



OXFORD JOURNALS  
OXFORD UNIVERSITY PRESS

## American Society of Mammalogists

---

Sodium Dynamics and Adaptations of a Moose Population

Author(s): Gary E. Belovsky and Peter A. Jordan

Source: *Journal of Mammalogy*, Vol. 62, No. 3 (Aug., 1981), pp. 613-621

Published by: [American Society of Mammalogists](#)

Stable URL: <http://www.jstor.org/stable/1380408>

Accessed: 29-02-2016 14:47 UTC

### REFERENCES

Linked references are available on JSTOR for this article:

[http://www.jstor.org/stable/1380408?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references\\_tab\\_contents](http://www.jstor.org/stable/1380408?seq=1&cid=pdf-reference#references_tab_contents)

You may need to log in to JSTOR to access the linked references.

---

Your use of the JSTOR archive indicates your acceptance of the Terms & Conditions of Use, available at <http://www.jstor.org/page/info/about/policies/terms.jsp>

JSTOR is a not-for-profit service that helps scholars, researchers, and students discover, use, and build upon a wide range of content in a trusted digital archive. We use information technology and tools to increase productivity and facilitate new forms of scholarship. For more information about JSTOR, please contact support@jstor.org.



American Society of Mammalogists and Oxford University Press are collaborating with JSTOR to digitize, preserve and extend access to *Journal of Mammalogy*.

<http://www.jstor.org>

# SODIUM DYNAMICS AND ADAPTATIONS OF A MOOSE POPULATION

GARY E. BELOVSKY AND PETER A. JORDAN

**ABSTRACT.**—A “balance sheet” for sodium losses and intakes was developed for moose (*Alces alces*) at Isle Royale National Park, Michigan. This technique emphasized potential times of the year and avenues of sodium loss that might be limiting. A mechanism for sodium storage was proposed which involves the replacement of sodium in the salivary-rumen fluids with potassium during periods of sodium deficiency (September to May).

Annual sodium “balance sheets” for adult moose (*Alces alces*) bulls, barren cows, cows with a single calf, and cows with twins were constructed to compare sodium retention with acquisition at Isle Royale National Park, Michigan. The ability to acquire sodium obviously must be greater than or equal to losses; otherwise, moose could not exist in the area because sodium is required for osmotic homeostasis, buffering of body fluids, nerve transmission, reproduction, hair production, lactation, growth, and the maintenance of body weight and appetite (Church et al., 1971; Smith et al., 1972). A sodium budget, at best, is crude because of the variability in field measurements and, in many cases, their approximate nature. However, the budgets demonstrated when sodium availability during a year or from year to year might be limiting to moose.

Sodium was chosen as a likely limiting nutrient to moose because it is considered to be a rare element in northern ecosystems that do not receive oceanic salt impaction (Botkin et al., 1973; Jordan et al., 1974). Botkin et al. (1973) found at Isle Royale that the average sodium content of terrestrial vegetation was 3 to 28 parts per million (ppm), while that of aquatic macrophytes was to 2 to 9,400 ppm. Based upon dietary sodium requirements of domestic livestock, they demonstrated that a moose could satisfy only 7 to 14% of its sodium requirements by feeding on terrestrial plants. Consequently, the remaining requirement must be acquired from sodium in aquatic vegetation. Aho and Jordan (1979) documented that moose at Isle Royale consumed from 63 to 95% of the annual production of submerged aquatics, and we have observed that moose on the island appeared to have a “drive” for aquatics to the point of ignoring danger (loud noises, presence of humans, and motorboats).

In addition, several investigators examined sodium as a potentially limiting nutrient for herbivores. Hutchinson and Deevey (1949) suggested that sodium might account for herbivore cycles in northern regions; Aumann (1965) and Aumann and Emlen (1965) showed a positive correlation between peak microtine population densities and the concentration of sodium in soils. Furthermore, captive *Microtus pennsylvanicus* exhibited a reduced fecundity and density tolerance as dietary sodium levels decreased. Krebs et al. (1971) countered these arguments by demonstrating no correlation between soil sodium levels and microtine densities in Indiana. Nevertheless, other studies indicated that herbivorous mammals modified their behavior in response to sodium: East African ungulates sought surface water high in sodium (Weir, 1972a, 1973; Jarman, 1972); Australian herbivores sought foods high in sodium and excreted very little sodium (Denton et al., 1961; Denton, 1956, 1957, 1965; Bott et al., 1964; Scoggins et al., 1970); *Odocoileus virginianus* had seasonal adaptations to sodium retention linked with availability and requirements (Weeks and Kirkpatrick, 1976); *Marmota monax* and *Sciurus niger* had seasonal predilections for sodium salts (Weeks and Kirkpatrick, 1978); and *Cynomys gunnisoni* and *C. ludovicianus* possibly alleviated a potential sodium deficit by feeding on insects (Bakko, 1977). Finally, Jordan

et al. (1972) demonstrated that sodium was the least stable mineral, as yet studied, in forest biogeochemical cycles.

#### METHODS AND RESULTS

The adults, for which annual  $\text{Na}^+$  "balance sheets" were constructed, were assumed to be of average weight, 358 kg (Jordan et al., 1971). Two separate sets of data were required to construct "balance sheets:" the  $\text{Na}^+$  content of materials ingested, excreted, or stored, and the rates of ingestion, excretion, and storage of  $\text{Na}^+$ .

The study areas were described in greater detail elsewhere (Belovsky and Jordan, 1978). The study was conducted at Isle Royale National Park, Michigan, between 1972 and 1974 on an upland forest site, the canopy of which was composed primarily of deciduous species, and on a coastal forest, the canopy of which was dominated by conifers.

*Na<sup>+</sup> content of materials.*—The  $\text{Na}^+$  content of moose tissue, feces, and urine (Table 1) was measured by use of the same analytical techniques employed by Botkin et al. (1973) for vegetation. Samples were collected with plastic gloves, distilled in purified-silica flasks and analyzed by atomic absorption spectrophotometry. The mean  $\text{Na}^+$  concentrations of food plants were computed from vegetation  $\text{Na}^+$  values reported by Botkin et al. (1973) and the observed moose diet at Isle Royale (Belovsky and Jordan, 1978).

The small number of urine samples (Table 1) was unavoidable, given the protected status of moose in national parks and the unavailability of captive individuals. Urine in summer was collected by catheterization of immobilized moose. Of seven moose immobilized, only three had not emptied their bladders. Winter samples were even more difficult to collect, because the study period was only 2 weeks and samples were available only from moose shot for another study. Only one of the three moose shot had urine in its bladder. The individual was healthy as determined by bone marrow condition and was considered typical of adult moose in February.

Additional winter urine samples were obtained by watching moose at close range (3–15 m) and collecting frozen urine-snow samples within several min of an observed urination. This was possible because the urine-snow mixture froze before the urine melted to the soil. The moose urine-snow was compared with controls of human urine and urine-snow to estimate dilution. Two such samples analyzed had  $\text{Na}^+$  concentrations that were approximately 1 ppm, suggesting that the  $\text{Na}^+$  concentration of the single winter urine sample collected from the bladder was reliable (Table 1).

*Rates of storage, excretion, and ingestion.*—The rate of  $\text{Na}^+$  storage (Table 1) by a moose depends upon its growth rate and offspring production. The model of moose-biomass dynamics presented by Jordan et al. (1971) was used to estimate adult body growth, most of which arose from fat storage for winter and from recovery from weight losses after winter when food was scarce. Reproductive cows require  $\text{Na}^+$  to produce fetuses, amniotic fluids, and milk to feed calves. Variation in milk production during lactation was not included in the "balance sheet;" rather a total production value for the period was used.

$\text{Na}^+$  is lost by moose primarily through excretion because cervids do not normally sweat as a means of thermoregulation (Irving, 1964) and artiodactyl sweat is low in  $\text{Na}^+$  (MacFarlane, 1964). Furthermore, losses of  $\text{Na}^+$  through "drooled" saliva was considered unimportant, because moose were seldom observed to salivate on themselves or their food plants. Defecation and urination rates (Table 1) were obtained by observing moose over more than 80 h at distances of 3 to 15 m. The number of fecal groups produced/day was computed from these observations. The urination rate was measured by one observer timing the duration of urination and closely watching urine flow, while a second person cut holes of different sizes in plastic bags, that were

TABLE 1.—Parameters ( $\bar{X} \pm SD$ ) employed in constructing the  $Na^+$  "balance sheets" for reproductive and nonreproductive adult moose, with sources of values.

Category	Estimates
<b>Forage plants</b>	
Terrestrial	
Summer	9 ppm <sup>a</sup>
Winter	7 ppm <sup>a</sup>
Aquatic	2,950 ppm <sup>a</sup>
<b>Moose materials</b>	
Urine	
Summer	44 ppm $\pm$ 28 (n = 3)
Winter	1 ppm (n = 1)
Feces	
Summer	85 ppm $\pm$ 55 (n = 26)
Winter	112 ppm $\pm$ 39 (n = 7)
Tissue (muscle, fat, and hair) <sup>b</sup>	1,000 ppm <sup>a</sup>
Milk	1,576 ppm <sup>c</sup>
<b>Outputs</b>	
Urine	
Summer	131 s/day $\pm$ 56 $\times$ 0.1 l/s $\pm$ 0.02 = 13.1 l/day (n = 5) (n = 6)
Winter	73 s/day $\pm$ 7 $\times$ 0.1 l/s $\pm$ 0.02 = 7.3 l/day (n = 3) (n = 6)
Feces	
Summer	6 pies/day $\pm$ 2 $\times$ 178 g dry wt/pie $\pm$ 36 = 1,068 g dry wt/day (n = 7) (n = 35)
Winter	17 pellet groups/day $\pm$ 7 $\times$ 178 g/pellet group $\pm$ 35 = 3,026 g/day (n = 3) (n = 23)
<b>Storage</b>	
Growth	45 kg/yr <sup>d</sup>
Lactation	70 l/calf/yr <sup>e</sup>
Amniotic fluids	4.4 l/calf <sup>f</sup>
Fetal growth	11.2 kg/fetus <sup>e</sup>
<b>Consumption</b>	
Terrestrial plants	
Summer	4,030 g dry wt/day <sup>g</sup>
Winter	4,647 g dry wt/day <sup>e</sup>
Aquatic plants	
Bulls	655 g dry wt/day <sup>g</sup>
Cows	1,081 g dry wt/day <sup>g</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Botkin et al., 1973; <sup>b</sup> assuming that the tissue added by a moose each year is composed of 90% muscle and fat and 10% hair; <sup>c</sup> Cook et al., 1970; <sup>d</sup> Jordan et al., 1971; <sup>e</sup> Knorre, 1959; <sup>f</sup> Austin and Short, 1972; <sup>g</sup> Belovsky and Jordan, 1978.

maintained at a constant volume of water. By comparison, the observer matched the proper flow from the bags to estimate the rate of urine flow.

The daily consumption of food by adult moose measured at Isle Royale by Belovsky and Jordan (1978) was used in the "balance sheet" computations (Table 1).

**Ability to find  $Na^+$ .**—Buckets of salt solutions (KCl,  $KHCO_3$ ,  $KSO_4$ , NaCl,  $NaHCO_3$ ,  $NaSO_4$ ) of 1, 10, and 100 milliequivalents/l (meq/l) concentrations were set at a natural mud lick to determine whether moose had a predilection for  $Na^+$  salts and to determine the minimum salt concentrations that they could detect. One hundred twenty-six presentations, which were divided equally among all six salts and concentrations, were made.

TABLE 2.—Annual Na<sup>+</sup> (in g) “balance sheets” for moose of different sexes and reproductive classes at Isle Royale.

Na <sup>+</sup> factor	Bulls	Cows		
		Barren	With 1 calf	With twins
<b>Outputs</b>				
Excretion	157.6	157.6	157.6	157.6
Tissue growth	45.0	45.0	45.0	45.0
Total	202.6	202.6	202.6	202.6
<b>Reproduction</b>				
Amniotic fluid			4.4	8.8
Fetus			11.2	22.4
Milk			112.0	224.0
Total			127.6	255.2
Total outputs	202.6	202.6	330.2	457.8
<b>Inputs</b>				
Aquatic consumption	208.7	344.4	344.4	344.4
<b>Terrestrial consumption</b>				
Summer	4.5	4.5	4.5	4.5
Winter	8.4	8.4	8.4	8.4
Total inputs	221.6	357.3	357.3	357.3
Net balance	+19.0	+154.7	+27.1	-100.5

*Chronology of Na<sup>+</sup> “balance sheet.”*—Moose were observed to feed only on aquatic vegetation for 108 days (early June through mid-September); this time limit possibly was imposed by excessive heat losses by moose to cold pond water during other periods. Because aquatic plants have the highest water and sodium content of forage plants, it was assumed that the high output of urine during summer was restricted to the aquatic feeding period. Summer fecal production was considered for 124 days, the period that deciduous leaves and herbs were consumed (mid-May through mid-September).

*Na<sup>+</sup> “balance sheets.”*—With the above chronology and the values in Table 1, the annual Na<sup>+</sup> requirements (losses plus storage) and intakes (food) were computed for adult moose of different reproductive classes (Table 2).

#### DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Although we cannot show irrefutably that the “balance sheets” (Table 2) present minimum Na<sup>+</sup> losses and requirements, two additional sets of observations suggest that they were minimal. First, moose on another area at Isle Royale, where aquatic macrophytes were unavailable, “slurped” water containing filamentous algae, *Spirogyra* sp., (Belovsky and Jordan, 1978), which was approximately 0.0146 g Na<sup>+</sup>/g dry wt (Boyd and Lawrence, 1966). The annual Na<sup>+</sup> intake for moose on this second area was computed to be 177 g/yr for a bull and 338 g/yr for a cow, comparable to values presented in Table 2. Second, moose have an energy-maximizing foraging strategy (Belovsky, 1978). This strategy suggests that moose should not consume more aquatic plants than necessary to supply Na<sup>+</sup> requirements, because aquatics have the lowest net energy content per unit of rumen filled of any summer forage plant. Therefore, a moose at Isle Royale should use the least amount of Na<sup>+</sup> to minimize aquatic consumption and maximize daily energy intake.

Because the “balance sheets” appeared to present minimum Na<sup>+</sup> requirements, several points can be made. First, there were striking differences in Na<sup>+</sup> requirements

between reproductive and nonreproductive moose (Table 2). A reproductive moose required 128 to 255 g/yr more  $\text{Na}^+$  than nonreproductive individuals, depending upon whether one or two calves were produced. Cows with twins did not seem to be able to satisfy their  $\text{Na}^+$  requirements by food intake; perhaps they mobilized  $\text{Na}^+$  stored from foods consumed in previous years. Furthermore, 94 to 96% of an adult moose's  $\text{Na}^+$  intake came from aquatic plants, which were available only for 30% of the year. These observations suggested that moose may have evolved adaptations to reduce excretory  $\text{Na}^+$  losses, to increase intake of aquatic plants, and to store  $\text{Na}^+$  for periods when aquatic plants were not available (70% of year). In addition, they suggest that moose growth rates and reproduction, especially for reproductive cows, may be limited by  $\text{Na}^+$  availability.

*Na<sup>+</sup> retention adaptations.*—Moose lost less  $\text{Na}^+$  through urine than by any other route (7%), suggesting an efficient excretory system. In summer, the  $\text{Na}^+$  concentration of urine was 1.9 meq/l, while in winter it declined to 0.00004 meq/l.  $\text{Na}^+$  values for moose urine were equal to or less than  $\text{Na}^+$  urine values measured for other  $\text{Na}^+$ -deprived herbivores: *Odocoileus virginianus*, 1.7 meq/l (Weeks and Kirkpatrick, 1976); *Cynomys ludovicianus* and *C. gunnisoni*, 4.5 meq/l (Bakko, 1977); and Australian mammals, including *Vombatus* sp., *Oryctolagus cuniculus*, *Macropus* sp., and sheep, 0.3 to 0.5 meq/l (Scoggins et al., 1970). Ability of a moose to reduce renal  $\text{Na}^+$  was impressive because its large daily intake of water in summer (28.7 l) required a large urine output and renal filtration rate, thereby demanding that renal  $\text{Na}^+$  conservation mechanisms operate quickly and efficiently. Other mammals studied for renal  $\text{Na}^+$  retention were from dry environments, where urine was concentrated at slow filtration rates making  $\text{Na}^+$  retention easier (Gordon et al., 1968).

Although  $\text{Na}^+$  losses were greatest in feces, there was evidence for a well developed fecal- $\text{Na}^+$  conservation mechanism. During winter, moose lost 4.9 meq  $\text{Na}^+$ /kg dry wt of feces and the same per liter of fecal water; in summer, 3.7 meq/kg dry wt or 1.2 meq/l of fecal water were lost. The fecal- $\text{Na}^+$  values for moose were equal to or less than values measured for other  $\text{Na}^+$ -deprived herbivores: domestic cow, 196 meq/kg dry wt or 7.6 meq/l (Renkema et al., 1962); *Loxodonta africana*, 78.3 meq/kg dry wt (Weir, 1972b); and Australian domestic rabbits, 5 meq/kg dry wt for soft feces or 2 meq/kg dry wt for reingested feces (Scoggins et al., 1970). White-tailed deer, however, conserved fecal  $\text{Na}^+$  58% better than moose (Weeks and Kirkpatrick, 1976).

*Adaptations for Na<sup>+</sup> intake.*—The  $\text{Na}^+$  content of forage necessary to satisfy requirements of moose was 90 to 200 ppm, depending upon reproductive status, far less than the 1,000 ppm suggested for livestock (Hafez and Dyer, 1969). Nevertheless, moose appeared to possess several adaptations for feeding upon plants high in  $\text{Na}^+$ . Female moose have a rumen volume 1.2 times larger than that of a bull of the same weight, based upon the wet weight of rumen contents (Belovsky, 1978). The greater volume permitted cows, whose  $\text{Na}^+$  requirements were greater, to consume more bulky aquatics for  $\text{Na}^+$  content, and still have rumen capacity for energy-food (leaves) (Belovsky, 1978).

The ability to detect low  $\text{Na}^+$  concentrations in foods was another adaptation. Studies cited by Arnold and Hill (1972) demonstrated that  $\text{Na}^+$  solutions were detected by ruminants between 85 and 100 meq/l concentrations; moose were found to consume only 100 meq/l solutions of  $\text{Na}^+$  and  $\text{K}^+$  ( $\chi^2 = 22.7$ ,  $P < 0.005$ ,  $df = 1$ ). Moose were expected to prefer  $\text{Na}^+$  solutions, however, almost as many  $\text{K}^+$  buckets were utilized as  $\text{Na}^+$  buckets (7  $\text{K}^+$ :8  $\text{Na}^+$ ). Moose were either unable to distinguish specific ions and concerned themselves only with minimum concentrations, or the experiment was not definitive.

Natural mud licks at Isle Royale were not important sources of  $\text{Na}^+$ ; they contained only 0.4 to 2.2 meq  $\text{Na}^+$ /l, which was less than concentrations detectable by moose.

TABLE 3.—A comparison of moose preference for aquatic plants (% by weight in diet  $\times$  % occurrence in diet/% by weight availability  $\times$  % occurrence in the environment: Krueger, 1972), based on data collected at Isle Royale (Belovsky and Jordan, 1978), with their Na<sup>+</sup> content (Botkin et al., 1973; Boyd and Lawrence, 1966).

Species	Preference index	Na <sup>+</sup> (ppm)
<i>Utricularia</i> sp.	5.73	8,048
<i>Potamogeton</i> sp.	5.78	7,230
<i>Nitella</i> and <i>Chara</i> sp.	3.39	2,850
<i>Equisetum</i> sp.	0.96	1,574
<i>Carex</i> sp.	0.27	390
<i>Spirogyra</i> sp.	11.11	14,600

If moose were to use licks as substitutes for aquatic plants, 15 to 83 l/day of lick water would be needed to supply Na<sup>+</sup> requirements. This amount of water intake would pose a serious reduction in rumen volume for feeding and increase the renal filtration rate, which might lead to greater losses of Na<sup>+</sup> in urine. Furthermore, licks were distributed too widely for all moose to have access to them. Concentrations of Na<sup>+</sup> in licks at Isle Royale may not be abnormal, because all reported lick-Na<sup>+</sup> concentrations found in the literature were below 20 meq/l (Weeks and Kirkpatrick, 1976; Knight and Mudge, 1967; Hebert and Cowan, 1971; Cowan and Brink, 1949; Murie, 1934; Dalke et al., 1965; Stockstad et al., 1953).

Moose demonstrated preferences for species of aquatic plants, the main Na<sup>+</sup> sources, based upon their Na<sup>+</sup> concentration (Table 3). Furthermore, a preference index of 1, indicating a neutral reaction to a food, was found at Na<sup>+</sup> concentrations of 65 meq/l, a value close to the level of Na<sup>+</sup> detection by moose.

*Na<sup>+</sup> storage adaptations.*—Moose may store Na<sup>+</sup> in the saliva-rumen fluid system during the aquatic feeding period (early June to mid-September) for later withdrawal. Denton (1956, 1957) and Bott et al. (1964) demonstrated for sheep and cattle that K<sup>+</sup> replaced Na<sup>+</sup> in saliva-rumen fluids during Na<sup>+</sup> deprivation and liberated Na<sup>+</sup> to maintain the body's ionic balance. The process was reversed when Na<sup>+</sup> was no longer deficient.

About 15% of the body mass of a ruminant is ingesta and fluids in the rumen (Denton, 1956, 1957; Church et al., 1971), and an average adult moose (358 kg) displaces 33.6 l of rumen volume with food (Belovsky and Jordan, 1978). If moose replace Na<sup>+</sup> with K<sup>+</sup> in rumen-saliva fluids at the same rate as sheep, 5,100 ppm (Denton, 1956, 1957), an adult bull would have a Na<sup>+</sup> reserve of 93 g, while a cow would have 112 g—the sex difference arises from the different rumen capacities. These potential Na<sup>+</sup> reserves would fulfill requirements for bulls and for cows with single calves, but would fall 17 g short annually for a cow with twins. This may explain why twinning was not more common at Isle Royale.

The rumen-fluid composition for a moose shot in February was 6,221 ppm Na<sup>+</sup> and 49,510 ppm K<sup>+</sup>; a Na<sup>+</sup>/K<sup>+</sup> ratio of 1:8. Because ruminants seem to have similar saliva-rumen fluid compositions (Johnson, 1966), the Na<sup>+</sup>/K<sup>+</sup> ratio was compared with those observed for sheep: 18:1 for non-Na<sup>+</sup> deprived and 1:18 for severely deprived (Denton, 1956). The ratio for the single moose fell at the lower end of the sheep values, suggesting that moose may replace Na<sup>+</sup> with K<sup>+</sup>.

The factors in Table 1 along with moose and vegetation K<sup>+</sup> values (D. Botkin, pers. comm.) were used to compute a K<sup>+</sup> budget. During summer, moose did not gain K<sup>+</sup>; the intake was excreted or used for growth and reproduction. In winter, however, 360 g were accumulated and available for substitution with Na<sup>+</sup>. Furthermore, in winter, moose urine contained 800 ppm K<sup>+</sup>, a value comparable with the 1,170 ppm of a Na<sup>+</sup>-

deprived cow (Bott et al., 1964), and the 741 ppm of sheep (Denton, 1956). Therefore, moose seemed to increase  $K^+$  reserves under conditions of  $Na^+$  deprivation.

While  $Na^+$ -deprived, a moose's rumen reservoir would need to release 0.4 g/day of  $Na^+$ , far less than the several g/day response elicited for sheep and cattle (Denton, 1956, 1957; Bott et al., 1964). In terms of total response, the experimental short-term  $Na^+$  released (30 days) by sheep and cattle was equivalent to the amount required during the period of chronic deprivation for moose.

In summary, our study suggests that in regions where primary foods contain nutritionally inadequate levels of sodium, moose circumvent sodium stress by consuming aquatic plants in midsummer. These generally have  $Na^+$  levels an order of magnitude or two higher than terrestrial plants. Moose then retain enough sodium during the rest of the year to avoid deficiency, to support new growth in spring, and to support gestation and early lactation in reproducing females. Essentially nothing is known about  $Na^+$  physiology of other nonaquatic herbivores of the boreal region; it has been observed that white-tailed deer apparently consume more aquatics than has commonly been reported (Hennings, 1977). There is a marked need to verify the hypothesized  $Na^+$ - $K^+$  shift in moose and other ruminants that are seasonally restricted in their access to sodium.

Because sodium drive in moose at Isle Royale is so pronounced, and their consumption of aquatics sometimes approaches 100% (Murie, 1934; Aho and Jordan, 1979), it would appear that a relatively small decline in aquatics could have a major impact on the herd; implications of this are explored in a sequel paper (Belovsky, 1981). Furthermore, in regions where terrestrial environments are the same but aquatic resources are not as abundant nor as evenly dispersed, capacity of the environment to support moose may be correspondingly lower than at Isle Royale.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank T. W. Schoener, D. B. Botkin, H. P. Weeks, J. B. Slade, and C. R. Taylor for critically reading early drafts of the paper. We also thank J. Cannon, L. Stowe, D. McEcheron, M. Tate, K. Hay, P. Spiro, W. Berliner, R. Bates, D. Johnson, D. Pletcher, and J. B. Slade for the long hours they donated as field assistants. The work was supported by a grant from the National Science Foundation to P. A. Jordan and D. B. Botkin, and grants to G. E. Belovsky from the Environmental Education Fund, the Richmond Society, Harvard University, and the Harvard Society of Fellows. We acknowledge the aid provided by the National Park personnel at Isle Royale National Park, in particular, Superintendent H. Beattie, District Ranger D. Peterson, and North Central Science Director R. Linn.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- AHO, R. W., AND P. A. JORDAN. 1979. Production of aquatic macrophytes and its utilization by moose on Isle Royale National Park. Pp. 341-348, in *Proceedings of the first conference on scientific research in the national parks* (R. M. Linn, ed.). Trans. Proc. Ser., U.S. Natl. Park Serv., 5(1):1-681.
- ARNOLD, G. W., AND J. L. HILL. 1972. Chemical factors affecting selection of food plants by ruminants. Pp. 71-102, in *Phytochemical ecology* (J. B. Harborne, ed.). Acad. Press, New York, 272 pp.
- AUSTIN, C. R., AND R. V. SHORT. 1972. Embryonic and fetal development. Cambridge Univ. Press, London, *Reproduction in Mammals*, 2:1-272.
- AUMANN, G. D. 1965. Microtine abundance and soil sodium levels. *J. Mamm.*, 46:594-604.
- AUMANN, G. D., AND J. T. EMLÉN. 1965. Relation of population density to sodium availability and sodium selection by microtine rodents. *Nature*, 208:198-199.
- BAKKO, E. B. 1977. Field water balance performance in prairie dogs (*Cynomys leucurus* and *C. ludovicianus*). *Comp. Biochem. Physiol.*, 56A:443-451.
- BELOVSKY, G. E. 1978. Diet optimization in a generalist herbivore: the moose. *Theor. Population Biol.*, 14:105-134.
- . 1981. A possible population response



- of moose to sodium availability. *J. Mamm.*, 62:631-633.
- BELOVSKY, G. E., AND P. A. JORDAN. 1978. The time-energy budget of a moose. *Theor. Population Biol.*, 14:76-104.
- BOTKIN, D. B., ET AL. 1973. Sodium dynamics in a northern forest ecosystem. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.*, 70:2745-2748.
- BOTT, E., D. A. DENTON, J. R. GODING, AND J. R. SABINE. 1964. Sodium deficiency and corticosteroid secretion in cattle. *Nature*, 202:461-463.
- BOYD, C. E., AND J. M. LAWRENCE. 1966. The mineral composition of several freshwater algae. *Proc. Ann. Conf., S.E. Assoc. Game Fish Comm.*, 20:413-424.
- CHURCH, D. C., G. E. SMITH, J. P. FONTENOT, AND A. T. RALSTON. 1971. Digestive physiology and nutrition of ruminants. *Oregon St. Univ. Book Stores*, 2:401-801.
- COOK, H. W., R. A. RAUSCH, AND B. E. BAKER. 1970. Moose (*Alces alces*) milk. Gross composition, fatty acid, and mineral constitution. *Canadian J. Zool.*, 48:213-215.
- COWAN, I. M., AND V. C. BRINK. 1949. Natural game licks in the Rocky Mountain National Parks of Canada. *J. Mamm.*, 30:379-387.
- DALKE, P. D., ET AL. 1965. Use of salt by elk in Idaho. *J. Wildl. Mgmt.*, 29:319-332.
- DENTON, D. A. 1956. The effect of Na<sup>+</sup> depletion on the Na<sup>+</sup>:K<sup>+</sup> ratio of the parotid saliva of the sheep. *J. Physiol.*, 131:516-525.
- . 1957. The study of sheep with permanent unilateral parotid fistulae. *Quart. J. Exp. Physiol.*, 42:72-95.
- . 1965. Evolutionary aspects of the emergence of aldosterone secretion and salt appetite. *Physiol. Rev.*, 45:245-295.
- DENTON, D. A., ET AL. 1961. Adaptation of ruminant animals to variation of salt intake. Pp. 193-198, in *Salinity problems in the arid zones*. *Proc. Teheran Symp., Paris*, 395 pp.
- GORDON, M. S., ET AL. 1968. *Animal function; principles and adaptations*. Macmillan Co., New York, 560 pp.
- HAFEZ, E. S. E., AND I. A. DYER. 1969. *Animal growth and nutrition*. Lea and Febinger, Philadelphia, 649 pp.
- HEBERT, D., AND I. M. COWAN. 1971. Natural salt licks as a part of the ecology of the mountain goat. *Canadian J. Zool.*, 49:605-610.
- HENNINGS, K. R. 1977. *Aquatic feeding by white-tailed deer and moose in northeastern Minnesota*. Unpubl. M.S. thesis, Univ. Minnesota, St. Paul, 62 pp.
- HUTCHINSON, G. E., AND E. S. DEEVEY. 1949. Ecological studies on populations. *Surv. Biol. Progr.*, 1:325-359.
- IRVING, L. 1964. Terrestrial animals in cold: birds and mammals. Pp. 361-377, in *Handbook of physiology*. Adaptation to the environment (D. B. Dill, ed.). *Amer. Physiol. Soc., Washington, D. C.*, 4:1-1056 pp.
- JARMAN, P. J. 1972. The use of drinking sites, wallows and salt licks by herbivores in the flooded Zambezi Valley. *E. African Wildl. J.*, 10:193-209.
- JOHNSON, R. R. 1966. Techniques and procedures for *in vitro* and *in vivo* rumen studies. *J. Anim. Sci.*, 25:855-875.
- JORDAN, C. F., J. R. KLINE, AND D. S. SASSCER. 1972. Relative stability of mineral cycles in forest ecosystems. *Amer. Nat.*, 106:237-253.
- JORDAN, P. A., D. B. BOTKIN, AND M. L. WOLFE. 1971. Biomass dynamics in a moose population. *Ecology*, 52:147-152.
- JORDAN, P. A., ET AL. 1974. Sodium as a critical nutrient for the moose of Isle Royale. *Proc. N. Amer. Moose Conf. Workshop*, 9: 13-42.
- KNIGHT, R. R., AND M. R. MUDGE. 1967. Characteristics of some natural licks in the Sun River area, Montana. *J. Wildl. Mgmt.*, 31:293-299.
- KNORRE, E. P. 1959. Ecology of the moose. *Trans. of the Pecora-Illych State Game Preserve, U.S.S.R.* (G. A. Novikov, ed.). Syktyvkar, U.S.S.R.: Komi Book Publishers (Translated by the Canadian Bureau of Indian Affairs from the Russian), 367 pp.
- KREBS, C. J., B. L. KELLER, AND J. H. MYERS. 1971. *Microtus* population densities and soil nutrients in southern Indiana grasslands. *Ecology*, 52:660-663.
- KRUEGER, W. C. 1972. Evaluating animal forage preference. *J. Range Mgmt.*, 25:471-475.
- MACFARLANE, W. V. 1964. Terrestrial animals in dry heat: ungulates. Pp. 509-539, in *Handbook of physiology*. Adaptation to the environment (D. B. Dill, ed.). *Amer. Physiol. Soc., Washington, D. C.*, 411-1056 pp.
- MURIE, A. 1934. The moose of Isle Royale. *Mus. Zool., Univ. Michigan Misc. Publ.*, 25:1-44.
- RENKEMA, J. A., T. SENSU, B. D. E. GAILLARD, AND E. BROUWER. 1962. Regulation of sodium excretion and retention by the intestine in cows. *Nature*, 195:389-390.
- SCOGGINS, B. A., ET AL. 1970. Physiological and morphological responses of mammals to changes in their sodium status. *Mem. Soc. Endocrinol.*, 18:577-600.
- SMITH, H. A., T. C. JONES, AND R. D. HUNT. 1972. *Veterinary pathology*. Lea and Febinger, Philadelphia, 1521 pp.
- STOCKSTAD, D. S., M. S. MORRIS, AND E. C. LORY. 1953. Chemical characteristics of natural licks used by big game animals in western Montana. *Trans. N. Amer. Wildl. Conf.*, 18:247-257.
- WEEKS, H. P., JR., AND C. M. KIRKPATRICK. 1976. Adaptations of white-tailed deer to naturally occurring sodium deficiencies. *J. Wildl. Mgmt.*, 40:610-625.
- . 1978. Salt preferences and sodium

- drive phenology in fox squirrels and woodchucks. *J. Mamm.*, 59:531–542.
- WEIR, J. S. 1972a. Spatial distribution of elephants in an African national park in relation to environmental sodium. *Oikos*, 23:1–13.
- . 1972b. Mineral content of elephant dung. *E. African Wildl. J.*, 10:229–230.
- . 1973. Exploitation of water soluble soil sodium by elephants in Murchison Falls National Park, Uganda. *E. African Wildl. J.*, 11:1–7.

*School of Natural Resources, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, MI 48109, and Department of Zoology, University of Washington, Seattle, WA 98195 (Belovsky), and Department of Entomology, Fisheries and Wildlife, University of Minnesota, St. Paul, MN 55455 (Jordan). Submitted 23 February 1979. Accepted 18 March 1981.*