BRUCE K. JOHNSON Wyoming Game and Fish Department Big Piney, WY 83113

FOOD HABITS AND FORAGE PREFERENCES OF BIGHORN SHEEP IN ALPINE AND SUBALPINE COMMUNITIES

BRUCE K. JOHNSON, Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology, Colorado State
University. Fort Collins 80523

DWIGHT R. SMITH, Department of Fishery and Wildlife Biology, Colorado State
University, Fort Collins 80523

ABSTRACT: Relationships between Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis canadensis) and their habitat were studied from June 1976 to October 1978 in the Pecos Wilderness, New Mexico. Food habits and forage preferences of bighorn sheep were determined for summer and autumn by direct observations of feeding of human-habituated, wild bighorn sheep. Year-round diet was determined by microhistological analysis of fecal samples. Food habits and forage preferences of bighorns from June to October were calculated for Kobresia, Trifolium, Geum, Potentilla, Salix, Vaccinium, Deschampsia, and Polygonum communities. Forbs were preferred over grasses and grasslike plants and woody plants. Forage preferences were not significantly different among bighorn ewes, yearlings, and immature rams. Diets selected varied among communities. Bighorn ate vegetation that was in early stages of phenological development, and abandoned stands as plants matured. Bighorn altered their feeding locations in response to phenological development among plant communities. Condition of this herd was excellent based on body weights, age-ratios, horn growth and levels of Protostongylus in lungs and feces. It is hypothesized that animals were

¹Present address Wyoming Game and Fish Department, Big Piney, WY 83113.

in excellent condition, because they were able to eat a high quality diet by changing their distribution, forage preferences, and diet selection throughout summer.

Todd (1972) summarized the literature on food habits of Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis canadensis) and concluded that grasses and grasslike plants were the most important forage and that forbs were consumed voraciously when they became available. Recent research continues to support this statement (Constan 1972, Erickson 1972, Frisina 1974, Stewart 1975, Lauer and Peek 1976, Harrington 1978). However, few studies determined forage preferences of bighorn or how food habits changed within a season.

Knowledge of food habits and forage preferences of bighorn is necessary to understand their habitat requirements. Traditionally, it has been assumed that lack of suitable winter range is the limiting factor affecting bighorn populations (Smith 1954, Buechner 1955, Oldemeyer et al. 1971, Stelfox 1976, Hoefs and Brink 1978). However, the importance may be underestimated of other seasonal ranges in maintaining populations in good condition by providing high quality forage throughout the growing season.

Recent papers have pointed out the importance of summer forage in maintaining ungulate populations in good condition. Captive bighorn maintained on a diet collected year-round on winter ranges were smaller and less able to tolerate cold temperatures than were sheep maintained on a diet simulating a diet obtained from altitudinal migration to alpine summer range. The explanation was that migrating animals were able to eat forage in early stages of phenological development thus obtaining a diet high in protein and digestible energy throughout summer. Nonmigrating animals

hemionus sitkensis) in Alaska that used a summer range with a wide variety of communities were larger than mule deer restricted to habitat with only a few communities. The larger animals used a succession of sites that were in early stages of phenological development and abandoned sites as plants matured. Thus they are a higher quality diet throughout summer than did animals restricted to a less diverse habitat (Klein 1965).

This paper was developed from data collected during a 3-year study of habitat of bighorn sheep funded by the Santa Fe and Carson National Forests. USDA. J. A. Bailey, D. Hein, and C. A. Wasser reviewed the design of this study. R. A. Sleeper reviewed this manuscript.

The study area was within the Pecos Wilderness near the southernmost end of the Rocky Mountains in the Sangre de Cristo Mountains, New Mexico (105°35'W, 36°30'N). Elevation ranged from 2750 to 4031 m. Treeline varied from 3500 to 3700 m depending on slope and aspect.

METHODS

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY AREA

Direct observations of feeding, totaling 62,244 bites, were obtained on 150 occasions from human-habituated, wild bighorn. All observations of feeding were made from within 5 m of the sheep and most were recorded from within 1 m. An occasion was defined as at least 100 bites recorded for 1 animal feeding in 1 location. A location was defined as an area that was relatively homogeneous with respect to vegetative composition. Up to 5 occasions of feeding were recorded at 1 location. Feeding observations were obtained during 2 3-day periods per month from the periods June-October 1977 and June-September 1978. Weather conditions and inability to find

human-habituated sheep made it impossible to obtain feeding observations on some days. Bighorn were especially wary of humans following trapping and transplanting operations conducted by New Mexico Game and Fish Department in August 1977 and 1978.

One 30-m transect was established that bisected each location where direct observations of feeding were obtained. Canopy cover was estimated for each species in 30 1x4-dm quadrats, and midpoints of percent classes 0-1, 2-5, 6-25, 26-50, 51-75, 76-95, 96-100 were recorded (Daubenmire 1959). Communities were identified from numerical analysis (Goldstein and Grigal 1972) of vegetation data describing 55 locations where 136 occasions of bighorn feeding were recorded. (See Johnson 1980 for detailed description of methods of obtaining direct observations of feeding and vegetation analysis). Forage preference was expressed as the ratio between percent bites of a species to percent that species contributed to vegetative canopy cover (Petrides 1975). A preference index of 1 indicated neither selection nor avoidance, whereas a value of greater than 1 indicated a selection and less than 1 an avoidance.

Composition of the year-round diet was estimated from microhistological analysis (Sparks and Malachek 1968) of 485 fecal samples collected from June 1976-October 1978. Of this total, 419 samples were from animals of known age and sex (Johnson 1980).

RESULTS

Communities Used in Summer and Autumn

Ten communities were identified from vegetation describing 55 feeding sites used by bighorn in summer and autumn (Table 1). The communities were diverse, ranging from xeric to mesic. Some had little snow cover throughout

TABLE 1. Communities used by bighorn in summer identified from numerical classification of 55 stands. Pecos Hilderness, New Hexico, 1526-1938.

	Mumber	Number	Pe	Percent canopy cover ^b ,d	by cover ^b	p,	Perc	Percent ground cover	cover",			Percen
Commity	Stands	Pellets ^a	Grasses	Grass- likes	Forbs	Shrubs	Mosses/ Lichens	Litter	Rock	ground	Dominant vegetation ^C species	Coverb.d
Kobresia	-	187±150 ^d	1+0.4	12±3	13.1	241	4+2	1343	35±6	21+8	Kobresia macrocarpa Geum rossii	241
Trifolium	100	17413	2=5	3+2	33+4	45	žı	10+3	9752	2345	Trifolium dasyphyllum Arenaria obtusiloba Potentilla gracilis	SEE
5		¥.	2-5 2-5	3)	37±4	2+5	[+]	10.1	1814	18+4	Geum rossii Deschampsia caespitosa Trifolium dasyphyllum	348)
Potentilla	90	2148	B+3	5*1	27.4	17+3	3+2	2) **	7	22+3	Potentilla fruticosa Deschampsia caespitosa Trifolium daysphyllum	575 475 475
Saltx		£	31	F	H.	\$	ž)	55	4+2	9+01 10+01	Salix planifolia Caltha leptosepala Polygonam bistortoides Sibbaldia procumbens	24.4 M
Vaccinium	12	*1	Ξ	ž	24+2	19+1	1+0.4	17±5	2145	17+4	Vaccinium scoparium Deschampsia caespitasa Aletes acaulis	04.5
Deschargsia	1	Ĭ.	E N	5+2	34.6	<u>2+1</u>	1+0.5	10+2	20+7	2146	Deschampsia caespitosa Sibbaldía procumbens Polygonum bistortoldes	266
Pal ygonum	9	45	145	E	4116	342	94. 1	14+7	6+2	1646	Pelygonum bistortoides Caltha leptosepala Deschampsia caespitosa	265
Danthonia	-	0	26	m	O)	2	0	12	<u>ss</u>	92	Canthonia parryi Potentilla fruticosa Siepheraneuron tricolepis	5 4 4 E
Potentilla	-	40	п	ω	g	0		ij	w	z	Achilles langosa Carex spp.	000

a humber of pellets per 30 1 x 4-dm quadrats.

P Estimated in 30 1 x 4-dm quadrats per transect.

C Speciesiscluded if greater than 2 percent ground cover.

d Mean ± 1 standard error.

winter, and other communities were covered by snow through early July.

Trifolium, Kobresia, Danthonia and portions of the Geum communities used
in summer were part of the winter range also. Remaining communities were
snow-covered throughout winter and were not included in winter range. Snow
persisted until late May to late June on the Deschampsia, Salix, Vaccinium,
and Polygonum communities and until early July on the Potentilla diversifolia
community.

Forage Preferences and Food Habits

Variation in preferences and diet among age and sex classes. -- Diet and forage preference were not significantly different among age and sex classes of bighorn. Forage preferences of ewes, yearlings, and immature rams were not significantly different in Trifolium or Vaccinium communities or when occasions were combined across all communities (Table 2). Diets were not significantly different among ewes, yearlings, lambs, and rams for summers 1976-1978, autumns 1976-1978, early winter 1976-1977, and late winter 1977 (Johnson 1980:63, 146-148). Therefore, data were combined across age and sex classes for the remaining analysis of forage preferences and food habits.

Seasonal preferences and diet. -- Forage preferences changed throughout the year. In the period June to October, bighorn preferred forbs (1.18 mean preference index, n = 136) over grasses and grasslike plants (0.81, n = 136) and woody plants (0.87, n = 116) (p < 0.05) except in July of both years when grass and grasslike plants were preferred more than or equally to forbs (Table 3).

Bighorn diet varied significantly throughout the year. Forbs dominated the diet from June to September, and grasses and grasslike plants were most

TABLE 2. Forage preferences of bighorn eves, yearlings, and immature rams in 2 vegetative communities and across 8 communities, Pecos Wilderness, liew Mexico, June-Dctober 1977 and June-September 1978.

			Nean Rank	ak.	-		Total	٠		
	Ened		Yearling	6	Ram		Occasions	×	d.f.	Significance
Trifolium community	21.0	ē	9	(2)	12.4 (7)	(2)	23	1.89	~	0.39
NAMES OF TAXABLE PARTIES OF TAXA									P	4
Forb preference	9.7	6)	16.4	3	10.6 (7)	(2)	23	4.76	2	0.00
Shrub preference	9.6	(8)	5.5 (6)	(9)	13.4 (5)	(2)	19	5.3	14	0.03
Vaccinium community										
Grasses and grasslike plants preference		(53)			11.0	[3]	36	0.37	EV.	0.55
Forb preference		(23)			14.2 (3)	(3)	92	0.03	. 3	0.87
Skrub preference	12.7 (23)	(23)			20.0 (3)	(3)	36	2.47	N	0.12
Across all communities										
Grasses and grasslike plant preference	(201) (105)	(101)	61.3(14)	(14)	(61)6.99	(15)	136	65.0	ev.	0.74
Farb preference	69.1 (107	(101)	73.6(14)	(14)	59.1(15)	(15)	136	1.12	N	0,57
Shrub preference	50.5	(16)	39.2	39.2(13)	(66.8(12)	(12)	116	5.35	eu.	0.07

A fumbers in parentheses were occasions feeding was observed.

Preference interes were not calculated if a forage class was meither consumed nor sampled. Shrubs did not occur on all sites where occasions were recorded, therefore, shrub total is less than other totals.

Corrected for ties; indexes within a forage class were ranked across all age-sex classes from low (1) to high (total accasions) and
a mean rank for each age-tex citis was calculated.

Nonthly variations in Dighorn forse preferences determined fromdirect feeding observations. Fecus Wilderness, the Nexico. June-October 1977 and June-September 1978. TABLE 3.

		1000	1977				1971	90		Total	2		
Month	Jun	lac	Aug	Sep	Oct	Jun	201	Aug	Sep	Occasions r d.f.	L	4.1	Significance
Grasses and grasslike plant preference	it preference	2											
Number occasions Mean rank ^C Calculated indexes ^d	51.1	17 18 51.1 101.5 0.5+0.1 1.4+0.2	54.1	72.8	78.4	23 67.3 0.8*0.1	70.5	24 65.7	52.3	136	19.5		0.012
Forb preference	1	ľ		1									
Number occasions Nean rank	78	18 60.1	76.0	106.0	121.4	70.8	27.0	24	13.6	136	19.2	60	0.014
Calculated indexes	1.5+0.2	1.0.0.1		1.6+0.4	2.0+0.2	1.1+0.1	0.9+0.1	1.0+0.1	1.3+0.1				
Shrub preference													
Number occasions Nean rank	51.5 45.9	45.9	2.45	30.0	4 10	21.4	22 6	20	11 45.7	116	19.5	9	0.013
Calculated Indexes	0.5+0.4	0.4+0.2	0.5+0.2	0.4+0.1	0.4+0.2	0.8+0.4	1.6+0.6	1.0+0.2	0.7+0.4				

A Preference indexes were not calculated if a forage class was neither consumed nor sampled. Shrubs did not occur on all sites where occasions were recorded; therefore shrub total is less than other totals.

b Corrected for ties.

C Indexes within a forage class were ranked across all months from low (1) to high (total occasions) and a monthly mean rank calculated.

d Mean + 1 standard error.

prominant in October, as determined by direct feeding observations (Table 4). However, forbs and grasses and grasslike plants were equally important in the diet in summer as determined by microhistological analysis. Grasses and grasslike plants were the major forage and forbs were a minor portion of the diet during the rest of the year. Woody plants were of minor importance in the diet throughout the year, with the most consumed in late winter (Table 5).

Differences in results between the direct feeding observation and fecal analysis techniques were discussed by Johnson (1980). It was recommended that food habits determined by direct observations more accurately described dietary selection than data from fecal analysis. However, there are few populations of human-habituated sheep and the cost of hand-rearing study animals often is prohibitive, and is subject to other biases. Fecal analysis is a technique that is less costly in time and money, but results should be carefully reviewed.

Bighorn changed species proportions in their diets during the period June to October, and these changes were consistent between years for the major species in the diet. <u>Trifolium dasyphyllum</u> was the dominant forage in June, and <u>Polygonum bistortoides</u> provided up to a third of bighorn diets in July and August. In late summer, the composite family was the dominant forage. <u>Senecio amplectens</u> was the dominant species eaten. In October grasses dominated the diet (Table 4).

Variations in preferences and diet among 8 communities. --Forage preferences of bighorn varied significantly among communities (Table 6). Generally, bighorn preferred 1 to several of the dominant species within a community, although not necessarily during the same month. Notable

Bighorn diet, in percent bites, determined from direct feeding observations, Pecos Wilderness, New Mexico, June-October 1977 and June-September 1973. Table 4.

			1977				1978			
	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Oct.	Jun.	Jul.	Aug.	Sep.	Totals
Total bites	5,394	6,633	3,493	851	2,196	12,868	13,744	12,414	4,651	66,244
Grasses and grasslike plants	18	33	17	14	99	14	26	16	12	24 ^b
Carex spp. a	7	12	N.	00 +	4	47.0	un e	m	en.	
Kobresia macrocarpa	n L	10	2 5	4	9	20	14	7)	-	
Spp.		11	O)	2	52	2	'n	10	8	
Forbs	89	64	71	74	30	83	57	89	85	29
Erigeron spp. Geum rossii	m	H 4 0	4		10		4100	13	4	
Polygonum bistortoides	2	31	12	4:		n	143	20	4	
Solidago ciliosa	37	1 6	* 2 ¥	18	۲,	63	0	7 P. P. P.	15.5	
other forbs	26	13	31	33	12	14	22	25	45	
Woody plants	14	М	12	12	4	m	17	16	m	6
Saltx nivalis	7		7				01	6		
Vaccinium scoparium other woody plants	ω 4	т	4 -	10	4	es	7	7	e	

^aA species is listed if it was at least 5 percent of the total bites recorded for some 2 months.

^bMean percent diet.

Bighorn seasonal diets determined by microhistological analysis of fecal samples, Pecos Wilderness, New Mexico, June 1976-October 1978. Table 5.

14						Ĭ	Season					
		Γ	1976-197	1				1977-1978	78		Ī	378
	Jun- Aug	Sep- Oct	Nov-	Feb-	May	Jun-	Sep- Oct	Nov-	Feb-	May	ay Jun- S Aug 0	Sep- Oct
Humber samples	16	12	10	10	1ª	16	12	ъ.,	1 a	19	16	11
Grasses and grasslike plants	51+5 _C	64+4	83+3	84+2	74	43+5	64+5	83	75	47	44+6	57+6
Carex-Kobresia ^b	29+4	22+4	50+5	8+69	18	28+4	25+2	11	70	10	23+5	26+5
Danthonia spp.	2+1	5+5	12+4	19+10	45	2+1	10+2	0	2	10	3+1	17
Deschampsia caespitosa	6+3	18+3	6+3	Ξ	2	4+5	10+3	2	0	10	5+2	9+3
Festuca spp.	11±2	10+2	18+3	5+2	9	3+1	15+3	ю	0	0	8+2	12+4
Forbs	47+5	34+4	15±3	6+2	26	53+4	25+4	ıń	S	41	9+09	36+6
Potentilla-Geumb	311+5	10+3	2+2	1	23	29+4	11+2	-	6	31	15+1	11+3
Trifolium spp.	5+5	3+3	Ξ	Ξ	2	8+3	t _d	2	0	4	23+6	3+1
Woody plants	3+1	2+1	2+1	11+2	0	4+5	11+2	12	20	12	6+2	7+2

^aComposite samples.

Drechnicians cannot distinguish between these genera.

GMean + 1 standard error.

dLess than 0.5 percent.

Hean ranks of forage preferences of Digtorn determined by direct feeding observations in A communities, Pecus Wilderness, New Mexica June-October 1977 and June-September 1978. TABLE 6.

				Corm	unities				Total		Ī
		2	_	-	5		-	9	Occas fon	ccasions N d.r	f. cance
Grasses and grasslike plant preference	ference										
Samber occas fons	12	25	170	12	23	27	23	13	136	20.5	7 5.3051
Calculated indexe.	1.1-0.1	0.6+0.1	1.010.2	0.6+0.2	0.4+0.1	0.7+0.1	0.9+0.1	1.0+0.2			
Forb preference											
Tlumber occasions	12	23	7.	12	12	27	23	13	136	42.9	7 0,0001
Hean rank	29.0	67.1	51.6	106.7	34.8	86.4	80.8	59.3			
Calculated indexes	6.5+0.1	1.1+0.03	1.0+0.1	1.8+0.2	0.7+0.2	1.3+0.1	1.7+0.3	1.1+0.04			
Shrub preference											
flumber occasions	110	10	74	12	12	27	21	80	116	23.0	7 0.0038
Mean rank	74.1	40.4	67.6	38.9	6.98	64.0	58.6	51.3			
Calculated indexes	1.2+0.5	0.5+0.2	0.8+0.3	0.3+0.1	1.4+0.1	0.9+0.2	0.8+0.2	D.B+0.4			

* Communities: I * Kobresia; 2 * Irifolium; 3 * Geum; 4 : Potentilla; 5 * Salix; 6 * Vaccinium; 7 * Deschampsia; 6 * Polygonum.

b Preference indexes were not calculated if a forage class was neither consumed nor sampled; shrubs did not accur on all sites where occasions were recorded; therefore, the shrub total is less than the other totals.

^c Corrected for ties.

Within a forese class, indexes were ranked ecross all communities from low [1] to high (Total Occasions) and a mean rank for each community calculated. 70

e Mean +istandard error.

exceptions were the low preference for \underline{P} . $\underline{fruticosa}$ (0.3) in the $\underline{Potentilla}$ community and for \underline{G} . \underline{rossii} (0.3) in the \underline{Geum} community. Within a community used during several months, forage preferences changed as summer progressed (Johnson 1980:80-92).

Diets of bighorn from June to October varied among communities (Table 7). Those species contributing the most to the diet in each community were usually the most abundant species within that community. However, in the Geum and Potentilla communities, G. rossii and P. fruticosa were each 8 percent of the bites recorded in the respective communities. In those communities used all 5 months, June through October, bighorn ate a greater variety of species than in communities used only 2 or 3 months (Table 7). Within a community grazed during 3 or more months, food habits of bighorn changed as summer progressed (Johnson 1980:154-161).

DISCUSSION

Bighorn distribution changed among communities as summer progressed. They are species that were in early stages of phenological development and avoided plants that were past flowering. Plants in xeric communities flowered earlier in summer than did plants in mesic communities. Xeric communities were used early in summer but were abandoned as plants matured and snow melted, exposing vegetation on the more mesic sites. Thus by utilizing various communities and various species within communities, bighorn maintained a diet high in protein, phosphorus, and digestible energy. Highest levels of protein, phosphorus, and digestible energy are in plants in early stages of phenological development and decline as plants mature (Klein 1965, Johnston et al. 1968, Hebert 1973, Keiss and Schoonveld 1974, P-R Proj., W-41-R-23, Colorado Div. of Wildlife, Fort Collins, Keiss 1977).

Bighorn food habits in I communities determined by direct feeding observations in surmer and autumn. Species included contributed at least 5 percent of total bites recorded in some 2 months during the periods June-October 1977 and June-Septemier 1978, Pecos Milderness, New Mexico. Table 7.

	Kobresta	Trifollum	5	Dotentilla Sal	Salts	Vaccinium	Deschangsia	Folygonum
lumber accasions lonths utilized	300e(4) ⁸ 301y(6)	23 June (19) July (1)	June (4) July (6)	12 June [9] July [1]	12 July(6)		25 June(1) July(11)	20 3417(6)
	Sept(2)	Sept (2)	Aug (2) Sept(2)		Aug (6)	Sept (9)	Aug (5)	Aug(12) Sept(2)
irasses and grass- like plants	89+6S	12+2	2014	1244	24.6			16+2
Forbs Woody plants	285 285	7+0.5	1075	10+0 0+5 0+5	1316	1573	29+4 6+1	2412
Deschanosia	91	2+2	71		1+0.1	40	PA	2+1
caespitosa obresia macrocarpa	1+0.4	3+1	5+3	142	1+0.1 T+1	34.	Ē.	175
rigeron spp.	æş	1	lar (1+1	£5	249	216
Oreoxis alpina	452	1	100	916	ΞΙ	1.0	100	# 1+4 N
historioides	1+0.4	4	10+3	1 -1	21	12+2	27+5	5492
of ideas ciliosa	3.5		Ξ			121	Į.	Ē
desyphyllum	1+1	5349	23+8	41-11	Ξ.	-3		Ξ
Salix planifolis	1		ļu.		15 th	j		**
scopulorum			342	<u>=</u>)	**	13+3	5-1	243
Number bites	4,073	12,689	106-8	4,019	3,583	10,3 9	0,796	9,864

Alumber of occasions feeding observations obtained in month.

^bpercent nean ± 1 standard error.

Less than 0.5 percent.

d.rossii was not 5 percent of the bites for some 2 months, but it was inclined because it was a major species over much of the range.

Enumber of species greater than 5 percent of the total bites for some age-srx class for some 1 month.

This population of bighorn was in excellent condition as measured by body weight, horn growth of rams, lamb:ewe and yearling:ewe ratios, and Protostrongylus numbers in feces and lungs. Ewes weighed up to 90 kg. Horns of 2-year old rams were greater than 1/2 curl by end of summer and mean weights of 5 2 1/2-year old rams was 81 kg. Lamb:ewe and yearling:ewe ratios were 0.86 and 0.89 in 1976; 0.67 and 0.40 in 1977, and 0.62 and 0.32 in 1978. Ratios of yearlings:ewes were depressed in 1977 and 1978 because of a disproportionate number of lambs and yearlings captured during trapping operations in 1977 and 1978. Three ewes and 2 lambs were necropsied in 1976, and all animals were in excellent condition with few Protostongylus nodules in the lungs (Lange 1980). Protostrongylus was present in low levels in feces (Lange 1980). We believe the excellent condition of this herd was directly attributable to availability and selection of high quality forage throughout summer.

This information has important management implications. On sites considered for release of bighorn sheep, potential summer range should be critically examined. A mosaic of slopes and aspects should exist that will support a variety of communities providing forage in various stages of phenological development throughout summer. This will permit animals to obtain a high quality diet and will increase the probability of a successful establishment of a self-sustaining population of bighorn. LITERATURE CITED

BUECHNER, H. K. 1960. The bighorn sheep in the United States, its past, present, and future. Wildl. Monogr. No. 4. 174pp.

CONSTAN, K. J. 1972. Winter foods and range use of three species of ungulates. J. Wildl. Manage. 36(4):1068-1076.

- DAUBENMIRE, R. 1959. A canopy-coverage method of vegetation analysis.

 N. W. Sci. 33(1):43-64.
- ERICKSON, G. L. 1972. The ecology of Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep in the Sun River area of Montana with special reference to summer food habits and range movements. Montana Fish and Game Dept., P-R Rep., Proj. W-120-R-2,3. Job No. 8.01. 50pp.
- FRISINA, M. R. 1974. Ecology of bighorn sheep in the Sun River area of Montana during fall and spring. Montana Fish and Game Dept., P-R Rep., Proj. W-120-R-4,5. Job. No. 8.02. 68pp.
- GOLDSTEIN, R. A., and D. F. GRIGAL. 1972. Computer programs for the ordination and classification of ecosystems. Ecological Sci. Div. Publ. No. 417. Oak Ridge Natl. Lab., Oak Ridge, Tennessee.
- HARRINGTON, F. A. 1978. Ecological segregation of ungulates in alpine and subalpine communities. Ph.D. Dissertation. Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins. 152pp.
- HEBERT, D. M. 1973. Altitudinal migration as a factor in the nutrition of bighorn sheep. Ph.D. Dissertation. Univ. British Columbia, Vancouver. 355pp.
- HOEFS. M., and V. C. BRINK. 1978. Forage production and utilization of a dall sheep winter range, Southwest Yukon Territory. Trans. Northern Wild Sheep Counc. 87-112.
- JOHNSON, B. K. 1980. Bighorn sheep food habits, forage preferences, and habitat selection in alpine and subalpine communities. Ph.D. Dissertation. Colorado State Univ., Fort Collins. 170pp.
- JOHNSTON, A., L. M. BEZEAU, and S. SMOLIAK. 1968. Chemical composition and <u>in vitro</u> digestibility of alpine tundra plants. J. Wildl. Manage. 32(4):773-777.

- KEISS, R. E. 1977. Evaluation of the nutritional requirements of bighorn sheep. Colorado Div. Wildl., P-R Rep., Proj. W-41-R-26. Job No. 16. 56pp.
- KLEIN, D. R. 1965. Ecology of deer range in Alaska. Ecol. Monogr. 35: 259-284.
- LANGE, R. E., JR. 1980. Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep (Ovis canadensis

 canadensis) in the Pecos Wilderness, New Mexico. Status and Management.

 New Mexico Game and Fish Dept. P.R. Rep., Proj. W-124-R. 55pp.
- LAUER, J. L., and J. M. PEEK. 1976. Big game-livestock relationships on the bighorn sheep winter range East Fork, Salmon River, Idaho. Univ. Idaho For., Wildl., and Range Exp. Stn. Bull. 12. 44pp.
- OLDEMEYER, J. L., W. J. BARMORE, and D. L. GILBERT. 1971. Winter ecology of bighorn sheep in Yellowstone National Park. J. Wildl. Manage. 35(2):257-269.
- PETRIDES, G. A. 1975. Principal foods versus preferred foods and their relations to stocking rate and range condition. Biol. Conserv. 7(3): 161-169.
- SMITH, D. R. 1954. The bighorn sheep in Idaho. Its status, life history and management. Idaho Dept. Fish and Game, Wildl. Bull. No. 1. 154pp.
- SPARKS, D. R., and J. C. MALACHEK. 1968. Estimating dry weight in diets using a microscopic technique. J. Range. Manage. 21(4):264-265.
- STELFOX, J. G. 1976. Range ecology of Rocky Mountain bighorn sheep.

 Can. Wildl. Serv. Rep. Ser. No. 39. 49pp.
- STEWART, S. T. 1975. Seasonal ecology of bighorn sheep in the Beartooth Mountains. Montana Dept. Fish and Game, P-R Rep., Proj. W-120-R-6,7.
- TODD, J. W. 1972. A literature review on bighorn sheep food habits.

 Colorado Div. Wildl. Spec. Rep. No. 27. 21pp.