To: Senate Committee on Environment and Natural Resources

From: Sally Mackler, Oregon Carnivore Coordinator, Predator Defense
sally@predatordefense.org

Re: Docments of interest relating to testimony Opposing HB2624
May 22, 2013 Public Hearing

1. Comments from cougar biologists re. Oregon's population model, effects of hunting on safety and predation (full comments available upon request)

2. National Agricultural Statistics Service stats on cougar predation in Oregon

3. Oregon deer and elk hunting trends

Cougar Biologists' Comments on Oregon's Population Model, Effect of Hunting on Predation, Safety

The belief that managers have professed to, that increase harvest or off-take of cougars will reduce **the risk of an attack**, is simply not based on any scientific analysis and is logically deficient. To illustrate this point, how do you measure success of reducing an already rare event (on the order of 100 million or more to one) in a measurable way? If you reduced the cougar population in the state by 10% and assumed this meant your risk improved by 10%, you have simply shifted the odds from 1:100 million to 1:110 million. In other words, it is simply immeasurable; you would have no way to know that you had any effect. The only way to ensure there is never again an attack is to either eradicate the cougar from the landscape entirely or forbid people from living and/or recreating in cougar country: two completely untenable proposals.

Dr. Rick Hopkins, cougar researcher and ecologist, Comment on the Oregon Cougar Management Plan

---

1. **Models are used to determine population numbers**, trends and densities. Those models are of questionable reliability. There is no sensitivity analysis reported for the models used in the document. As pointed out by the authors, models are only as good as the data put into them. What was the quality of bounty data from 1924? Deterministic models should only be used over short time periods. Density estimates are strongly inversely related to study area size and should not be extrapolated over large areas. **Harvest and non-hunter take are notoriously bad indices to population size yet this document relies heavily on those data for population estimates.**

2. Research suggests that **high harvest levels can disrupt the social structure** of cougar populations by affecting the age distribution. High harvest can lead to an abundance of younger animals, possibly more prone to depredation and likely to tolerate higher densities. Increases in harvest levels may be a result of this as pointed out the average age of animals has declined in those areas.

Becky Pierce, Calif. Department of Fish and Game, from Comments on the Oregon Cougar Management Plan

---

Cougars as limiting factors to deer and elk populations: I believe that it is appropriate to have "trigger" points associated with elk recruitment, **but declines in recruitment should not automatically be attributed to cougar predation.** Many other factors in addition to, or acting synergistically with, cougar predation can affect elk recruitment. I believe it is possible that cougar predation may act as a proximate cause of deer and elk decline but suspect that it is seldom the ultimate cause except under condition of small ungulate population size.

Dr. Barry R. Noon, Professor, Dept of Fish, Wildlife, Conservation Biology Colorado State University from Comments on the Oregon Cougar Management Plan

---

My research in WA indicates that **traditional methods to estimate cougar numbers** and densities (number of cougars captured or otherwise documented in a fixed study area) **DOUBLE OR TRIPLE THE REAL NUMBERS AND DENSITIES** because most cougars spend time outside the trapping area and actually inhabit a vastly larger area at much lower densities (Maletzke et al. 2010b).

Dr. Robert Wielgus, Director Washington State University Carnivore Lab
From Comments on ODFW 2009 Evaluation of the Cougar Management Plan

Cattle Death Loss

ISSN:

Released May 12, 2011, by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), Agricultural Statistics Board, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Cattle and Calf Death Losses

This report is released every five years as a cooperative effort between the National Agricultural Statistics Service and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services and Veterinary Services. The information presented in this report is based on producer reports from the January 2011 Cattle survey and includes detailed percentage breakouts of cattle and calf losses by predators and non-predator causes as well as non-lethal control measures.

Cattle and calf losses from predators and non-predator causes in the United States totaled 3.99 million head (excluding Alaska) during 2010. This represents 4.3 percent of the 93.9 million cattle and calves in the United States at the beginning of 2010. Losses of cattle weighing more than 500 pounds totaled 1.73 million head or 43.4 percent of total losses. Calves weighing less than 500 pounds lost to all causes totaled 2.26 million head or 56.6 percent of total losses.

Cattle and calf losses from animal predators totaled nearly 220 thousand head during 2010. This represented 5.5 percent of the total deaths from all causes and resulted in a loss of $98.5 million to farmers and ranchers. Coyotes and dogs caused the majority of cattle and calf predator losses accounting for 53.1 percent and 9.9 percent respectively.

Cattle and calf losses from non-predator causes totaled 3.77 million head or 94.5 percent of the total losses during 2010. Respiratory problems represented the leading cause of non-predator deaths, accounting for 28.0 percent, followed by digestive problems at 13.4 percent.

Non-lethal predator control measures cost farmers and ranchers throughout the United States $188.5 million during 2010. Use of guard animals was the most common method at 36.9 percent. Exclusion fencing, frequent checking, and culling were the next most commonly used methods of preventing cattle and calf losses at 32.8 percent, 32.1 percent, and 28.9 percent respectively.

Number of Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Death Loss by Cause – United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

Cause	Number of head	Percent of total	Total value
	(number)	(percent)	(1,000 dollars)
Predator			
Coyotes	116,700	53.1	48,185
Mountain lions and bobcats [1]	18,900	8.6	9,221
Dogs	21,800	9.9	10,067
Vultures	11,900	5.4	4,641
Wolves	8,100	3.7	3,646
Bears	2,800	1.3	1,415
Other predators	12,400	5.6	6,352
Unknown predators	27,300	12.4	14,948
Total predator	219,900	100.0	98,475
Non-predator			
Digestive problems	505,000	13.4	267,799
Respiratory problems	1,055,000	28.0	643,146
Metabolic problems	59,800	1.6	47,558
Mastitis	62,000	1.6	59,112
Lameness/injury	140,900	3.7	112,251
Other diseases	179,500	4.8	114,577
Weather related	489,000	13.0	274,092
Calving problems	494,000	13.1	274,670
Poisoning	36,100	0.9	26,817
Theft	15,100	0.4	9,309
Other non-predator	301,600	8.0	247,092
Unknown non-predator	435,000	11.5	276,476
Total non-predator	3,773,000	100.0	2,352,899
United States Total [2]	3,992,900	100.0	2,451,374

[1] Includes cougars, pumas and lynx.
[2] Excludes Alaska.

Total Value per Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Losses by Cause – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Total value per head		Total value predator losses		Total value non-predator losses	
	Cattle [1]	Calves [2]	Cattle	Calves	Cattle	Calves
	(dollars)	(dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)
Alabama	852	324	852	1,685	18,744	8,035
Arizona	790	354	1,738	743	14,062	5,629
Arkansas	807	339	1,533	1,627	26,712	11,933
California	923	348	1,292	2,854	91,008	44,126
Colorado	1,037	372	830	1,600	56,205	18,860
Connecticut	1,095	300	-	30	1,205	330
Delaware	843	312	-	-	337	156
Florida	766	333	689	1,798	16,929	8,525
Georgia	793	330	1,031	1,155	14,036	6,435
Hawaii	520	273	52	137	2,548	956
Idaho	967	354	1,837	1,487	38,777	16,567
Illinois	1,001	336	300	504	17,718	9,576
Indiana	955	321	96	257	12,320	6,805
Iowa	1,097	360	219	504	76,571	33,696
Kansas	1,017	378	814	1,474	126,311	28,766
Kentucky	871	330	1,045	3,135	37,279	19,305
Louisiana	871	318	1,568	1,463	14,110	4,579
Maine	879	300	-	90	1,670	720
Maryland	911	312	91	31	2,642	1,529
Massachusetts	824	300	-	-	824	300
Michigan	942	278	188	167	20,536	11,787
Minnesota	987	375	395	788	45,007	32,213
Mississippi	821	315	657	882	16,584	7,623
Missouri	997	357	698	2,321	64,107	42,305
Montana	1,058	384	1,058	1,613	23,276	20,275
Nebraska	1,128	393	226	865	123,854	32,540
Nevada	969	369	485	849	4,361	3,579
New Hampshire	973	300	-	-	778	240
New Jersey	918	249	-	25	459	149
New Mexico	894	354	2,950	2,336	16,718	10,054
New York	911	276	273	386	28,879	11,482
North Carolina	838	315	1,173	1,260	9,721	5,040
North Dakota	1,135	366	341	915	16,685	13,725
Ohio	908	321	454	738	18,614	8,571
Oklahoma	914	360	3,108	3,780	79,152	43,020
Oregon	972	345	583	1,104	18,857	10,971
Pennsylvania	996	300	100	180	34,760	12,720
Rhode Island	951	300	-	-	95	60
South Carolina	843	315	253	315	5,648	2,205
South Dakota	1,133	381	340	991	76,704	33,299
Tennessee	820	324	1,066	2,527	26,814	15,617
Texas	889	354	5,334	14,160	270,256	88,500
Utah	984	360	295	828	12,497	8,532
Vermont	842	300	84	60	4,968	2,340
Virginia	801	330	481	1,584	20,345	15,576
Washington	949	342	190	513	18,790	5,985
West Virginia	884	297	88	297	4,332	4,158
Wisconsin	949	423	475	1,311	70,701	57,909
Wyoming	1,094	396	438	1,386	11,596	10,494
United States [3]	952	354	35,720	62,755	1,615,102	737,797

- Represents zero.

[1] Cattle value per head is based on a two-year straight average of the value of beef cows reported in the January 1 Cattle survey from 2010 and 2011.

[2] Calf value per head is based on the market year average calf price. An average weight of 300 pounds was used in all States.

[3] Excludes Alaska. United States value per head for cattle and calves derived.

ELK HUNTING TRENDS 1940 - 2011

	STATEWIDE					ROCKY MOUNTAIN ELK					ROOSEVELT ELK				
YEAR	HUNTERS	BULL HARV.	ANTLER-LESS HARVEST	TOTAL HARV.	% HUNT SUCC.	HUNTERS	BULL HARV.	ANTLER-LESS HARVEST	TOTAL HARV.	% HUNT SUCC.	HUNTERS	BULL HARV.	ANTLER-LESS HARVEST	TOTAL HARV.	% HUNT SUCC.
1990	110,504	10,762	7,574	18,336	17	66,121	7,690	5,618	13,308	20	44,383	3,072	1,956	5,028	11
1991	117,342	13,384	8,185	21,569	18	71,069	9,856	6,503	16,359	23	46,273	3,528	1,682	5,210	11
1992	128,560	13,082	8,933	22,015	17	76,710	8,998	7,012	16,010	21	51,850	4,084	1,921	6,005	12
1993	138,270	13,254	8,335	21,589	16	81,899	8,048	6,288	14,336	18	56,371	5,206	2,047	7,253	13
1994	129,903	14,568	11,496	26,064	20	76,313	10,027	8,827	18,854	25	53,590	4,541	2,669	7,210	13
1995	140,777	13,291	10,167	23,458	17	81,906	9,210	7,541	16,751	20	58,871	4,081	2,626	6,707	11
1996	137,032	13,213	12,755	25,968	19	77,736	8,269	9,601	17,870	23	59,296	4,944	3,154	8,098	14
1997	142,262	12,829	12,878	25,707	18	78,841	8,186	9,209	17,395	22	63,421	4,643	3,669	8,312	13
1998	146,614	12,138	11,634	23,772	16	79,419	7,452	8,472	15,924	20	67,195	4,686	3,162	7,848	12
1999	142,980	11,573	10,004	21,577	15	78,263	7,474	7,171	14,645	19	64,717	4,099	2,833	6,932	11
2000	137,624	10,645	9,595	20,240	15	75,181	6,697	6,531	13,228	18	62,443	3,948	3,064	7,012	11
2001	137,348	10,934	9,448	20,382	15	74,408	6,747	6,210	12,957	17	62,940	4,187	3,238	7,425	12
2002	134,485	10,889	9,458	20,347	15	74,408	6,747	6,210	12,957	17	60,077	4,142	3,248	7,390	12
2003	129,101	10,512	9,007	19,519	15	69,760	6,085	5,284	11,369	16	59,341	4,427	3,723	8,150	14
2004 [1]	105,782	7,589	5,444	13,033	12	50,883	3,821	2,251	6,072	12	54,899	3,768	3,193	6,961	13
2005 [1]	107,101	8,521	5,055	13,576	13	51,915	4,389	2,286	6,675	13	55,186	4,132	2,769	6,901	13
2006 [1]	112,380	9,405	5,119	14,524	13	51,011	5,060	2,252	7,312	14	61,369	4,345	2,867	7,212	12
2007 [1]	114,184	8,530	4,602	13,132	12	51,010	4,487	2,149	6,636	13	63,174	4,043	2,453	6,496	10
2008 [1]	114,118	8,746	4,803	13,561	12	49,823	5,121	2,036	7,169	14	64,295	3,625	2,767	6,392	10
2009 [1]	113,265	9,003	5,044	14,070	12	50,672	4,946	2,324	7,293	14	62,593	4,057	2,720	6,777	11
2010 [1]	100,740	9,236	4,785	14,021	14	46,123	5,161	2,272	7,433	16	54,617	4,075	2,513	6,588	12
2011 [1]	83,835	8,315	4,957	13,272	16	31,742	3,875	2,473	6,348	20	52,093	4,440	2,484	6,924	13

[1] Harvest surveys were not conducted on all hunts this year. This data is not comparable to previous years.

DEER HUNTING TRENDS 1952 - 2011

	STATEWIDE			MULE DEER						BLACK-TAILED DEER					
YEAR	HUNTERS	DEER HARVEST	% HUNT SUCC.	HUNTERS	TOTAL HARVEST	% HUNT SUCC.	% TOTAL HARV.	ANTLER-LESS HARVEST	% ANTLER-LESS HARVEST	HUNTERS	TOTAL HARVEST	% HUNT SUCC.	% TOTAL HARV.	ANTLER-LESS HARV.	% ANTLER-LESS HARV.
1992	247,996	92,336	37	91,518	38,749	42	42	5,362	14	156,478	53,587	34	58	13,472	25
1993	237,824	57,980	24	76,904	18,027	23	31	2,226	12	160,920	39,953	25	69	10,183	25
1994	234,816	70,848	30	74,442	28,315	38	40	3,040	11	160,374	42,533	27	60	8,961	21
1995	227,948	63,344	28	82,200	28,466	35	45	3,993	14	145,748	34,878	24	55	6,727	19
1996	233,265 [1]	65,757	28	84,796	29,581	35	45	5,303	18	148,469	36,176	24	55	7,762	21
1997	233,968 [1]	70,525	30	88,705	37,862	43	54	6,348	17	145,263 [1]	32,663	22	46	6,505	20
1998	243,515 [1]	72,089	30	91,592	36,735	40	51	5,387	15	151,923 [1]	35,354	23	49	6,582	19
1999	234,274 [1]	63,507	27	93,101	34,503	37	54	5,297	15	141,173 [1]	29,004	21	46	5,704	20
2000	225,989 [1]	61,816	27	90,603	33,217	37	54	5,293	16	135,386 [1]	28,599	21	46	5,609	20
2001	217,144 [1]	58,283	27	91,215	32,623	36	56	5,135	16	125,929 [1]	25,660	20	44	5,187	20
2002	204,481 [1]	50,644	25	90,012	29,646	33	59	5,099	17	114,469 [1]	20,998	18	41	3,891	19
2003	196,251 [1]	51,868	26	86,790	28,173	32	54	4,577	16	109,461 [1]	23,695	22	46	3,906	16
2004 [2]	175,902 [1]	47,424	27	73,990	21,453	29	45	1,456	7	101,912 [1]	25,971	25	55	2,555	10
2005 [2]	171,680 [1]	48,605	28	72,060	28,039	39	58	725	3	99,620 [1]	20,566	21	42	2,357	11
2006 [2]	175,911 [1]	44,646	25	74,257	24,136	33	54	728	3	101,654 [1]	20,510	20	46	2,434	12
2007 [2]	188,870 [1]	51,210	27	74,347	26,861	36	52	1,281	5	114,523 [1]	24,349	21	48	2,297	9
2008 [2]	190,224 [1]	46,308	24	70,126	20,457	29	44	981	5	120,098 [1]	25,851	22	56	2,470	10
2009 [2]	180,068 [1]	43,476	24	68,882	20,980	30	48	1,045	5	111,186 [1]	22,496	20	52	2,463	11
2010 [2]	180,039 [1]	40,239	22	67,487	19,953	30	50	785	4	112,552 [1]	20,286	18	50	2,880	14
2011 [2]	166,829 [1]	43,223	26	65,832	22,945	35	53	844	4	100,997 [1]	20,278	20	47	2,446	12

[1] Total eliminates duplication where hunters could hunt two areas

[2] Harvest surveys were not conducted on all hunts this year. This data is not comparable to previous years.

Paul Beier
Professor of Conservation Biology and Wildlife Ecology
Flagstaff AZ 86011-5018
Phone: 1-928-523-9341. Email: paul.beier@nau.edu Web Page: http://oak.ucc.nau.edu/pb1

March 31, 2003

To whom it may concern:

As a post-doctoral Research Specialist with University of California, I studied cougars in the Santa Ana Mountain Range of southern California from 1988 through 1992. I have published about 8 peer-reviewed papers from this study, including the only paper that documents trends in cougar attacks on humans (Beier 1991: Cougar attacks on humans in the United States and Canada, 1890-1990. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 19:403-412). You can access this paper via my website (above). I am writing now because I have been asked to comment on whether sport hunting reduces the risk of such attacks.

I am not opposed to cougar hunting. I adamantly feel that the focus of predator conservation should be on protecting core areas and habitat connectivity, not on opposing hunting. I believe hunters logically should be, and often are, the natural allies of other conservationists in this effort. It pains me to see these two conservationist camps battling each other instead of joining forces to oppose habitat loss, habitat fragmentation, and habitat degradation.

The issue of hunting cougars should be debated solely on the basis of how the people of the State value these animals. Neither side can claim that they have the scientifically correct answer. On the one hand, opponents of hunting cannot claim sport hunting will endanger the species. As a biologist, I believe that most cougar populations can sustain hunting losses without long-term detriment under a conservative hunting program, and I further believe that most state agencies can and do run responsible hunting programs. On the other hand, proponents of hunting should not claim that hunting cougars is necessary to maintain public safety. Quite simply, I believe that sport hunting does not reduce the risk of cougar attacks on humans because:

1. In most states, the sport hunting take is probably less than 5% of the population. If this reduced the population by 5% (which it doesn't, see point 2) and if sport hunters killed animals randomly (which they don't, point 3), this would reduce the rate of cougar attacks by 5%. Because the odds of being attacked are less than the odds of winning the lottery - maybe 1 chance in 25,000,000 - hunting would, under the most optimistic scenario, lower the odds to about 1 chance in 26,250,000.

2. In fact, a 5% harvest does not reduce the population by 5% because all wild populations exhibit what ecologists call "compensatory mortality" (meaning that when some animals are

removed, the remaining animals have a better chance to survive) and "compensatory natality" (meaning that at the lower density after harvest, more cubs will be successfully raised). Quite likely the change in cougar population size to hunting is about 0%.

3. Hunters tend to take large adult males. My research has shown that attackers are most often yearlings (both sexes), followed by adult females, with adult males least inclined to attack humans. Because of the compensatory natality (above), hunting may well cause an increase in the numbers of yearlings - i.e., the class most prone to attack humans.

4. The theory that hunting cougars teaches them to avoid humans may be true, but lacks empirical support. Shooting a cougar kills it (and surely does prevent it from attacking), but there is no reason to think that the un-shot cougars are taught to avoid humans. Indeed, Vancouver Island, despite a substantial harvest of cougars, has a far higher rate of cougar attacks on humans than any other geographic area.

5. Persecution (i.e., the bounty system practiced in North American until the mid 1960s) did greatly reduce cougar populations and probably did reduce the risk of attack. Since the cessation of persecution, the risk of attack, although still low, has increased approximately 4-fold. A renewed program of persecution could reduce cougar populations by 50-80% (a level that sport hunting probably would not approach), and would likely reduce the risk of attacks. So if the people of the state want to reduce the risk of attack, they can do so by re-instituting the bounty and persecution program, or by modifying human behavior, but sport hunting probably is not an effective risk-reduction strategy.

In short, public safety is irrelevant to the decision whether or not to curtail or increase sport hunting. Risk of cougar attack can be reduced, and the risk of serious injury can be greatly reduced by a simple modification of human behavior: When in wildlands, do not travel alone, and especially do not let children travel without an adult.

Again, I stress that from the perspective of the biology and management of the species, there is no "right" answer, and I am not advocating an "anti-hunting" vote. I am simply rebutting the argument that curtailing hunting will endanger humans, or that increasing harvest will increase human safety. The people and the legislature have every right to increase the opportunity to hunt these animals, or to curtail sport hunting for other value-based reasons.

You may circulate this letter as you wish. As a courtesy, I request that if you use portions of the letter in a press release or public testimony, please attach the full letter as well.

Respectfully submitted,

Paul Beier

Trends in cougar (mountain lion) complaints, damage, harvest, and other mortality in Oregon during 1992–2012. Complaint and mortality data are current through 22 January 2013 and 11 January 2013, respectively, based on check-in of cougars. Numbers may change as late data are added.

			Number of Mortalities by Source					
Year	Number of Complaints[a]	Number of Tags Sold[b]	Hunter-Harvest	Damage[c]	Human Safety[d]	Administrative Removals[e]	Other[f]	Total
1992	184	517	187	17	3	0	22	229
1993	276	560	160	21	6	0	21	208
1994	554	588	144	30	9	0	21	204
1995	742	385	34	41	22	0	12	109
1996	840	779	45	66	32	0	25	168
1997	798	935	61	82	20	0	18	181
1998	954	11,761	153	93	20	0	17	283
1999	1,072	14,564	157	91	39	0	25	312
2000[g]	942	22,386	136	120	25	0	19	300
2001	829	28,447	220	97	25	0	23	365
2002	765	32,126	232	111	23	0	37	403
2003	697	34,135	248	111	28	0	25	412
2004	545	34,071	265	95	28	0	35	423
2005	622	38,079	224	125	28	0	30	407
2006	451	38,719	289	106	26	0	32	453
2007	453	41,813	309	114	21	52	41	537
2008	518	43,211	273	109	23	34	54	492
2009	437	45,375	274	110	31	21	37	473
2010	469	48,776	239	99	25	79	39	481
2011	500	50,889	241	139	23	71	32	506
2012	287	53,698	242	119	40	55	39	495

[a]Number of complaints received during the calendar year. Sightings not associated with damage or public safety concerns are not included.
[b]Includes general and additional tags (including Sports Pac licenses).
[c]Number of animals killed as a result of damage during a calendar year.
[d]Animals killed as a result of real or perceived threat to humans or pets.
[e]Adminstrative removals on cougar target areas (2007–present only).
[f]Includes roadkill, accidental, found dead, and illegal kill.
[g]Hunting season changed to calendar year.

Cattle Death Loss

ISSN:

Released May 12, 2011, by the National Agricultural Statistics Service (NASS), Agricultural Statistics Board, United States Department of Agriculture (USDA).

Cattle and Calf Death Losses

This report is released every five years as a cooperative effort between the National Agricultural Statistics Service and Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service – Wildlife Services and Veterinary Services. The information presented in this report is based on producer reports from the January 2011 Cattle survey and includes detailed percentage breakouts of cattle and calf losses by predators and non-predator causes as well as non-lethal control measures.

Cattle and calf losses from predators and non-predator causes in the United States totaled 3.99 million head (excluding Alaska) during 2010. This represents 4.3 percent of the 93.9 million cattle and calves in the United States at the beginning of 2010. Losses of cattle weighing more than 500 pounds totaled 1.73 million head or 43.4 percent of total losses. Calves weighing less than 500 pounds lost to all causes totaled 2.26 million head or 56.6 percent of total losses.

Cattle and calf losses from animal predators totaled nearly 220 thousand head during 2010. This represented 5.5 percent of the total deaths from all causes and resulted in a loss of $98.5 million to farmers and ranchers. Coyotes and dogs caused the majority of cattle and calf predator losses accounting for 53.1 percent and 9.9 percent respectively.

Cattle and calf losses from non-predator causes totaled 3.77 million head or 94.5 percent of the total losses during 2010. Respiratory problems represented the leading cause of non-predator deaths, accounting for 28.0 percent, followed by digestive problems at 13.4 percent.

Non-lethal predator control measures cost farmers and ranchers throughout the United States $188.5 million during 2010. Use of guard animals was the most common method at 36.9 percent. Exclusion fencing, frequent checking, and culling were the next most commonly used methods of preventing cattle and calf losses at 32.8 percent, 32.1 percent, and 28.9 percent respectively.

This page intentionally left blank.

Contents

This page intentionally left blank.

Number of Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Death Loss by Cause – United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

Cause	Number of head	Percent of total	Total value
	(number)	(percent)	(1,000 dollars)
Predator			
Coyotes	116,700	53.1	48,185
Mountain lions and bobcats [1]	18,900	8.6	9,221
Dogs	21,800	9.9	10,067
Vultures	11,900	5.4	4,641
Wolves	8,100	3.7	3,646
Bears	2,800	1.3	1,415
Other predators	12,400	5.6	6,352
Unknown predators	27,300	12.4	14,948
Total predator	219,900	100.0	98,475
Non-predator			
Digestive problems	505,000	13.4	267,799
Respiratory problems	1,055,000	28.0	643,146
Metabolic problems	59,800	1.6	47,558
Mastitis	62,000	1.6	59,112
Lameness/injury	140,900	3.7	112,251
Other diseases	179,500	4.8	114,577
Weather related	489,000	13.0	274,092
Calving problems	494,000	13.1	274,670
Poisoning	36,100	0.9	26,817
Theft	15,100	0.4	9,309
Other non-predator	301,600	8.0	247,092
Unknown non-predator	435,000	11.5	276,476
Total non-predator	3,773,000	100.0	2,352,899
United States Total [2]	3,992,900	100.0	2,451,374

[1] Includes cougars, pumas and lynx.
[2] Excludes Alaska.

Number of Head of Cattle and Calves Lost by Cause – States and United States: 2010

State	All causes		Predators		Non-predators	
	Cattle	Calves	Cattle	Calves	Cattle	Calves
	(head)	(head)	(head)	(head)	(head)	(head)
Alabama	23,000	30,000	1,000	5,200	22,000	24,800
Arizona	20,000	18,000	2,200	2,100	17,800	15,900
Arkansas	35,000	40,000	1,900	4,800	33,100	35,200
California	100,000	135,000	1,400	8,200	98,600	126,800
Colorado	55,000	55,000	800	4,300	54,200	50,700
Connecticut	1,100	1,200	-	100	1,100	1,100
Delaware	400	500	-	-	400	500
Florida	23,000	31,000	900	5,400	22,100	25,600
Georgia	19,000	23,000	1,300	3,500	17,700	19,500
Hawaii	5,000	4,000	100	500	4,900	3,500
Idaho	42,000	51,000	1,900	4,200	40,100	46,800
Illinois	18,000	30,000	300	1,500	17,700	28,500
Indiana	13,000	22,000	100	800	12,900	21,200
Iowa	70,000	95,000	200	1,400	69,800	93,600
Kansas	125,000	80,000	800	3,900	124,200	76,100
Kentucky	44,000	68,000	1,200	9,500	42,800	58,500
Louisiana	18,000	19,000	1,800	4,600	16,200	14,400
Maine	1,900	2,700	-	300	1,900	2,400
Maryland	3,000	5,000	100	100	2,900	4,900
Massachusetts	1,000	1,000	-	-	1,000	1,000
Michigan	22,000	43,000	200	600	21,800	42,400
Minnesota	46,000	88,000	400	2,100	45,600	85,900
Mississippi	21,000	27,000	800	2,800	20,200	24,200
Missouri	65,000	125,000	700	6,500	64,300	118,500
Montana	23,000	57,000	1,000	4,200	22,000	52,800
Nebraska	110,000	85,000	200	2,200	109,800	82,800
Nevada	5,000	12,000	500	2,300	4,500	9,700
New Hampshire	800	800	-	-	800	800
New Jersey	500	700	-	100	500	600
New Mexico	22,000	35,000	3,300	6,600	18,700	28,400
New York	32,000	43,000	300	1,400	31,700	41,600
North Carolina	13,000	20,000	1,400	4,000	11,600	16,000
North Dakota	15,000	40,000	300	2,500	14,700	37,500
Ohio	21,000	29,000	500	2,300	20,500	26,700
Oklahoma	90,000	130,000	3,400	10,500	86,600	119,500
Oregon	20,000	35,000	600	3,200	19,400	31,800
Pennsylvania	35,000	43,000	100	600	34,900	42,400
Rhode Island	100	200	-	-	100	200
South Carolina	7,000	8,000	300	1,000	6,700	7,000
South Dakota	68,000	90,000	300	2,600	67,700	87,400
Tennessee	34,000	56,000	1,300	7,800	32,700	48,200
Texas	310,000	290,000	6,000	40,000	304,000	250,000
Utah	13,000	26,000	300	2,300	12,700	23,700
Vermont	6,000	8,000	100	200	5,900	7,800
Virginia	26,000	52,000	600	4,800	25,400	47,200
Washington	20,000	19,000	200	1,500	19,800	17,500
West Virginia	5,000	15,000	100	1,000	4,900	14,000
Wisconsin	75,000	140,000	500	3,100	74,500	136,900
Wyoming	11,000	30,000	400	3,500	10,600	26,500
United States [1]	1,733,800	2,259,100	39,800	180,100	1,694,000	2,079,000

- Represents zero.
[1] Excludes Alaska.

Total Value per Head and Total Value of Cattle and Calf Losses by Cause – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Total value per head		Total value predator losses		Total value non-predator losses	
	Cattle [1]	Calves [2]	Cattle	Calves	Cattle	Calves
	(dollars)	(dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)	(1,000 dollars)
Alabama	852	324	852	1,685	18,744	8,035
Arizona	790	354	1,738	743	14,062	5,629
Arkansas	807	339	1,533	1,627	26,712	11,933
California	923	348	1,292	2,854	91,008	44,126
Colorado	1,037	372	830	1,600	56,205	18,860
Connecticut	1,095	300	-	30	1,205	330
Delaware	843	312	-	-	337	156
Florida	766	333	689	1,798	16,929	8,525
Georgia	793	330	1,031	1,155	14,036	6,435
Hawaii	520	273	52	137	2,548	956
Idaho	967	354	1,837	1,487	38,777	16,567
Illinois	1,001	336	300	504	17,718	9,576
Indiana	955	321	96	257	12,320	6,805
Iowa	1,097	360	219	504	76,571	33,696
Kansas	1,017	378	814	1,474	126,311	28,766
Kentucky	871	330	1,045	3,135	37,279	19,305
Louisiana	871	318	1,568	1,463	14,110	4,579
Maine	879	300	-	90	1,670	720
Maryland	911	312	91	31	2,642	1,529
Massachusetts	824	300	-	-	824	300
Michigan	942	278	188	167	20,536	11,787
Minnesota	987	375	395	788	45,007	32,213
Mississippi	821	315	657	882	16,584	7,623
Missouri	997	357	698	2,321	64,107	42,305
Montana	1,058	384	1,058	1,613	23,276	20,275
Nebraska	1,128	393	226	865	123,854	32,540
Nevada	969	369	485	849	4,361	3,579
New Hampshire	973	300	-	-	778	240
New Jersey	918	249	-	25	459	149
New Mexico	894	354	2,950	2,336	16,718	10,054
New York	911	276	273	386	28,879	11,482
North Carolina	838	315	1,173	1,260	9,721	5,040
North Dakota	1,135	366	341	915	16,685	13,725
Ohio	908	321	454	738	18,614	8,571
Oklahoma	914	360	3,108	3,780	79,152	43,020
Oregon	972	345	583	1,104	18,857	10,971
Pennsylvania	996	300	100	180	34,760	12,720
Rhode Island	951	300	-	-	95	60
South Carolina	843	315	253	315	5,648	2,205
South Dakota	1,133	381	340	991	76,704	33,299
Tennessee	820	324	1,066	2,527	26,814	15,617
Texas	889	354	5,334	14,160	270,256	88,500
Utah	984	360	295	828	12,497	8,532
Vermont	842	300	84	60	4,968	2,340
Virginia	801	330	481	1,584	20,345	15,576
Washington	949	342	190	513	18,790	5,985
West Virginia	884	297	88	297	4,332	4,158
Wisconsin	949	423	475	1,311	70,701	57,909
Wyoming	1,094	396	438	1,386	11,596	10,494
United States [3]	952	354	35,720	62,755	1,615,102	737,797

- Represents zero.
[1] Cattle value per head is based on a two-year straight average of the value of beef cows reported in the January 1 Cattle survey from 2010 and 2011.
[2] Calf value per head is based on the market year average calf price. An average weight of 300 pounds was used in all States.
[3] Excludes Alaska. United States value per head for cattle and calves derived.

Percent of Total Cattle Predator Losses by Predator – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Coyotes	Mountain lions and bobcats [1]	Dogs	Vultures	Wolves	Bears	Other predators	Unknown predators
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	38.3	-	49.9	3.4	-	-	-	8.4
Arizona	15.8	7.3	-	-	-	1.5	0.7	74.7
Arkansas	37.5	-	43.1	-	-	-	2.2	17.2
California	57.0	32.5	8.5	-	-	1.0	-	1.0
Colorado	17.7	4.0	0.8	-	-	21.4	47.6	8.5
Connecticut	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	40.8	1.9	9.0	3.1	-	-	25.6	19.6
Georgia	7.0	-	14.1	0.1	-	-	71.5	7.3
Hawaii	-	-	67.2	-	-	-	14.8	18.0
Idaho	3.9	1.5	0.5	-	30.0	0.4	3.2	60.5
Illinois	66.5	17.4	-	-	-	-	16.1	-
Indiana	67.6	16.2	-	-	-	-	16.2	-
Iowa	38.0	7.1	26.1	-	-	-	-	28.8
Kansas	66.1	24.6	1.8	-	-	-	3.4	4.1
Kentucky	50.7	-	16.8	7.1	0.5	2.4	7.5	15.0
Louisiana	68.8	-	4.8	1.1	-	-	19.6	5.7
Maine	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Maryland	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	59.5	-	25.0	-	-	-	15.5	-
Minnesota	52.1	5.4	7.0	-	16.8	-	-	18.7
Mississippi	79.3	-	17.2	-	-	-	3.5	-
Missouri	10.3	-	44.0	-	-	-	-	45.7
Montana	4.8	-	-	-	44.0	6.5	3.7	41.0
Nebraska	39.0	59.0	-	-	-	-	-	2.0
Nevada	4.7	17.3	-	-	-	-	-	78.0
New Hampshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Mexico	25.9	44.3	1.7	-	2.4	0.4	3.4	21.9
New York	7.3	-	5.9	-	-	-	-	86.8
North Carolina	26.1	-	23.1	-	-	6.8	-	44.0
North Dakota	85.8	-	-	-	-	-	-	14.2
Ohio	79.5	-	-	6.8	-	-	13.7	-
Oklahoma	35.7	6.8	19.5	7.8	-	-	13.6	16.6
Oregon	63.6	13.3	-	-	-	7.3	-	15.8
Pennsylvania	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	100.0
Rhode Island	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	65.8	-	6.3	-	-	-	25.5	2.4
South Dakota	72.0	24.0	-	4.0	-	-	-	-
Tennessee	62.1	-	26.4	-	-	-	-	11.5
Texas	22.2	27.7	6.5	6.0	-	0.1	11.3	26.2
Utah	44.0	1.9	-	-	-	42.8	0.4	10.9
Vermont	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Virginia	31.7	-	5.9	7.8	-	0.8	1.7	52.1
Washington	80.7	7.5	-	-	-	-	-	11.8
West Virginia	49.5	-	-	-	-	18.4	-	32.1
Wisconsin	31.5	-	-	-	58.0	10.5	-	-
Wyoming	19.8	11.9	1.0	-	18.6	15.7	-	33.0
United States [2]	34.4	12.1	11.3	2.3	3.8	1.9	9.3	24.9

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent.
[1] Includes cougars, pumas, and lynx.
[2] Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Total Calf Predator Losses by Predator – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Coyotes	Mountain lions and bobcats [1]	Dogs	Vultures	Wolves	Bears	Other predators	Unknown predators
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	48.4	1.5	26.0	9.9	-	-	6.7	7.5
Arizona	38.3	31.9	5.7	-	12.7	3.4	2.5	5.5
Arkansas	38.7	3.2	30.6	13.8	-	-	7.1	6.6
California	75.7	11.7	4.3	-	-	0.1	2.3	5.9
Colorado	82.2	6.3	1.0	-	-	7.8	0.3	2.4
Connecticut	100.0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Delaware	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	77.4	-	0.5	8.7	-	-	6.2	7.2
Georgia	53.7	-	15.8	12.5	-	-	13.3	4.7
Hawaii	-	-	89.9	-	-	-	7.5	2.6
Idaho	26.9	4.3	3.3	0.3	47.4	0.7	3.0	14.1
Illinois	87.9	7.1	1.0	0.3	-	-	1.6	2.1
Indiana	71.8	-	26.8	1.4	-	-	-	-
Iowa	66.9	1.0	13.9	-	-	-	8.4	9.8
Kansas	71.2	7.9	13.8	-	-	-	-	7.1
Kentucky	79.0	0.4	8.1	2.5	0.4	0.4	1.3	7.9
Louisiana	81.7	-	6.1	6.9	-	-	3.0	2.3
Maine	14.0	-	-	-	-	-	86.0	-
Maryland	56.6	-	6.6	-	-	-	-	36.8
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Michigan	55.5	-	5.6	-	-	-	-	38.9
Minnesota	35.3	1.9	1.4	-	37.7	-	5.2	18.5
Mississippi	65.9	1.2	16.0	3.8	-	-	12.1	1.0
Missouri	29.5	14.4	33.2	3.8	-	2.2	1.5	15.4
Montana	46.9	5.2	-	-	20.3	2.3	1.6	23.7
Nebraska	59.4	37.5	-	-	-	-	-	3.1
Nevada	61.8	2.4	1.7	-	-	0.1	3.6	30.4
New Hampshire	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
New Jersey	59.4	-	-	32.8	-	7.8	-	-
New Mexico	65.2	16.4	6.3	-	-	1.3	3.6	7.2
New York	88.5	1.8	3.6	-	-	-	-	6.1
North Carolina	63.7	-	12.1	10.4	-	-	1.8	12.0
North Dakota	86.2	3.7	1.7	-	0.7	-	2.4	5.3
Ohio	90.0	-	1.4	1.7	-	-	6.9	-
Oklahoma	52.6	7.1	13.8	4.4	1.5	1.5	9.3	9.8
Oregon	70.0	8.7	0.5	-	7.7	1.0	8.7	3.4
Pennsylvania	66.7	-	1.9	1.5	-	-	-	29.9
Rhode Island	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
South Carolina	80.2	0.5	5.0	7.0	-	-	3.8	3.5
South Dakota	95.5	3.5	-	-	-	-	1.0	-
Tennessee	62.5	0.3	16.0	8.8	-	-	0.9	11.5
Texas	40.1	15.4	9.3	14.0	0.4	-	7.9	12.9
Utah	58.8	6.2	4.8	-	1.8	15.4	9.8	3.2
Vermont	95.2	-	-	-	-	-	-	4.8
Virginia	65.0	-	7.5	12.9	-	5.4	0.8	8.4
Washington	77.3	3.4	-	-	2.4	3.3	-	13.6
West Virginia	80.9	-	-	-	-	8.8	-	10.3
Wisconsin	42.0	3.2	-	0.1	47.5	0.9	-	6.3
Wyoming	46.5	11.5	1.7	-	14.6	7.7	3.3	14.7
United States [2]	57.2	7.8	9.6	6.1	3.7	1.1	4.8	9.7

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent..
[1] Includes cougars, pumas, and lynx.
[2] Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Total Cattle Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Digestive problems	Respiratory problems	Metabolic problems	Mastitis	Lameness or injury	Other diseases
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	4.9	5.3	2.6	0.7	3.9	5.9
Arizona	8.6	10.9	0.5	3.1	5.0	1.1
Arkansas	8.1	13.6	1.2	1.1	1.2	11.0
California	7.9	27.3	3.9	10.6	11.0	5.6
Colorado	18.2	39.7	1.6	2.0	5.3	7.1
Connecticut	13.9	11.1	8.5	23.0	13.2	5.5
Delaware	8.9	2.7	1.5	21.6	6.2	6.2
Florida	5.9	10.8	3.8	5.3	6.8	2.3
Georgia	4.6	12.5	3.1	2.5	4.6	7.0
Hawaii	1.0	0.6	0.3	-	0.6	2.2
Idaho	13.4	25.6	5.6	7.6	9.9	8.1
Illinois	14.0	25.6	4.5	3.2	10.5	3.9
Indiana	10.9	20.9	6.7	3.8	8.9	2.4
Iowa	10.0	45.5	1.5	2.3	6.8	3.8
Kansas	5.2	63.8	0.3	0.7	1.8	2.9
Kentucky	9.9	35.7	1.0	1.1	3.3	1.9
Louisiana	4.1	11.6	0.2	1.1	4.8	5.6
Maine	5.6	30.5	16.0	6.5	20.9	2.7
Maryland	9.7	6.5	6.4	7.5	9.1	5.3
Massachusetts	9.6	8.1	13.0	16.8	6.9	0.2
Michigan	11.4	27.1	7.6	9.2	9.1	6.0
Minnesota	13.2	24.2	5.1	6.8	8.4	4.6
Mississippi	5.1	14.3	1.7	0.7	3.9	3.3
Missouri	4.5	11.5	1.5	1.0	5.0	8.3
Montana	6.6	16.9	0.7	0.5	5.1	4.7
Nebraska	9.3	39.2	0.4	0.3	4.2	2.0
Nevada	8.0	11.0	4.3	3.7	8.1	6.0
New Hampshire	8.5	6.2	9.0	7.5	11.6	9.9
New Jersey	2.7	7.1	8.3	0.8	7.9	2.7
New Mexico	19.8	18.2	2.9	17.7	2.7	7.2
New York	11.3	11.5	8.4	13.3	17.7	4.5
North Carolina	4.6	11.3	5.6	3.0	6.1	4.3
North Dakota	9.7	24.7	0.7	0.2	3.0	4.2
Ohio	13.0	25.7	5.7	6.3	12.7	3.9
Oklahoma	4.7	28.3	0.6	0.5	3.9	6.8
Oregon	9.9	9.9	4.5	5.0	12.4	3.6
Pennsylvania	10.1	14.3	6.1	16.8	13.2	9.8
Rhode Island	36.6	-	3.6	3.6	13.4	5.3
South Carolina	19.8	6.5	1.7	4.2	3.2	4.0
South Dakota	12.6	31.1	2.7	1.9	5.4	5.2
Tennessee	5.1	11.6	1.6	1.3	5.1	5.2
Texas	7.3	22.1	1.2	1.2	2.8	4.8
Utah	12.6	19.3	5.9	3.8	6.5	2.8
Vermont	14.0	10.0	6.6	16.7	12.8	9.5
Virginia	4.3	12.4	2.5	2.8	7.8	6.3
Washington	10.7	25.5	3.9	8.1	8.6	6.7
West Virginia	7.3	9.2	2.1	1.3	4.6	5.6
Wisconsin	10.8	17.3	8.2	9.4	17.5	5.0
Wyoming	5.2	11.7	1.6	1.4	3.0	5.5
United States [1]	8.7	26.5	2.6	3.7	6.1	5.0

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Percent of Total Cattle Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010 (continued)

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Weather related	Calving problems	Poisoning	Theft	Other non-predator	Unknown non-predator
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	16.4	16.8	3.1	1.3	25.1	14.0
Arizona	8.5	6.7	1.9	0.1	6.1	47.5
Arkansas	16.3	12.1	6.3	0.1	19.3	9.7
California	1.5	10.2	-	0.2	12.9	8.9
Colorado	5.2	3.3	2.3	0.1	5.7	9.5
Connecticut	0.7	9.7	4.3	0.6	4.9	4.6
Delaware	-	20.1	-	-	10.8	22.0
Florida	18.5	17.6	1.5	0.1	20.7	6.7
Georgia	3.4	21.8	0.3	-	26.4	13.8
Hawaii	74.4	6.5	0.1	2.5	9.8	2.0
Idaho	3.1	9.0	2.6	0.1	9.7	5.3
Illinois	11.4	9.4	0.9	-	12.5	4.1
Indiana	1.8	15.1	0.5	0.9	13.5	14.6
Iowa	8.5	7.1	0.6	-	7.2	6.7
Kansas	13.0	3.2	0.3	0.3	4.3	4.2
Kentucky	6.5	8.8	1.7	-	14.5	15.6
Louisiana	17.1	15.7	4.2	-	19.9	15.7
Maine	-	6.7	-	-	5.1	6.0
Maryland	1.6	12.8	0.3	-	22.0	18.8
Massachusetts	1.4	16.6	4.7	2.4	10.7	9.6
Michigan	1.5	8.6	-	-	7.7	11.8
Minnesota	5.3	7.7	1.2	-	14.3	9.2
Mississippi	17.1	17.4	0.7	0.6	21.6	13.6
Missouri	20.7	14.9	1.0	1.2	20.0	10.4
Montana	9.7	7.1	3.6	1.1	19.7	24.3
Nebraska	17.9	4.8	0.4	0.2	7.2	14.1
Nevada	1.5	4.2	6.8	9.4	9.5	27.5
New Hampshire	-	18.5	-	-	16.0	12.8
New Jersey	21.3	9.4	-	-	39.2	0.6
New Mexico	3.2	7.2	1.8	1.1	5.3	12.9
New York	1.6	11.0	2.3	0.2	10.5	7.7
North Carolina	10.9	21.3	0.5	1.0	21.0	10.4
North Dakota	16.0	2.4	0.4	0.4	22.4	15.9
Ohio	2.4	14.7	0.2	0.1	10.8	4.5
Oklahoma	11.1	10.4	0.4	1.8	18.6	12.9
Oregon	3.3	8.4	1.7	0.1	29.7	11.5
Pennsylvania	1.3	10.1	0.3	-	9.7	8.3
Rhode Island	-	6.3	-	-	31.2	-
South Carolina	10.4	18.4	1.4	0.2	20.0	10.2
South Dakota	13.1	5.9	3.1	0.1	13.3	5.6
Tennessee	7.9	16.8	1.9	0.7	28.1	14.7
Texas	10.8	12.2	1.4	0.2	17.4	18.6
Utah	6.2	4.8	3.7	1.4	13.6	19.4
Vermont	0.5	10.8	0.9	-	7.2	11.0
Virginia	19.4	14.3	2.5	-	17.3	10.4
Washington	3.0	6.8	-	0.1	13.8	12.8
West Virginia	28.2	18.4	2.7	2.1	9.6	8.9
Wisconsin	3.1	10.9	1.3	-	8.8	7.7
Wyoming	15.2	6.6	7.5	1.3	17.0	24.0
United States [1]	9.9	9.8	1.4	0.4	13.8	12.1

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent..

[1] Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Total Calf Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Digestive problems	Respiratory problems	Metabolic problems	Lameness or injury	Other diseases
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	5.0	12.7	2.5	2.8	4.7
Arizona	15.0	25.2	-	1.1	6.2
Arkansas	4.3	24.7	0.1	1.3	4.9
California	24.1	46.6	2.1	1.6	5.8
Colorado	18.4	30.8	0.2	1.2	2.6
Connecticut	38.8	20.5	0.4	1.1	6.0
Delaware	21.4	18.9	2.4	-	16.0
Florida	12.4	14.1	2.0	2.7	14.4
Georgia	8.1	16.4	0.5	1.0	2.6
Hawaii	5.6	4.7	-	2.6	4.3
Idaho	24.9	33.9	1.8	3.0	5.5
Illinois	18.1	25.8	0.3	2.8	5.2
Indiana	25.6	29.5	0.7	0.5	1.5
Iowa	21.0	30.7	0.5	1.3	1.7
Kansas	8.3	35.4	0.3	1.5	2.2
Kentucky	14.8	21.0	0.1	2.1	5.9
Louisiana	4.9	22.5	0.1	0.4	3.7
Maine	24.8	30.5	4.4	6.5	2.0
Maryland	14.6	13.4	0.6	3.8	6.9
Massachusetts	21.8	15.0	-	10.0	7.1
Michigan	30.1	41.7	0.1	1.4	2.9
Minnesota	27.7	31.6	1.3	2.6	2.8
Mississippi	5.7	24.7	0.5	2.8	1.5
Missouri	10.1	24.8	0.2	1.4	2.1
Montana	14.3	13.6	0.1	0.7	1.2
Nebraska	15.9	22.6	0.5	0.9	2.2
Nevada	12.1	21.6	-	0.7	0.9
New Hampshire	35.9	34.6	3.8	0.7	0.4
New Jersey	6.0	10.2	-	-	5.1
New Mexico	15.1	33.1	1.3	2.9	3.8
New York	32.9	31.8	2.4	3.2	7.6
North Carolina	9.4	18.7	2.6	2.8	6.7
North Dakota	14.5	28.6	0.4	0.8	3.0
Ohio	27.2	28.5	0.5	3.0	4.6
Oklahoma	4.3	35.1	0.8	2.0	6.4
Oregon	18.4	31.2	1.1	1.6	3.8
Pennsylvania	25.3	39.0	0.4	1.3	4.3
Rhode Island	39.0	22.0	-	-	-
South Carolina	24.4	10.7	1.5	0.5	2.8
South Dakota	12.8	29.2	0.3	0.4	0.9
Tennessee	14.4	21.0	0.6	2.6	6.6
Texas	11.8	28.2	0.5	2.2	9.2
Utah	23.4	25.7	0.5	0.9	2.1
Vermont	38.6	28.4	1.6	1.9	2.3
Virginia	9.9	12.7	0.2	1.8	3.8
Washington	19.4	31.8	0.8	2.8	4.9
West Virginia	8.0	12.7	-	2.6	4.2
Wisconsin	38.1	37.5	1.3	2.0	4.3
Wyoming	9.3	18.3	0.1	0.4	3.9
United States [1]	17.2	29.1	0.8	1.8	4.5

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Percent of Total Calf Non-Predator Losses by Type – States and United States: 2010 (continued)

[Totals may not add due to rounding]

State	Weather related	Calving problems	Poisoning	Theft	Other non-predator	Unknown non-predator
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	20.5	22.0	0.2	0.7	7.1	21.8
Arizona	9.3	12.1	0.2	3.1	3.6	24.2
Arkansas	16.6	20.1	8.5	-	5.9	13.6
California	3.6	7.0	0.1	0.1	1.9	7.1
Colorado	15.8	17.1	2.4	0.2	4.1	7.2
Connecticut	1.6	7.3	-	-	4.2	20.1
Delaware	-	35.4	-	-	-	5.9
Florida	11.0	29.2	0.4	0.1	0.3	13.4
Georgia	7.0	35.6	2.6	-	3.7	22.5
Hawaii	66.5	5.9	-	1.2	4.3	4.9
Idaho	5.4	20.5	0.1	0.2	1.0	3.7
Illinois	13.7	20.5	-	-	8.6	5.0
Indiana	7.3	13.4	0.1	-	6.1	15.3
Iowa	12.5	19.2	0.6	-	4.1	8.4
Kansas	24.6	15.3	0.1	0.5	2.4	9.4
Kentucky	19.4	13.5	0.7	0.6	3.5	18.4
Louisiana	23.4	22.8	3.1	2.0	5.4	11.7
Maine	11.4	10.9	-	-	1.3	8.2
Maryland	32.8	9.4	-	-	5.9	12.6
Massachusetts	10.3	12.5	-	-	14.7	8.6
Michigan	5.0	5.6	-	0.2	4.3	8.7
Minnesota	7.6	16.4	0.9	-	1.9	7.2
Mississippi	12.7	31.1	0.4	0.6	2.1	17.9
Missouri	28.8	20.7	0.1	-	2.2	9.6
Montana	27.1	22.4	1.3	2.3	1.6	15.4
Nebraska	28.0	23.2	0.3	-	1.3	5.1
Nevada	9.2	7.5	0.7	-	-	47.3
New Hampshire	-	19.0	1.1	-	0.5	4.0
New Jersey	21.6	27.2	-	-	12.5	17.4
New Mexico	15.1	6.0	1.1	3.2	4.5	13.9
New York	1.7	10.9	0.2	0.3	4.1	4.9
North Carolina	17.7	16.8	0.3	0.4	3.6	21.0
North Dakota	26.3	17.7	0.2	0.1	2.8	5.6
Ohio	8.3	24.7	-	-	0.6	2.6
Oklahoma	15.0	17.8	0.7	1.5	4.6	11.8
Oregon	10.5	19.2	0.2	-	2.8	11.2
Pennsylvania	2.5	12.9	0.6	-	3.6	10.1
Rhode Island	4.9	29.2	-	-	4.9	-
South Carolina	3.8	23.9	0.3	-	1.2	30.9
South Dakota	36.8	15.6	0.1	0.1	0.6	3.2
Tennessee	11.0	26.8	0.6	0.5	6.0	9.9
Texas	10.9	11.5	0.5	0.4	3.8	21.0
Utah	21.3	7.7	0.2	2.2	2.1	13.9
Vermont	1.6	9.5	-	-	2.2	13.9
Virginia	30.0	15.5	0.3	-	12.1	13.7
Washington	3.7	17.1	0.1	-	3.2	16.2
West Virginia	52.6	12.4	-	0.6	2.2	4.7
Wisconsin	5.5	5.7	0.3	-	1.6	3.7
Wyoming	29.0	25.0	0.5	0.4	2.6	10.5
United States [1]	15.4	15.8	0.6	0.4	3.3	11.1

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent.
[1] Excludes Alaska.

Percent of Operations using Non-Lethal Methods to Prevent Losses of Cattle and Calves to Predators by Method– States and United States: 2010

[Use of multiple non-lethal methods will result in percentages summing to greater than 100]

State	Guard animals	Exclusion fencing	Herding	Night penning	Fright tactics
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	53.0	32.1	1.2	1.5	1.4
Arizona	26.8	8.5	81.8	53.4	0.1
Arkansas	51.7	15.0	0.3	11.1	3.2
California	29.8	74.6	1.6	0.5	1.4
Colorado	27.5	22.6	1.7	28.5	2.7
Connecticut	59.0	35.2	1.2	1.2	-
Delaware	-	-	-	-	-
Florida	37.4	14.1	2.8	2.3	0.5
Georgia	49.2	31.9	1.9	0.6	-
Hawaii	0.8	80.6	0.4	-	2.1
Idaho	21.8	19.6	10.9	12.7	12.8
Illinois	39.9	42.5	2.9	20.6	2.7
Indiana	16.4	36.8	2.3	18.0	4.8
Iowa	46.5	22.3	-	6.6	-
Kansas	19.1	10.3	7.1	-	8.3
Kentucky	36.9	52.2	2.2	1.7	0.2
Louisiana	31.0	38.5	7.9	-	2.0
Maine	46.5	85.7	-	7.6	-
Maryland	-	80.5	-	-	-
Massachusetts	26.7	93.1	1.2	22.7	0.5
Michigan	38.6	23.3	-	2.8	0.8
Minnesota	59.0	24.9	5.2	12.8	6.7
Mississippi	72.4	17.2	-	-	-
Missouri	35.9	31.2	6.0	4.8	-
Montana	34.6	3.1	12.7	19.8	4.4
Nebraska	24.5	48.1	1.7	5.1	2.7
Nevada	58.1	-	-	-	-
New Hampshire	4.0	59.6	5.2	13.2	-
New Jersey	0.8	94.1	-	17.8	19.3
New Mexico	38.0	25.3	5.7	11.5	0.1
New York	23.8	51.0	9.3	4.9	2.0
North Carolina	64.0	36.2	0.7	0.5	0.4
North Dakota	38.6	19.2	1.5	1.0	16.4
Ohio	30.1	59.0	2.0	22.7	0.7
Oklahoma	41.8	24.7	8.9	3.6	3.2
Oregon	27.3	24.4	1.7	7.2	1.9
Pennsylvania	6.3	78.4	5.6	5.7	2.0
Rhode Island	10.9	94.5	5.5	13.1	-
South Carolina	16.5	65.7	7.3	-	0.5
South Dakota	39.9	16.9	0.6	14.6	4.5
Tennessee	33.9	33.9	4.6	4.2	0.5
Texas	50.2	24.1	4.7	1.2	1.3
Utah	17.9	79.2	6.9	0.5	0.4
Vermont	37.3	82.7	4.5	4.5	-
Virginia	36.8	17.8	10.1	6.0	5.1
Washington	45.7	32.2	1.6	0.4	10.7
West Virginia	47.0	47.3	15.3	9.9	0.1
Wisconsin	27.0	41.3	5.4	22.1	5.0
Wyoming	19.8	23.5	22.7	19.4	3.5
United States [1]	36.9	32.8	5.3	6.6	2.5

See footnote(s) at end of table.

--continued

Percent of Operations using Non-Lethal Methods to Prevent Losses of Cattle and Calves to Predators by Method– States and United States: 2010 (continued)

[Use of multiple non-lethal methods will result in percentages summing to greater than 100]

State	Livestock carcass removal	Culling	Frequent checks	Other non-lethal
	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)	(percent)
Alabama	17.2	20.4	14.2	2.4
Arizona	0.7	5.4	46.8	0.6
Arkansas	7.8	46.6	22.5	-
California	26.6	5.2	20.3	7.3
Colorado	21.1	18.6	36.8	17.6
Connecticut	1.2	-	-	5.9
Delaware	-	-	-	100.0
Florida	74.2	68.5	80.6	0.4
Georgia	25.1	34.9	21.0	9.2
Hawaii	2.1	12.8	9.9	4.5
Idaho	28.8	36.3	66.4	13.4
Illinois	38.5	28.1	13.7	4.2
Indiana	40.1	31.3	35.3	4.3
Iowa	22.8	30.7	32.3	23.9
Kansas	45.4	40.6	41.4	1.4
Kentucky	14.2	14.2	18.1	4.8
Louisiana	17.9	19.7	24.5	18.9
Maine	-	-	-	-
Maryland	14.0	32.4	29.3	1.3
Massachusetts	-	-	-	-
Michigan	15.4	24.7	14.5	11.2
Minnesota	17.7	14.7	23.1	3.7
Mississippi	0.7	0.7	4.1	14.0
Missouri	18.8	44.4	15.3	0.1
Montana	36.9	30.1	26.6	17.1
Nebraska	63.7	72.7	64.9	11.6
Nevada	17.1	23.3	36.2	-
New Hampshire	4.0	3.8	28.5	1.1
New Jersey	2.9	8.3	20.7	0.8
New Mexico	13.5	9.2	37.6	0.9
New York	11.5	26.5	19.3	2.0
North Carolina	10.7	2.6	9.3	-
North Dakota	20.8	30.8	26.6	11.5
Ohio	22.6	19.8	44.4	4.4
Oklahoma	18.2	24.7	16.7	14.3
Oregon	12.9	12.6	60.9	5.9
Pennsylvania	17.5	21.2	15.2	7.4
Rhode Island	18.5	13.1	18.5	-
South Carolina	28.3	26.6	39.0	1.0
South Dakota	12.1	18.8	37.7	15.3
Tennessee	25.3	22.0	45.0	7.6
Texas	8.1	31.4	29.6	7.2
Utah	12.6	21.9	17.6	50.8
Vermont	4.5	12.7	4.5	-
Virginia	34.3	47.9	37.7	14.8
Washington	1.3	2.6	2.2	11.4
West Virginia	10.2	33.8	15.2	13.9
Wisconsin	19.0	22.4	31.4	6.6
Wyoming	42.9	28.3	47.0	8.3
United States [1]	23.9	28.9	32.1	7.0

- Represents zero or less than 0.1 percent.
[1] Excludes Alaska.

Statistical Methodology

Survey Procedures: A random sample of United States producers were contacted during the January Cattle Inventory survey to provide data for these estimates. Survey procedures ensured that all cattle producers, regardless of size, had a chance to be included in the survey. Large producers were sampled more heavily than small operations. Data were collected from about 40,000 operators during the first half of January by mail, telephone, and face-to-face personal interviews and 78 percent of the reports were usable.

Estimating Procedures: These estimates of death loss were prepared by the Livestock Branch of the National Agricultural Statistics Service using producer data from the January 2011 Cattle survey. Cattle and calf inventory estimates were published in the *Cattle* report released on January 28, 2011 while total cattle and calf death losses from all causes were published in the *Meat Animals Production, Disposition and Income* report released on April 28, 2011. In setting the predator and non-predator loss estimates, first total predator and non-predator losses were estimated first as a percent of total losses, then specific predator and non-predator losses were estimated as a percent of total predator and non-predator losses. Value estimates were rounded to the nearest $1,000.

Revision Policy: Revisions to previous estimates are made to improve current estimates. Previous year estimates are subject to revision when current estimates are made. Estimates of losses from all causes are subject to revision in next year's Meat Animals Production, Disposition and Income report. No revisions to predator and non-predator loss estimates are planned.

Reliability: Since all cattle operators are not included in the sample, survey estimates are subject to sampling variability. Survey results are also subject to non-sampling errors such as omissions, duplications, and mistakes in reporting, recording, and processing the data. The effects of these errors cannot be measured directly. They are minimized through rigid quality controls in the data collection process and through a careful review of all reported data for consistency and reasonableness.

Terms and Definitions

Cattle includes all cows, bulls, steers, and heifers weighing over 500 pounds. This includes beef and milk breeds as well as cattle on feed.

Calves include beef and milk breed steers, heifers, and bulls weighing less than 500 pounds.

Information Contacts

Listed below are the commodity specialists in the Livestock Branch of the National Agricultural Statistics Service to contact for additional information. E-mail inquiries may be sent to nass@nass.usda.gov

Dan Kerestes, Chief, Livestock Branch ..... (202) 720-3570

Scott Hollis, Head, Livestock Section ..... (202) 690-2424
- Travis Averill – Dairy Products Prices ..... (202) 690-2168
- Sherry Bertramsen – Livestock Slaughter ..... (515) 284-4340
- Doug Bounds – Hogs and Pigs ..... (202) 720-3106
- Jason Hardegree – Cattle, Cattle on Feed ..... (202) 720-3040
- Mike Miller – Milk Production and Milk Cows ..... (202) 720-3278
- Everett Olbert – Sheep and Goats ..... (202) 720-4751
- Lorie Warren – Dairy Products ..... (202) 690-3236

Access to NASS Reports

For your convenience, you may access NASS reports and products the following ways:

- All reports are available electronically, at no cost, on the NASS web site: http://www.nass.usda.gov
- Both national and state specific reports are available via a free e-mail subscription. To set-up this free subscription, visit http://www.nass.usda.gov and in the "Receive NASS Updates" box under "Receive reports by Email," click on "National" or "State" to select the reports you would like to receive.
- Printed reports may be purchased from the National Technical Information Service (NTIS) by calling toll-free (800) 999-6779, or (703) 605-6220 if calling from outside the United States or Canada. Accepted methods of payment are Visa, MasterCard, check, or money order.

For more information on NASS surveys and reports, call the NASS Agricultural Statistics Hotline at (800) 727-9540, 7:30 a.m. to 4:00 p.m. ET, or e-mail: nass@nass.usda.gov.

From: Jerod Broadfoot [redacted]
Sent: Tuesday, October 04, 2011 2:30 PM
To: Wayne Endicott; Steve Chapman
Subject: Fwd: Oregon Voter Survey Results: Topline and Cross-tabs

Do not share. We need to discuss this tonight. Numbers are not good overall but it does provide us with good information to move forward with.

Jerod Broadfoot
President
Broadfoot Media Group
[redacted] Mobile
[redacted]

Begin forwarded message:

From: "Kelly Middendorff" [redacted]
Date: October 4, 2011 4:51:54 PM EDT
To: "Jerod Broadfoot" [redacted]
Cc: "Bob Moore[redacted], "Projects" [redacted]
Subject: Oregon Voter Survey Results: Topline and Cross-tabs

Jerod:
The crosstabs and topline for your survey are attached. We will be sending you a PowerPoint presentation on Friday, October 7th. In the meantime here is an overview of the findings.

A ballot measure that allowed the Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife (ODFW) to authorize hunters to use dogs for hunting cougars and bears and bait to hunt bears is supported by 40% and opposed by 51%. The remaining 9% have no opinion. When the three components of the proposed measure were tested individually, we found majority opposition to all three. Specifically, 58% were opposed to allowing the ODFW to authorize use of bait to hunt bears, 55% were opposed to allowing the ODFW to authorize the use of dogs to hunt bears, and 51% were opposed to allowing ODFW to authorize use of dogs to hunt cougars.

After hearing several messages about the problems posed by increasing cougar and bear populations, the margin of opposition on the ballot measure narrowed to 44% yes, 48% no, 7% undecided. Finally, after hearing a draft ballot title and result of a “yes” and “no” vote, 36% would vote yes, 56% would vote no and 8% were undecided.

The data indicate that Oregon voters would be more receptive to a ballot measure that allowed the ODFW to control cougar and bear populations rather than allowing the ODFW “to authorize hunters” to use dogs and bait to control those populations. For example, when it comes to managing cougar and bear populations in Oregon, a wide majority (64%) of voters say that local wildlife biologists working for the ODFW should have the most influence in managing cougar and bear populations. Further, more than half of the state’s voters (51%) would return all management tools, including dogs and bait, to the ODFW and allow the agency to do its job and six-in-ten (60%) believe if the ODFW is not allowed to manage cougar and bear populations, someone could get attacked or killed.

On other issues explored in the survey:

- A plurality of Oregon voters believes habitat should be the State Legislature's highest priority on issues involving wildlife.

- More than eight-in-ten voters (82%) believe hunting is an important part of managing wildlife populations in the state.

- More than six-in-ten voters (61%) have heard, read, or seen something about cougars and bears recently.

The survey was conducted October 2-3, 2011 by Moore Information, Inc. among a representative sample of 500 likely voters statewide. The potential sampling error is plus or minus 4% at the 95% confidence level.

Please let me know if you have any questions.

Bob Moore

Bob Moore, Moore Information, Inc.
[redacted]
www.moore-info.com
_____