

Nutritional Composition of Desert Mule Deer Forage in the Picacho Mountains, Arizona

Paul R. Krausman

School of Renewable Natural Resources
University of Arizona

Leonard L. Ordway

School of Renewable Natural Resources
University of Arizona

Frank M. Whiting

Department of Animal Sciences
University of Arizona

William H. Brown

Department of Animal Sciences
University of Arizona

Abstract

Nineteen forage species used by Desert Mule Deer (*Odocoileus hemionus crooki*) in the Picacho Mountains, Arizona were collected bimonthly in 1983 and analyzed for dry matter, protein fiber, lignin, ether extract, ash, cellulose, cell solubles, and hemicellulose. Results of the analyses are presented as a reference source for wildlife biologists, range managers, and others working with desert ecosystems.

Introduction

Knowledge of the nutritional composition of forage used by wildlife is important for land managers. Rautenstrauch et al. (1988) briefly summarized how forage quality data have been used and presented the first data on the quality of Desert Mule Deer forage in xeric regions of the Sonoran Desert. Although forage quality has been measured throughout the range of Rocky Mountain Mule Deer (*Odocoileus hemionus*) by Kufeld et al. (1973) and in the more mesic regions of the range of Desert Mule Deer (*O. h. crooki*) in the Trans-Pecos region of Texas (Payton and Garner, 1980), in Arizona chaparral (Swank, 1956; Reynolds, 1967), in desert grassland (Short, 1977), and in chaparral-desert ecotone (Urness et al., 1971; Horejsi, 1982), quality values of Desert Mule Deer forage in xeric regions of the Sonoran Desert have only been reported once (Rautenstrauch et al., 1988).

The objective of our present study was to measure the nutritional quality of some important Desert Mule Deer forages in the Picacho Mountains of southcentral Arizona. We present this information in an unsummarized format as a reference for wildlife managers and researchers working with the Sonoran Desert.

B. D. Leopold, University of Arizona, helped collect forage samples. K. C. Maddock supervised the proximate analyses. This study was funded by the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Study Area

The study was conducted in the Picacho Mountains, Pinal County, Arizona. The study area covered approximately 228 km² and ranged in elevation from 485 to 1,374 m.

The Lower Sonoran Life Zone (Lowe, 1964) which covers the Picacho Mountain lowlands consists of two basic plant communities, one of Little-Leaf Palo Verde (*Cercidium microphyllum*) and Saguaro Cactus (*Carnegie gigantea*) on the mountain slopes and bajadas (the transition zone between the desert floor and mountain slopes), and one of Creosotebush (*Larrea tridentata*) and Triangle-Leaf Bursage (*Franseria deltoidea*) on the flats.

Within the mountainous terrain and bajadas water was available in 6 big game water catchments, 1 ephemeral spring, and an undetermined number of rain pools. In the flat country away from the mountains (≥ 1 km) (1 km) there were 21 stock ponds.

Mean daily maximum temperatures 13 km east of the study area at Eloy, Arizona ranged from 19 C in January to 41 C in July, and mean daily minimum temperatures ranged from 2 C in January to 24 C in July (Sellers and Hill, 1974). The area has an arid climate with an annual precipitation average of 21 cm, 40% of which falls during the summer months of July, August, and September (Sellers and

Table 1. Nutritional composition (%) of 19 Desert Mule Deer forage species collected bimonthly in the Picacho Mountains, Arizona 1983.

| Month | Dry Matter* | | Fiber | | Lignin | Ether Extract | Ash | Cellulose | Cell soluble | Hemicellulose | % Month | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|---------|-------|-----|--------|---------------|-----|-----------|--------------|---------------|------------|---------|--------|---------------|-------|-----------|--------------|---------------|-------|-------|-------|-------|---------|-------|-------|-------|-------|-------|------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| | Matter* | Protein | ADF | NDF | | | | | | | ADF | NDF | Lignin | Ether Extract | Ash | Cellulose | Cell soluble | Hemicellulose | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| Catclaw Acacia (<i>Acacia greggii</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 44.13 | 10.43 | 37.72 | 52.98 | 8.14 | 2.80 | 11.46 | 30.15 | 47.02 | 15.26 | Nov-Dec | 47.93 | 8.10 | 49.83 | 58.97 | 13.63 | 2.46 | 10.15 | 36.11 | 41.03 | 9.14 |
| False Mesquite (<i>Calliandra sp.</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 51.05 | 5.85 | 41.82 | 57.11 | 10.74 | 5.76 | 5.55 | 30.89 | 42.89 | 15.29 | Mar-Apr | 48.24 | 5.25 | 47.08 | 57.33 | 10.66 | 7.37 | 5.98 | 35.97 | 42.67 | 10.25 |
| Saguaro (<i>Cereus giganteus</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 56.56 | 7.20 | 38.20 | 46.23 | 11.34 | 12.45 | 8.10 | 24.75 | 53.77 | 8.03 | Jul-Aug | 55.52 | 6.13 | 53.24 | 60.01 | 16.67 | 7.98 | 7.12 | 35.06 | 39.99 | 6.77 |
| Range Ratany (<i>Krameria parvifolia</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 31.17 | 11.48 | 38.92 | 50.95 | 11.63 | 7.87 | 8.33 | 27.55 | 49.05 | 12.03 | Nov-Dec | 36.80 | 8.56 | 42.44 | 50.23 | 15.05 | 9.62 | 7.00 | 27.29 | 49.77 | 7.79 |
| Mammillaria (<i>Mammillaria</i> spp.) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 63.76 | 4.77 | 47.86 | 61.98 | 9.72 | 0.84 | 5.95 | 39.20 | 38.02 | 14.12 | Mar-Apr | 64.27 | 4.97 | 51.83 | 67.66 | 13.18 | 1.77 | 6.97 | 45.97 | 38.04 | 8.74 |
| Opuntia (<i>Opuntia</i> spp.) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 63.92 | 8.31 | 44.11 | 57.23 | 10.50 | 2.42 | 6.64 | 32.85 | 42.77 | 13.12 | Jul-Aug | 74.16 | 6.63 | 48.76 | 62.30 | 9.22 | 0.79 | 6.98 | 38.94 | 37.70 | 13.54 |
| Mormon Tea (<i>Ephedra</i> spp.) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 31.03 | 8.90 | 42.80 | 56.84 | 9.09 | 3.22 | 7.23 | 34.19 | 43.16 | 14.04 | Nov-Dec | 53.13 | 6.88 | 44.10 | 59.23 | 9.91 | 1.78 | 6.66 | 33.48 | 40.77 | 15.13 |
| Wild Buckwheat (<i>Eriogonum fasciculatum</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 66.11 | 5.81 | 41.75 | 62.37 | 10.33 | 1.02 | 5.14 | 31.60 | 37.63 | 20.62 | Mar-Apr | 58.75 | 5.79 | 39.25 | 60.86 | 9.63 | 1.06 | 5.43 | 29.65 | 39.14 | 21.62 |
| Mesquite (<i>Prosopis</i> spp.) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 58.42 | 6.58 | 33.27 | 54.36 | 9.36 | 1.07 | 4.49 | 23.69 | 45.64 | 21.09 | Jul-Aug | 62.35 | 7.87 | 39.75 | 59.32 | 11.74 | 0.69 | 5.29 | 27.84 | 40.68 | 19.57 |
| Jojoba (<i>Simmondsia chinensis</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 52.37 | 7.30 | 40.68 | 60.54 | 11.16 | 1.32 | 5.00 | 29.67 | 39.46 | 19.86 | Nov-Dec | 60.63 | 6.28 | 37.38 | 60.66 | 11.16 | 1.49 | 6.36 | 24.52 | 39.34 | 23.28 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 35.72 | 6.08 | 26.49 | 61.56 | 6.02 | 2.16 | 15.59 | 18.64 | 38.44 | 35.07 | Mar-Apr | 62.28 | 5.46 | 30.50 | 66.24 | 8.82 | 0.93 | 18.42 | 15.57 | 33.76 | 35.74 |
| Spurge (<i>Euphorbia</i> spp.) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 23.37 | 4.56 | 32.07 | 67.66 | 6.62 | 0.53 | 13.79 | 21.57 | 32.34 | 35.59 | Jul-Aug | 40.81 | 6.30 | 48.13 | 77.14 | 4.57 | 0.41 | 33.91 | 16.84 | 22.86 | 29.01 |
| Globe Mallow (<i>Sphaeralcea</i> spp.) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 52.61 | 4.05 | 24.43 | 45.98 | 5.84 | 1.85 | 17.08 | 11.76 | 54.02 | 21.55 | Nov-Dec | 16.07 | 5.75 | 44.15 | 69.30 | 3.34 | 1.83 | 16.53 | 19.38 | 30.70 | 25.15 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 86.64 | 6.47 | 14.22 | 23.30 | 3.08 | 3.69 | 16.94 | 11.81 | 76.70 | 9.08 | Mar-Apr | 75.56 | 6.08 | 17.26 | 28.98 | 3.88 | 2.45 | 15.24 | 11.37 | 71.02 | 11.72 |
| Spurge (<i>Euphorbia</i> spp.) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 36.40 | 6.64 | 29.63 | 44.67 | 5.60 | 5.02 | 11.68 | 22.65 | 55.33 | 5.04 | Jul-Aug | 26.99 | 5.07 | 24.47 | 42.47 | 4.93 | 5.64 | 14.36 | 21.91 | 62.14 | 6.61 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 15.40 | 5.82 | 19.09 | 74.00 | 2.42 | 3.06 | 9.06 | 13.12 | 26.00 | 54.91 | Nov-Dec | 14.03 | 7.77 | 27.99 | 44.72 | 5.85 | 7.87 | 7.10 | 22.14 | 55.28 | 16.73 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 44.11 | 6.27 | 43.60 | 56.09 | 8.60 | 1.98 | 6.33 | 35.85 | 43.91 | 12.49 | Mar-Apr | 44.14 | 5.50 | 37.66 | 50.48 | 9.17 | 1.83 | 7.60 | 28.65 | 49.52 | 12.82 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 54.14 | 4.50 | 42.24 | 53.65 | 10.00 | 1.74 | 5.22 | 32.24 | 46.35 | 11.41 | Jul-Aug | 68.90 | 3.21 | 49.10 | 62.56 | 12.44 | 2.10 | 5.50 | 36.43 | 37.44 | 13.46 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 52.37 | 7.30 | 37.95 | 50.95 | 9.47 | 3.09 | 9.54 | 28.88 | 49.05 | 13.00 | Nov-Dec | 41.20 | 7.25 | 41.80 | 54.08 | 10.55 | 1.64 | 7.81 | 31.30 | 45.92 | 12.28 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 53.40 | 13.39 | 29.84 | 44.19 | 6.83 | 5.11 | 9.35 | 23.17 | 55.81 | 14.35 | Mar-Apr | 31.62 | 25.12 | 27.43 | 38.40 | 7.07 | 4.62 | 7.67 | 20.24 | 61.60 | 10.97 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 38.47 | 20.82 | 31.24 | 39.45 | 7.11 | 2.93 | 6.54 | 24.43 | 60.55 | 8.21 | Jul-Aug | 62.64 | 13.11 | 30.98 | 42.28 | 6.18 | 4.50 | 6.71 | 25.60 | 57.72 | 11.30 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 42.62 | 19.11 | 27.42 | 42.54 | 5.74 | 4.83 | 8.08 | 22.57 | 57.46 | 14.94 | Nov-Dec | 50.40 | 16.34 | 32.00 | 44.07 | 8.92 | 4.45 | 8.60 | 23.55 | 55.93 | 12.07 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 45.73 | 6.99 | 28.01 | 50.86 | 6.12 | 2.24 | 6.06 | 22.68 | 49.14 | 22.85 | Mar-Apr | 51.00 | 10.07 | 27.59 | 48.30 | 7.43 | 3.83 | 6.61 | 19.92 | 51.70 | 20.71 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 42.59 | 7.52 | 29.65 | 54.73 | 9.06 | 6.15 | 5.90 | 19.68 | 45.27 | 25.08 | Jul-Aug | 57.32 | 6.25 | 39.22 | 58.28 | 10.80 | 2.52 | 7.00 | 27.81 | 41.72 | 16.56 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 44.77 | 10.98 | 30.61 | 55.45 | 7.75 | 3.18 | 6.88 | 23.47 | 44.55 | 24.84 | Nov-Dec | 44.71 | 9.36 | 27.55 | 55.15 | 8.80 | 2.39 | 6.09 | 19.68 | 44.85 | 27.60 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Jan-Feb | 29.93 | 18.35 | 25.66 | 43.77 | 5.86 | 2.19 | 12.67 | 20.24 | 56.23 | 18.11 | Mar-Apr | 32.94 | 12.95 | 33.78 | 51.65 | 8.88 | 3.47 | 10.14 | 24.50 | 48.35 | 17.87 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | May-Jun | 50.47 | 6.47 | 38.26 | 56.79 | 9.14 | 1.75 | 6.66 | 29.09 | 43.21 | 18.53 | Jul-Aug | 74.04 | 5.74 | 48.78 | 70.60 | 12.59 | 1.74 | 7.58 | 34.89 | 28.05 | 21.82 |
| Lance-leaf Ditch (<i>Ditaxis lanceolata</i>) | | | | | | | | | | | | Sep-Oct | 36.91 | 13.32 | 30.86 | 53.70 | 8.54 | 3.47 | 11.43 | 46.30 | 22.87 | 22.84 | Nov-Dec | 33.28 | 13.52 | 39.71 | 54.80 | 10.86 | 1.53 | 10.04 | 29.76 | 45.20 | 15.09 |

* All values except dry matter reported on a moisture free basis.
 ** Plant parts used by Desert Mule Deer not available for sampling.

Hill, 1974). Climate data for 1981–82 were not significantly different from the 20 year averages given above (Nat'l. Oceanic and Atmosph. Admin., 1981, 1982).

Methods

During 1983 samples of 19 forage species used by Desert Mule Deer were collected bimonthly. The selection of forage species collected was based on observations of forage consumed by Desert Mule Deer in the Picacho Mountains. Plant collections were made during two to three days in the middle of each bimonthly period. At least 200 g (fresh weight) of each species was collected from at least 20 differ-

ent individual plants over a range of the available habitat. Plant parts collected mimicked plant parts selected (leaves, flowers, new growth) by Desert Mule Deer as much as possible. As plant parts were collected they were individually placed in pretared brown paper bags and weighed. Samples were kept for approximately 48 hours at ambient temperatures until received at the Animal Sciences Laboratory, University of Arizona, where they were frozen and stored at -20 C until analysis.

Dry matter (%) was determined by heating samples to a constant weight in a convection oven at 35 C. Dried matter was then ground to a 2 mm particle size with a Wiley

laboratory mill. The percentage of ether extract (lipid) was determined by the procedure described by the Association of Official Agricultural Chemists (1980). Fiber, lignin, and cellulose were determined according to Goering and Van Soest (1970). Nitrogen was determined using a micro Kjeldahl digestion and an autoanalyzer.

All parameters for each sample were only measured once. Following completion of all laboratory analyses, anomalous data points were reanalyzed for verification of accuracy. In some cases, bimonthly samples on either side of a data point in question were also reanalyzed. Plant names follow Lehr (1978).

Results and Discussion

Results of chemical analyses are presented in Table 1. A knowledge of nutritional values of key forage species has practical application in ungulate management and research. Our purpose was to present the nutritional quality of key forage plants as an easily accessed reference. Forage quality can be used as a criterion for assessing the quality of habitats. Monitoring seasonal nutritional levels of key forage species can help wildlife managers determine when the habitat is most productive and may provide clues as to when and if diet supplements are called for. This is especially important on ranges shared by native ungulates and livestock.

Literature Cited

- Association of Official Agricultural Chemists. 1980. *Official Methods of Analysis*. 12th ed. Association of Official Agricultural Chemists. Washington, D.C. 1015 pp.
- Goering, C. G., and P. J. Van Soest. 1970. *Forage Fiber Analyses*. U.S. Dept. Agric. Handbook No. 379. 20 pp.
- Horejsi, R. G. 1982. *Mule Deer Fawn Survival on Cattle-Grazed and Ungrazed Desert Ranges*. Arizona Game and Fish Dept., Fed Aid Fish and Wildl. Restor. Final Rept. W-78-R, Job 17. 43 pp.
- Kufeld, R. R., O. C. Wallmo, and C. Feddema. 1973. *Foods of the Rocky Mountain Mule Deer*. U.S. Forest Service Res. Pap. RM-111. 31 pp.
- Lehr, H. J. 1978. *A Catalogue of the Flora of Arizona*. Northland Press. Flagstaff. Ariz. 203 pp.
- Lowe, C. H. 1964. (ed.) *The Vertebrates of Arizona*. Univ. Ariz. Press. Tucson. 270 pp.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration. 1981. *Climatological Data: Arizona, Annual Summary*. Natl. Climatic Cent. Asheville, N.C. 29 pp.
- . 1982. *Climatological Data: Arizona, Annual Summary*. Natl. Climatic Cent. Asheville, N. C. 29 pp.
- Payton, T. W., and G. W. Garner. 1980. Nutritional values for selected forages of desert mule deer in southwest Texas. *Proc. Ann. Conf. West. Assoc. Fish and Wildl. Agencies* 60: 601–619.
- Rautenstrauch, K. R., P. R. Krausman, Frank M. Whiting, and W. H. Brown. 1988. Nutritional quality of Desert Mule Deer forage in King Valley, Arizona. *Desert Plants* 8: 172–174.
- Reynolds, H. G. 1967. Chemical constituents and deer use of some crown sprouts in Arizona chaparral. *J. Forest.* 65: 905–908.
- Sellers, W. D., and R. H. Hill. 1974. (eds.) *Arizona Climate: 1931–1972*. Univ. Ariz. Press. Tucson. 616 pp.
- Short, H. L. 1977. Food habits of mule deer in a semidesert grass-shrub habitat. *J. Range Manage.* 30: 206–209.
- Swank, W. G. 1956. Protein and phosphorous content of browse plants as an influence on southwestern deer herd levels. *Trans. North Amer. Wildl. Conf.* 21: 141–158.
- Urness, P. J., W. Green, and R. K. Watkins. 1971. Nutrient intake of deer in Arizona chaparral and desert habitats. *J. Wildl. Manage.* 35: 469–475.
- Swenson, E. and C. L. Mullins. 1985. Revegetating riparian trees in Southwestern floodplains. In: *Riparian Ecosystems and Their Management: Reconciling Conflicting Uses*. First North American Riparian Conference. USDA, Forest Service, Rocky Mtn. Forest and Range Exp. Sta. GTR-RM-120. p. 135–138.
- Thill, D. C., R. D. Schriman, and A. P. Appleby. 1979. Osmotic stability of mannitol and polyethylene glycol 20,000 solutions used as seed germination media. *Agron. J.* 71:105–108.
- Tschirley, F. H. and S. C. Martin. 1960. Germination and longevity of velvet mesquite in the soil. *J. of Range Manage.* 13: 94–97.
- York, J. C. 1985. Dormant stub planting technique. In: *Riparian Ecosystems and Their Management: Reconciling Conflicting Uses, First North American Riparian Conference*. USDA, Forest Service, Rocky Mtn. Forest and Range Exp. Sta. GTR-RM-120. p. 513–514.

Germination Requirements

– Continued from page 8

- Simpson, B. B. ed. 1977. *Mesquite: Its Biology in Two Desert Scrub Ecosystems*. Dowden, Hutchinson and Ross, Inc. Stroudsburg, PA 250 p.
- Steel, R. G. D. and J. H. Torrie. 1960. *Principles and Procedures of Statistics*. McGraw-Hill Book Co., Inc., New York, NY 481 p.
- Stromberg-Wilkens, J. and D. T. Patten. 1985. *Silvics of Arizona Walnut*. Final Report to Rocky Mtn. Forest and Range Exp. Sta. Arizona State University, Center for Environmental Resources, Tempe, AZ. 62 p.