

Topic: Percentage of Harvested Buck from 2014-2016.

Data Set:

PERCENTAGE OF BUCK HARVEST BY AGE CLASS

State/Province	1½ Years Old			2½ Years Old			3½ and Older		
	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016	2014	2015	2016
Alabama***	28	21	20	31	28	24	41	51	56
Arkansas	8	7	5	25	19	18	67	74	77
Florida***	23	17	19	44	45	46	32	38	35
Georgia	30	45	33	31	27	32	39	28	35
Louisiana	17	16	13	16	17	15	67	67	72
Mississippi	13	14	10	13	9	13	74	77	78
North Carolina	40	39	39	36	37	36	24	24	25
Oklahoma	24	25	17	16	15	24	60	60	59
South Carolina	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Tennessee	37	37	37	44	43	46	19	20	16
Texas	21	14	23	17	11	18	62	75	59
Southeast Average	24	24	22	27	25	27	49	51	51
Illinois	42	42	39	*	*	*	*	*	*
Indiana	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Iowa	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Kansas	16	*	*	35	*	*	49	*	*
Kentucky	28	33	30	44	41	41	28	26	29
Michigan	43	44	47	32	29	26	25	27	27
Minnesota	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Missouri**	15(40)	24	22	49(36)	41	48	36(24)	35	30
Nebraska	24	30	28	39	35	37	36	35	35
North Dakota	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Ohio	45	41	43	35	33	32	20	26	25
South Dakota	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Wisconsin	48	55	65	31	28	18	21	17	16
Midwest Average	34	38	39	37	34	34	30	28	27
Connecticut	45	42	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Delaware	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Maine	47	48	47	25	24	23	28	27	30
Maryland	47	51	47	*	*	*	*	*	*
Massachusetts	42	45	44	30	27	26	28	29	30
New Hampshire	46	43	51	29	28	25	25	29	24
New Jersey	46	36	*	45	43	*	9	21	*
New York	48	47	49	34	33	31	18	20	19
Pennsylvania	43	41	44	*	*	*	*	*	*
Rhode Island	36	33	35	38	32	37	26	35	23
Vermont	22	26	34	56	52	46	22	22	20
Virginia	43	46	49	29	28	27	28	26	25
West Virginia	26	*	*	47	*	*	27	*	*
Northeast Average	41	41	44	37	33	31	23	26	25
3 Region Average	33	34	35	34	31	31	34	35	34
Alberta	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
British Columbia	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Manitoba	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
New Brunswick	*	44	51	*	29	23	*	26	26
Nova Scotia	*	35	*	*	36	*	*	29	*
Ontario	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Quebec	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*
Saskatchewan	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*	*

*Data not provided/available **Data from antler-point-restriction counties (non-antler-point-restriction counties)

***Data from check stations and/or DMAP areas

Summary: White-tail deer are probably one of the most commonly hunted big game animals in Texas and other, similar, states. The males (bucks) of the species are probably some of the most sought after in terms of trophies, with females for meat, although some hunters will look at a buck for meat instead of as a trophy. In the data set above it compares the percentage of bucks harvested across three years. In the article titled “Effects of Deer Density and Land Use on Mass of White-Tailed Deer”, the authors elaborate on the density of deer and how it can affect their ecosystem. In another article titled “Influence of Habitat Features and Hunter Behavior on White-Tailed Deer Harvest”, the authors are talking about how environmental conditions can effect the hunter’s harvest of the white-tailed deer for the year. In the final article (“Effect of Hunter Selectivity on Harvest Rates of Radio-Collared White-Tailed Deer in Pennsylvania”) the authors talk about how radio transmitters did not have the effect they expected on which deer the hunter’s where expected to harvest.

Citations:

BUDERMAN, F., DIEFENBACH, D., ROSENBERRY, C., WALLINGFORD, B., & LONG, E. (2014). Effect of Hunter Selectivity on Harvest Rates of Radio-Collared White-Tailed Deer in Pennsylvania. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 78(8), 1456-1465. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.shsu.edu/stable/43188288>

LEBEL, F., DUSSAULT, C., MASSÉ, A., & CÔTÉ, S. (2012). Influence of Habitat Features and Hunter Behavior on White-Tailed Deer Harvest. *The Journal of Wildlife Management*, 76(7), 1431-1440. Retrieved from <http://www.jstor.org.ezproxy.shsu.edu/stable/23251441>

Trevor J. Hefley, Scott E. Hygnstrom, Jason M. Gilsdorf, Gregory M. Clements, Myndi J. Clements, Andrew J. Tyre, David M. Baasch, and Kurt C. VerCauteren (2013) Effects of Deer Density and Land Use on Mass of White-Tailed Deer. *Journal of Fish and Wildlife Management*: June 2013, Vol. 4, No. 1, pp. 20-32.