sedge Meadows	
	Patterned Fen idges meadows	σσσα
J	Pattern ridges	
	Willow- Bog Birch	σο σο σο
	W1110w Savanna	сопtinued v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v v
	Aspen- Willow	o co ho hu hu ho ho co co
	White Spruce	σ
<b>1</b>	Common Name	slough grass moonwart marsh reedgrass northern reedgrass Shepherd's purse meadow bittercress water sedge golden sedge golden sedge ilttle green sedge sedge sedge sedge sedge findian paint brush strawberry blight narrow-leaved goosefoot rostis neglecta.
* Appendiž A. continuéd.	ti fic	urria syzigachne hium lunaria ugrostis ugrostis ugrostis ugrostis ta bursa la bursa oris ine pratensis aquatilis aquatilis aquatilis atherodes aurea deflexa d
Appene	Scjentific Name	Bechmo Botryc Calamo cana cana cana carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Carex Calamo Carex Carex Calamo Calamo Carex Carex Calamo Carex Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Calamo Carex Calamo Carex Calamo Carex

-		179	
	• •		
, , ,	Sede	<b>1</b>	۲.
	ned Fen meadous	00 00 00 H 00 H	
· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	Patterned ridges we		
	Willow- Bog Birch		•
	W111ow Savanna	continued to way of the way way way and the second to the	
<b>3</b>	Aspen- Willow	с с ни со в в нисо в нив со с	
·	White Spruče	۵ پید پید س ۲	•
	Common Name	water hemlock bunch berry golden corydalis hawksbeard hairy wild rye crowberry fireweed bog willow-herb marsh willow-herb marsh willow-herb common horsetail dwarf scouring rush fleabane cottongrass cottongrass cottongrass strawberry northern bedstraw small bedstraw northern comandra prairie gentiana felwort yellow avens	
			:
x A. continued.		mackenzieana canadensis lis aurea runcinata innovatus um nigrum ium leptophyll ium leptophyll ium scirpoides tum arvense tum arvense on spp. orum stifolium um rankoides rankoides in boreale i trifidum ilon lividum na affinis unella amarella	
Appendix A.	Scientific Name	Cicuta mack Cornus cano Corydalis a Corydalis a Crepis runc Empetrum ni Epilobium Equisetum Equisetum Eriophorum Cheirans Fragaria v Gentian dor Gentian a Gentian allep Geum allep	

Appendíx A. continued.							•	
Scientific Name	Common Name	White Spruce	Aspen- Willow	Willow Savanna	Willow- Bog Birch	Patterned Fen ridges meadows	Sedge Meadows	•
						<b>4</b> 44	•	•
Hippurus vulgarus	mare's-tall wild barley		so (	, un u 	-		•	
			Ω.	ч н [°]	•		•	<b>)</b> .
ornstata ochroleucus	Juic grass peavine	•	Ъ,			•	•	l N
Lathyrus venosus	peavine	4	α Ψ					
Linnaea borealis	twin flower fuffed loosestrife	lfe I	4 00		 .⊮	ю. . цы		•
Lysumacnta tniysy win Nontha ampensis	wild mint	•	:	S	א מ	• • •	:	••
Muhlenbergia			•	<b>3</b>				
richardsonis	mat muniy loroweed		•	H		*	, -	•
Oxytropis spp. Pamassia palustris	northern grass-of-	of-		. <b>*</b>	•••	, , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , , ,	00	1
4	Parnassus	ard	•		•		•	а ,
Penstemon procerus	tongue		•	ເ <u>ດ</u>				•
Petasites sagittatus	arrow-leaved colt's-	lt's-	Ū	ų	ů u		0	•
	foot	(°	0	I		•	•	•
interior	blue grass	•	ัษ์	•				
Poa Leprocomia	fowl blue grass		σ)	ι α	<b>4</b> 4	1		
Poa pratensis	Kentucky blue grass	grass	, מס	איי מ ייי	i va	чн ^ч		
Polygonum amphibium	water smartweed	•	.) (		, , ,	<b>4</b>		•
Potamogeton spp.	pondweed							•
			00	. continued	· ·	ອ		
- <b>B</b>		•			•	•	•	
· · ·				•		••	`	80
	21	•	•	•		•		
8					•			•

				· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	1.		181
			under 1997.				101
	Ø	•					•
•	Sedge Meadows			<b>بر</b>	• •	α του του	
2 <b>4</b> . 4	ted Fen meadows				യം പം	00 00 00 H	
~	1 541			. i ^t	• •	4 	t
	Patterned Fen ridges meadow	ч.	00 00	S S	ب		
•			•	•	•		
	Willow- Bog Birch	Ø	ע גי גי	¢	Ω 41	ччч	
		<u>თ</u> ყ ყ	· · · · ·				n an
	Willow Savanne		очоч	β	a n	r v	nued
	Aspen- Willow	S	ທ ທ	н <b>н</b>	5 S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S	Ś	•• continued
\$	White Spruce		<b>u</b>	ч <b>ч</b>	S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S S		
0	~	ţ		<del>9</del> .		•	
		foil foil foil n	foil se reen	l green but tercup aved	e rry	cap	
	Common Name	cinque foil cinque foil cinque foil l'vanian	linque inque rimro iterg	ed :gree p but eave	rattle cress (aspbe)	great great ush loa skull	
	0 7	white cinquefoil rough cinquefoil marsh cinquefoil Pennsylvanian	cinquefoil brook cinquefoil mealy primrose pink wintergreen wintergreen	one-sided wintergreen buttercup Macoun's butt celery-leaved	puttercup yellow rattle yellow cress dwarf raspberry	western uock common great bullrush scolochloa common skullcap	
ued.			کي اندا يو <u>ہم</u>		סעע:	· ,	
continued.		Potentilla arguta Potentilla norvegica Potentilla palustris Potentilla	ilis ia ora	unda cymbalaria macounii sceleratus	ta- 001	Scirpus validus Scolochloa festucacea Scutellaria galericulata	
		argı nom palı	nica rivc 3ana rifol rdifl	ında cymb maco scel	cris andi is	festata	,
Appendix A.	Scientific Name	Potentilla arguta Potentilla norveg Potentilla palust Potentilla	pensylvanica Potentilla rivalis Primula incana Pyrola asarifolia Pyrola grandiflora	Pyrola secunda Ranınculus cymbalar Ranınculus macounii Ranınculus scelerat	Rhinanthus crista- galli Rorripa islandica Rubus acculis	Scirpus validus Scolochloa fest Scutellaria galericulata	
ppenc	Scient Name	Potentilla Potentilla Potentilla Potentilla	pens tent rimul rola rola	Pyrola sec Ranunculus Ranunculus , Ranunculus	iinant) galli prripa bus ac	irpu oloci utell jaler	
Apl	Sc. Nar	Pot Pot Pot Pot	Poil Poil Pyr	Pyr Ran Ran	Rhi g Rub Rub	Sci Scu Scu	•

concluded. Appendix A.

ا جا	8.8								***	•	
ned Per	meador				ŝ			44		S	ы
Patterned Fen	ridges meadows									ŝ	
Willow-	Bog Birch			÷.	н		•	ŝ		•	
Willow	Savama		Ч	S			ů,	4		S	S
White Aspen- Willow	Spruce Willow Savama		ц			S				S	
White	Spruce								,		•
Common	Name		balsam groundsel	blue-eyed grass	water parsnip	mountain goldenrod	late goldenrod	marsh hedge-nettle	long-stalked	chickweed	chickweed
Scientific	Name		Senecio pauperculus	Sigyrinchium montanum	Sium suave	Solidago decumbens	Solidago gigantea	Stachys patustris	Stellaria longipes		Stellaria spp.
	3	•							•		

Meadows Sedge

t

J

S

ŧ٨

seaside arrow-grass western meadow rue common bladderwort marsh arrow-grass early blue violet common dandelion marsh speedwell common cattail common tansey Inalictrum occidentale Taraxacum officinale Utricularia vulgaris Triglochin palustris Triglochin maritima Veronica scutellata Tanacetum vulgare Typha latifolia

Ø S

თ თ

S

american vetch

Vicia americana Viola adunca

•			SAMPLING DA	TE
	Soil Depth Class	25 June	19 July	20 August
Soil Moisture				•
			· .	
	0-15 cm	67.2	56.4	56.4
n=30	0-15 cm 15-30 cm	67.2 28.0	56.4 23.3	56.4 22.3
	0-15 cm 15-30 cm 30-45 cm			
	15-30 cm	28.0	23.3	22.3

Appendix B. Mean soil moisture (% dry weight) and soil temperature (°C) at different depths in the wet sedge meadow community in 1973.