

**ASPECTS OF HUNTING ON NORTHERN BOBWHITE POPULATIONS: TEMPORAL
AND SPATIAL ANALYSIS**

A Dissertation

by

DONAL ABRAHAM WOODARD

Submitted to the College of Graduate Studies
Texas A&M University-Kingsville
in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree of

DOCTOR OF PHILOSOPHY

December 2021

Major Subject: Wildlife Science

**ASPECTS OF HUNTING ON NORTHERN BOBWHITE POPULATIONS:
TEMPORAL AND SPATIAL ANALYSIS**

A Dissertation

by

DONAL ABRAHAM WOODARD

Approved as to style and content by:



Leonard A. Brennan, Ph.D.
Committee Chair



Fidel Hernández, Ph.D.
Committee Member



Humberto L. Perotto-Baldivieso, Ph.D.
Committee Member



Neal Wilkins, Ph.D.
Committee Member



Weimin Xi, Ph.D.
Graduate Council Representative



George Allen Rasmussen, Ph.D.
Vice President for Research and Graduate
Studies

December 2021

ABSTRACT

Aspects of Hunting on Northern Bobwhite Populations: Temporal and Spatial Analysis

(December 2021)

Donal Woodard, B.S., University of Rio Grande;

M.S. Texas A&M University

Chairman of Advisory Committee: Dr. Leonard A. Brennan

Northern bobwhites (*Colinus virginianus*) have been studied intensively now for more than a century. Despite the attention, widespread declines have occurred across their geographic ranges. These declines raise concerns regarding the long-term sustainability of populations exposed to hunting. However, population trends of northern bobwhites in South Texas seem to lack the long-term declines occurring across much of the state and elsewhere. Research has attributed this to favorable range management practices, large property sizes, and economic incentives derived from hunting lease fees in the region. The recommended harvest rate for South Texas is 20% of the fall abundance, including factoring for crippled individuals. This harvest rate is based on simulations of empirical data but still requires thorough evaluations in the field. We assessed the 20% recommendation during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons on East Foundation properties in Jim Hogg County, Texas, using designated hunted (15,030 acres) and non-hunted sites (10,813 acres). We estimated multi-temporal bobwhite densities (e.g., 4 per hunting season \times 3 seasons) using line-transect distance sampling from a helicopter platform and recorded bobwhite hunting details using Garmin GPS units (i.e., trucks and pointing dogs) and detailed hunting logs. Our specific objectives were to (1) evaluate the harvest rate recommendation for northern bobwhite populations in South Texas

by comparing temporal trends between hunted and non-hunted sites (Chapter 2), (2) analyze the temporal and spatial dynamics of quail hunts in South Texas (Chapter 3), and (3) evaluate the spatial effects of harvest-related hunting pressure on local distributions of northern bobwhites (Chapter 4). According to our bobwhite density estimates, spring densities on both sites (e.g., hunted vs. non-hunted) were similar through the first two years but diverged in 2020–2021, with bobwhite densities 129% higher on the non-hunted site (Chapter 2). Hunting parties effectively covered 23.8 ± 0.3 hectares per hour, with hunts lasting 3.5 ± 0.1 hours in the morning and 1.7 ± 0.1 hours in the evening (Chapter 3). We also found that hunting pressure associated with a 20% harvest (i.e., low hunting pressure; 5.3–8.3-gun hours/100 ha) has a minimal influence on the change in bobwhite density at 16 ha resolution, with the year (i.e., starting or peak density per year) as the primary influence (Chapter 4). Our results will assist managers in making decisions regarding sustainable harvest practices and aid with the strategic distributions of hunting pressure across properties and hunting seasons.

DEDICATION

I dedicate this dissertation to my family, who have supported me during this journey. Sofia, I am forever grateful for the support and sacrifices you have made over the last 9 years. I would not have been able to tackle the challenges of work and school without your steady encouragement and confidence in me. I look forward to the adventures God has in store for us. To my sons, Beau and Dylan, you may not realize it now, but all the nights, weekends, and summers I have spent working are to provide a better future for you. There is nothing in this world I enjoy more than being with you. You both are intelligent, strong, and have the biggest hearts; you can do anything you set your mind to. I love you both and your momma dearly. Dad and Deb, thank you for instilling in me a deep passion for the outdoors and teaching me that I can accomplish anything through hard work. Mother and Grandma, thank you for all your support and prayers. I could not have done this without all your help, thank you.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

I would like to thank my committed chair, Dr. Leonard Brennan, for allowing me to pursue the research topics I am passionate about. Your insight and advice have had a significant influence on my development as a scientist. I would like to thank my committee members Dr. Fidel Hernández, Dr. Humberto L. Perotto-Baldivieso, and Dr. Neal Wilkins, for providing constructive criticism and insights throughout my research. I would also like to thank Dr. David Wester for statistical assistance and for making time within a busy schedule to help all those who ask. I thank Dr. Andrea Montalvo for her assistance with distance sampling and surveys, navigating through graduate school processes, and candid conversations about research.

I would also like to thank East Foundation for the access, financial support, and dedication to their mission: promoting private-land stewardship through science, education, and outreach. These goals drove me to South Texas 13 years ago and why I returned for my Ph.D. I am truly blessed to be a part of such a great organization.

I would also like to thank my dedicated technician team and the volunteers who assisted with data collection. I especially thank Landon Schofield, Micayla Pearson, Mikayla Youts, Julio Menchaca, Ashley Garcia, Andres Rosales, Zach Pearson, and Kristyn Stewart. Whether it was early mornings on a freezing cold quail rig or sitting in a helicopter all day, you all were eager, reliable, and enthusiastic.

Lastly, I would like to thank Brad Dyer, Joe Foran, Van Singleton, Roy Ludick, and all the staff and hunting guides for their time, enthusiasm, and support. Your contributions to this project are un-measurable. Without your interest in bobwhite research, this project would not have been possible. I look forward to more hunting seasons and sitting around the campfire with all of you.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
ABSTRACT.....	iii
DEDICATION.....	v
ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS.....	vi
TABLE OF CONTENTS.....	vii
LIST OF FIGURES.....	x
LIST OF TABLES.....	xiii
CHAPTER 1. PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES.....	1
1.1 Background.....	1
1.2 Objectives.....	3
1.3 Literature Cited.....	5
CHAPTER 2. EVALUATING THE HARVEST RATE RECOMMENDATION FOR NORTHERN BOBWHITES IN SOUTH TEXAS PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES.....	8
2.1 Study Area.....	11
2.2 Methods.....	12
2.2.1 Abundance estimates and population trends.....	12
2.2.2 Harvest methods and structure.....	14
2.2.3 Age and sex ratios.....	15
2.3 Analyses.....	16
2.3.1 Abundance estimates.....	16
2.3.2 Hunted vs. non-hunted comparisons.....	16
2.4 Results.....	18
2.5 Discussion.....	21

	Page
2.6 Manage Implications.....	24
2.7 Literature Cited.....	25
CHAPTER 3. SPATIAL AND TEMPORAL ANALYSES OF NORTHERN BOBWHITE	
HUNTING DYNAMICS	51
3.1 Study Area	53
3.2 Methods.....	53
3.2.1 Harvest methods and structure.....	53
3.2.2 Spatial hunting effort and analysis.....	55
3.3 Results.....	58
3.4 Discussion.....	61
3.5 Management Implications.....	63
3.6 Literature Cited.....	64
CHAPTER 4. DISTRIBUTIONAL RESPONSES OF NORTHERN BOBWHITES TO	
HUNTING PRESSURE IN SOUTH TEXAS	81
4.1 Study Area	82
4.2 Methods.....	83
4.2.1 Bobwhite density	83
4.2.2 Bobwhite harvest	85
4.2.3 Analysis methods.....	88
4.3 Results.....	89
4.3.1 Bobwhite density	89
4.3.2 Bobwhite harvest	90
4.3.3 Seasonal analysis	90
4.3.4 Periodic analysis	91
4.4 Discussion.....	92

	Page
4.5 Management Implications.....	93
4.5 Literature Cited.....	95
APPENDIX A.....	127
APPENDIX B.....	130
APPENDIX C.....	133
APPENDIX D.....	138
APPENDIX E.....	143
APPENDIX F.....	145
APPENDIX G.....	147
APPENDIX H.....	149
VITA.....	150

PREVIEW

LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
Figure 2.1	Map of hunted (Buena Vista Ranch) and non-hunted sites (3 reference pastures within the San Antonio Viejo Ranch) in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	48
Figure 2.2	Line transects for distance sampling from a helicopter platform on non-hunted (A) and hunted (B) sites in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	49
Figure 2.3	Trends and comparisons of northern bobwhite densities (\hat{D} , 95% CI's) in fall (A) and spring (B) between hunted and non-hunted sites obtained from line-transect distance sampling surveys via helicopter platform in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Fall density estimates were calculated from November (2019 and 2020) and December (2017 and 2018) bobwhite surveys. Spring density estimates were calculated from March surveys conducted in 2019, 2020, 2021.....	50
Figure 3.1	Relationship between northern bobwhite harvest per hunt and hunting velocity, categorized by mean velocity of pointing dogs (A; $\bar{x} = 10.6 \pm 0.1$ kph; $r_s = -0.09$, P-value = 0.1786) and mean velocity of hunting vehicles (B; $\bar{x} = 3.8 \pm 0.1$ kph; $r_s = -0.01$, P-value = 0.9194) from 211 quail hunts in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	77
Figure 3.2	Spatial distribution of 211 quail hunts at 50 meter resolution, recorded during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	78
Figure 3.3	Frequency of 50 meter grid cells categorized by total hunting pressure for the 2018–2019 (A), 2019–2020 (B), 2020–2021(C), and cumulative across the three seasons (D) from quail hunts in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	79
Figure 3.4	Percent brush canopy cover (A) and distance to road (B) per 50×50 meter grid cell, categorized by total hunting effort from quail hunts record recorded during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	80
Figure 4.1	Bobwhite density surface models constructed from line-transect distance sampling surveys from a helicopter platform conducted in early-November (A), mid-December (B), early-February (C), and early-March (D) during the 2018–2019 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	114
Figure 4.2	Bobwhite density surface models constructed from line-transect distance sampling surveys from a helicopter platform conducted in early-November (A), mid-December (B), late-January (C), and early-March (D) during the 2019–2020 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	115

Figure 4.3	Bobwhite density surface models constructed from line-transect distance sampling surveys from a helicopter platform conducted in early-November (A), mid-December (B), late-January (C), and early-March (D) during the 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	116
Figure 4.4	Percent change in bobwhite density per hunting period (i.e., Early, Middle, Late) at 16 ha resolution during the 2018–2019 (A, B, C), 2019–2020 (D, E, F), and 2020–2021 (G, H, I) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. The percent change in bobwhite density was determined from density surface models constructed from helicopter surveys in early-November, mid-December, late-January, and early-March.	117
Figure 4.5	Percent change in bobwhite density from peak fall density to spring (i.e., March) at 16 ha resolution for the 2018–2019 (A), 2019–2020 (B), and 2020–2021 (C) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. The percent change in bobwhite density was determined from density surface models constructed from helicopter surveys in early-November, mid-December (2018–2019), and early-March.	118
Figure 4.6	The mean number of bobwhite hunts (e.g. hunts, hunting pressure) occurring within each 16-ha cell during the 2018–2019 (A), 2019–2020 (B), and 2020–2021 (C) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	119
Figure 4.7	The mean number of bobwhite hunts (e.g. hunts, hunting pressure) per hunting season period (i.e., Early, Middle, Late) that occurred within each 16-ha cell during the 2018–2019 (A, B, C), 2019–2020 (D, E, F), and 2020–2021 (G, H, I) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	120
Figure 4.8	Total gunshots fired within each 16-ha cell during bobwhite hunts in the 2018–2019 (A), 2019–2020 (B), and 2020–2021 (C) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	121
Figure 4.9	Total bobwhite harvested (i.e., bobwhites retrieved and crippled) within each 16-ha cell during bobwhite hunts in the 2018–2019 (A), 2019–2020 (B), and 2020–2021 (C) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	122
Figure 4.10	Total gunshots fired by bobwhite hunters per hunting season period (i.e., Early, Middle, Late) that occurred within each 16-ha cell during the 2018–2019 (A, B, C), 2019–2020 (D, E, F), and 2020–2021 (G, H, I) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	123

Figure 4.11	Total bobwhites harvest (i.e., bobwhites retrieved and crippled) by bobwhite hunters per hunting season period (i.e., Early, Middle, Late) that occurred within each 16-ha cell during the 2018–2019 (A, B, C), 2019–2020 (D, E, F), and 2020–2021 (G, H, I) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	124
Figure 4.12	Frequency of 16-ha grid cells according to the change in bobwhite density (bobwhites/ha) from peak fall density to spring (i.e., March) for the 2018–2019 (A), 2019–2020 (B), 2020–2021(C) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	125
Figure 4.13	Changes in bobwhite density and individual bobwhite hunting variables (Hunts, Gunshots, Harvest) per 16-ha grid cell during the 2018–2019 (A, B, C), 2019–2020 (D, E, F), and 2020–2021 (G, H, I) hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA	126

LIST OF TABLES

		Page
Table 2.1	Annual harvest prescriptions for northern bobwhites on designated hunted site based on November abundance estimates calculated from line-transect distance sampling from a helicopter platform during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. The 20% harvest prescription represents a 16% retrieved and 4% crippling loss as recommended by Brennan et al. (2014b)	33
Table 2.2	Summary of annual bobwhite hunting pressure and harvest according to designated periods: early (November through mid-December), (2) middle (mid-December through late-January), and (3) late (late-January through late-February). The hunting parameters were collected during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA	34
Table 2.3	Comparisons of northern bobwhite densities (\hat{D} , 95% CI's, coefficients of variation) between hunted and non-hunted sites obtained from line-transect distance sampling surveys via helicopter platform conducted in early-November (1), mid-December (2), late-January (3), and early-March (4) during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	35
Table 2.4	Comparisons of spring northern bobwhite densities (\hat{D} , 95% CI's, coefficients of variation) between field observations and means of 100-year simulations from stochastic model by Sands (2010). Observed density estimates obtained from line-transect distance sampling surveys via helicopter platform conducted in early-March of 2019, 2020, and 2021 in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	37
Table 2.5	Comparisons of November northern bobwhite densities (\hat{D} , 95% CI's, coefficients of variation) using a conventional distance sampling (CDS) analysis (November only) and results from the seasonal analysis (i.e., four surveys per hunting season). Density estimates were obtained from sites obtained from line-transect distance sampling surveys via helicopter platform during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons on the hunted and non-hunted sites in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Seasonal analysis included conventional distance sampling with a pooled detection function, conventional distance sampling with a fully stratified detection function, and multiple-covariate distance sampling (see Appendix A and Appendix B)	38

Table 2.6	Comparisons of annual harvest rates and range (harvest rate \times 95% CI's), according to November bobwhite abundance estimates (N^{\wedge} , 95% CI's) using a conventional distance sampling (CDS) analysis (November only) and results from the seasonal analysis (i.e., four surveys per hunting season) from line-transect distance sampling surveys via helicopter platform during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons on the hunted and non-hunted sites in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA	39
Table 2.7	Seasonal mortality comparisons of northern bobwhites between hunted and non-hunted sites and percent of natural mortality not accounted for by harvest (% NM) during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Seasonal mortality represents the difference in density estimates from November to March according to line-transect distance sampling via helicopter platform. Range values represent differences between lower 95% CI, upper 95% CI, and max difference (lower 95% CI - upper 95% CI) from November to March.	40
Table 2.8	Periodic mortality (% M) comparisons of northern bobwhites between hunted and non-hunted sites, and percent of natural mortality not accounted for by harvest (% NM) during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Periodic mortality represents the difference in density estimates between four seasonal surveys (early-November, mid-December, late-January, and early-March) according to line-transect distance sampling via helicopter platform representing early, middle, and late hunting season periods. Range values represent differences between lower 95% CI, upper 95% CI, and max difference (lower 95% CI - upper 95% CI) from between seasonal surveys	41
Table 2.9	Seasonal mortality estimates of northern bobwhites as predicted using the additive harvest model and the observed mortality. Observed seasonal mortality calculated using the difference in density estimates from November to March according to line-transect distance sampling via helicopter platform during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	42
Table 2.10	Periodic mortality comparisons of northern bobwhites as predicted using the additive harvest model and the observed mortality during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Observed periodic mortality calculated using the difference in density estimates between four seasonal surveys (early-November, mid-December, late-January, and early-March) according to line-transect distance sampling via helicopter platform representing early, middle, and late hunting season periods	43

Table 2.11	Sex and age ratios of northern bobwhites from hunted and non-hunted sites during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons. in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Ratios were collected using hunter-harvested bobwhites along with trapped and released bobwhites.	44
Table 2.12	Estimates of percent summer gain (PSG), adult summer mortality (ASM), and finite rate of increase (spring and fall) for northern bobwhites on hunted and non-hunted sites in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Density estimated using line-transect distance sampling via helicopter platform during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons.	46
Table 3.1	Annual summary of hunting effort and take for morning (between 07:00–14:00 CST) and afternoon (between 14:00–20:00 CST) hunts for northern bobwhites recorded during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	72
Table 3.2	Summary of annual bobwhite hunting parameters according to designated periods: early (November through mid-December), (2) middle (mid-December through late-January), and (3) late (late-January through late-February). The hunting parameters were collected during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Encounters per hour were significantly lower during the early period ($t = -2.78$, $P\text{-value} < 0.01$), as well as harvest per covey encounter ($t = -3.45$, $P\text{-value} < 0.01$).	73
Table 3.3	Velocities and area covered by northern bobwhite hunting parties recorded during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	74
Table 3.4	Model selection results for total hunting pressure over the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Negative binomial regression using percent brush canopy coverage (Brush) and distance access road (Road) per 50×50 -meter grid cell. Details include the number of parameters (K), log likelihood ($\log(L)$), Akaike’s Information Criterion (AICc), differences in corrected Akaike’s Information Criterion ($\Delta AICc$), and Akaike model weights (W_i).	75
Table 3.5	Parameter estimates of top-ranking model for total hunting pressure over the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.	76

Table 4.1	Model selection results for gunshots fired during covey encounters (n = 1,506 encounters) recorded during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Negative binomial regression used to predict gunshots per covey encounter using the total harvest and covey size per covey encounter. Details include the number of parameters (K), log likelihood (log(L)), Akaike’s Information Criterion (AICc), differences in corrected Akaike’s Information Criterion (Δ AICc), and Akaike model weights (Wi).....	105
Table 4.2	Parameter estimates (β -estimate), confidence intervals (L-CI, U-CI), and P-values o top-ranking model to predict gunshots fired during covey encounters (n = 1,506 encounters) during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	106
Table 4.3	Bobwhite density mean, range, and standard deviation (σ) of cell values (n = 442) calculated from density surface models (16 ha resolution) during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	107
Table 4.4	Central tendency (mean, median) and range (minimum, maximum) of the change in bobwhite density (bobwhites/ha) per period of interest during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Change in bobwhite density per cell (n = 442) determined by line-transect distance sampling via helicopter platform in early-November, mid-December, late-January, and early-March at 16 ha resolution.....	108
Table 4.5	Summary of annual bobwhite hunts, gunshots, and harvest across seasons and designated periods during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Hunting seasons designated into 3 periods: (1) Early (November through mid-December), (2) Middle (mid-December through late-January), and (3) late (late-January through late-February).....	109
Table 4.6	Analysis of correlation (Pearson’s Correlation = r) between change in bobwhite density from the peak fall density to spring density and the individual hunting metrics (i.e., Hunts, Gunshots, Harvest) at 16 ha resolution, collected during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	110

Table 4.7	Model selection results for the change in bobwhite density (i.e., peak density to spring density) and hunting variables (Hunts, Gunshots, Harvest) using a linear mixed-effects model with a first-order autoregressive structure. Bobwhite densities and hunting variables were collected during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA.....	111
Table 4.8	Parameter estimates (β -estimate), confidence intervals (L-CI, U-CI), and P-values of top-ranking models (2) for change in bobwhite density (i.e., peak density to spring density) and hunting variables over the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA	112
Table 4.9	Spearman's Rank Correlation (r_s) and P-value for change in bobwhite density in relation to individual hunting metrics (i.e., Hunts, Gunshots, Harvest) per time period (i.e., Early [Period 1], Middle [Period 2], Late [Period 3]) at 16 ha resolution during the 2018–2019, 2019–2020, and 2020–2021 hunting seasons in Jim Hogg County, Texas, USA. Change in bobwhite density per period represents the difference in density estimates per cell between four seasonal bobwhite density surface models derived from line-transect distance sampling via helicopter platform in early-November, mid-December, late-January, and early-March.....	113

CHAPTER 1.

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OBJECTIVES

BACKGROUND

Northern bobwhite (*Colinus virginianus*) populations have been declining across their geographic range for nearly 100 years (Stoddard 1936: xxi, Brennan 1991, Guthery 2002:4, 5). Researchers have attributed these downward trends to the widespread changes in land-use practices over time (Roseberry and Klimstra 1984: 194, Brennan 1991, Brennan et al. 2007b). There are, however, a few areas within the northern bobwhite geographic range that have maintained relatively abundant populations through the years. The South Texas Plains ecoregion has maintained a stable long-term bobwhite population, despite annual fluctuations (Peterson and Perez 2000). In South Texas, an alignment of favorable range management practices, large ranches that provide millions of acres of habitat that support bobwhite populations, and economic incentives such as fee-lease hunting that support sustained management (Brennan et al. 2007b, Hernández and Guthery 2012). The South Texas Plains is considered a National Legacy Landscape for Northern Bobwhite Conservation, and as such, is one of the last great places for quail in North America. A primary concern for landowners, wildlife managers, and sportsmen across the nation is the continued viability of huntable quail populations (Brennan 2007a).

Generally, quail harvest tends to fluctuate with annual abundance (Stoddard 1936:13, Vance and Ellis 1972, Peterson and Perez 2000, Palmer et al. 2002). Nevertheless, harvest at local scales tends to remain constant when populations are low (Guthery et al. 2004a). This occurs during years when the primary hunters in the field are avid quail hunters (Guthery et al. 2004a), who spend more time in the field and harvest more quail annually than the average quail hunter (Hurst et al. 1982). State game agencies regulate quail harvest; however, enforced

regulations (e.g., bag limits and season lengths) are not designed for management at local scales (Peterson and Perez 2000, Guthery et al. 2004b, Tomeček et al. 2015). Harvest within the legal guidelines can significantly impact breeding densities at local scales and population viability (Sands et al. 2012).

Several studies have investigated the impacts of bobwhite harvest at local levels, revealing a mixture of results due to issues such as poor experimental design (e.g., lack of controls, accounting for egress and ingress), unreliable population estimates (e.g., using indices rather than density), the temporal and spatial scale of study (e.g., years, acreage), and the inability to control the timing and rate of harvest (Burger et al. 1994, Guthery 2002). Furthermore, harvest recommendations have varied from 0% to 70% of the fall populations (Guthery et al. 2000). Stoddard (1931:226,341) suggested a harvest rate between 0% and 50% depending on environmental conditions and the control of predators. Rosene (1969:206,346) recommended a maximum harvest of 45% in the southeastern United States. Vance and Ellis (1972) suggested that a 70% harvest in Illinois was sustainable. Using population simulations, Roseberry (1979) found spring population reductions were modest up to a 40% harvest threshold. Models by Guthery et al. (2000) and Sands (2010) concluded that a 20-25% harvest was sustainable in South Texas. These studies simulated population responses to various harvest rates and stochastic environmental conditions against quasi-extinction criteria (Roseberry and Klimstra 1984: 146, 175, Guthery et al. 2000, Sands 2010).

Currently, Brennan et al. (2014) recommends a 20% harvest for South Texas bobwhite populations. This figure includes a correction rate for birds lost in the field and crippled (Guthery et al. 2000, Sands 2010, Brennan et al. 2014). This recommendation is based on simulation analyses of demographic data collected from wild bobwhites that still need empirical

evaluation. (Reed et al. 1998, Guthery 2002:114, Brennan 2002).

OBJECTIVES

This study was designed to examine the temporal and spatial effects resulting from the application of the 20% harvest rate across the statewide hunting season (e.g. 115 ± 5 days).

Specifically, the objectives were:

1. Collect multi-temporal (i.e., 4 surveys per year x 3 years) density estimates across hunting seasons using line-transect distance sampling from a helicopter platform, which would include pre-hunting and post-hunting abundance estimates;
2. Prescribe 20% harvest quotas for hunted site based on November (i.e., pre-hunting) abundance estimate to be distributed spatially by pasture densities and monthly across legal hunting seasons;
 - a. Determine the feasibility of a 20% harvest application, consisting of 16% retrieved and 4% assigned crippling loss based on the fall density estimate;
3. Compare population trends across months, seasons, and years between hunted and non-hunted populations, and against simulated results;
4. Analyze the spatial and temporal dynamics of quail hunts in South Texas;
 - a. Distribute harvest prescriptions temporally across hunting seasons and spatially across pasture;
 - b. Assess hunting efficiency between hunting season periods: (1) early period (November to mid-December), (2) middle period (mid-December to late January), and (3) late period (late January to early March); and

5. Determine the function of hunting pressure on changes in localized distributions;
 - a. Construct bobwhite density surface models from each line transect survey (n = 12 surveys) and calculate density trends at the resolution of a bobwhite winter home range (16 ha) across seasons and individual periods within years;
 - b. Assess the influence of bobwhite hunting variables (i.e., harvest, hunts, gunshots) to changes in bobwhite density and distribution.

PREVIEW

LITERATURE CITED

- Brennan, L. A. 1991. How can we reverse the northern bobwhite population decline? *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 19:544-555.
- Brennan, L.A. 2002. Closing remarks: pieces of the puzzle, circles in the stream. *Proceedings of the National Quail Symposium* 5:246-249.
- Brennan, L. A. 2007. The future of quail hunting and sustainability science. Pages 421-427 in L. A. Brennan, editor. *Texas quails: ecology and management*. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, USA.
- Brennan, L. A., F. Hernández, and F.C. Bryant. 2007. Introduction. Pages 3-5 in L. A. Brennan, editor. *Texas quails: ecology and management*. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, USA.
- Brennan, L.A., F. Hernández, E.D. Grahmann, F. C. Bryant, M.J. Schnupp, D.S. Delaney, and R. Howard. 2014. Quail harvest guidelines for South Texas: concepts, philosophy, and applications. Technical Publication No. 3, Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, Texas A&M University-Kingsville.
- Burger, L. W., E. W. Kurzejeski, L. D. Vangiler, T. V. Dailey, and J. H. Schulz. 1994. Effects of harvest on population dynamics of upland gamebirds: are bobwhite the model? *Transactions of the North American Wildlife and Natural Resource Conference* 59:466-476.
- Guthery, F. S. 2002. *The technology of bobwhite management: the theory behind the practice*. Iowa State Press, Ames, USA.
- Guthery, F. S., A. K. Crews, J. J. Lusk, R. N. Chapman, and M. Sams. 2004a. Effects of bag limits on bobwhite hunters and harvest. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 68:1,095-1,103.

- Guthery, F. S., M. J. Peterson, J. J. Lusk, M. J. Rabe, S. J. DeMaso, M. Sams, R. D. Appelgate, T. V. Dailey. 2004*b*. Multistate analysis of fixed, liberal regulations in quail harvest management. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 68:1,104-1,113.
- Guthery, F. S., M. J. Peterson, and R. R. George. 2000. Viability of northern bobwhite populations. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 64:646-662.
- Hernández, F., and F. S. Guthery. 2012. Beef brush and bobwhites: quail management in cattle country. Texas A&M University Press, College Station, USA.
- Hurst, G. A., R. C. Warren, W. R. Davidson, and W. M. Martin. 1982. Harvest rates and efforts of avid quail hunters in east central Mississippi. *Proceedings of the National Quail Symposium* 2:48–50.
- Palmer, W. E., S. D. Wellendorf, L. A. Brennan, W. R. Davidson, and F. E. Kellogg. 2002. Hunting success and northern bobwhite density on Tall Timbers Research Station: 1970-2001. *Proceedings of the National Quail Symposium* 5:213-216.
- Peterson, M. J., and R. M. Perez. 2000. Is quail hunting self regulatory?: northern bobwhite and scaled quail abundance and quail hunting in Texas. *National Quail Symposium* 4:85-91.
- Reed, J. M., D. Murphy, and P. F. Brussard. 1998. The efficacy of population viability analysis. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 26:244
- Roseberry, J. L. 1979. Bobwhite population responses to exploitation: real and simulated. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 43:385-305.
- Roseberry, J. L., and W. D. Klimstra. 1984. Population ecology of the bobwhite. Southern Illinois University Press, Carbondale, USA.
- Rosene, W. 1969. The bobwhite quail: its life and management. Rutgers University Press, New Jersey, USA.

- Sands, J.P. 2010. Testing sustained-yield harvest theory to regulate northern bobwhite hunting. Dissertation, Texas A&M University-Kingsville, Kingsville, USA.
- Sands, J.P., S.J. DeMaso, L.A. Brennan, D.L. Williford, R.W. DeYoung, E.M. Wehland, F. Hernández, and K.S. Miller. 2012. Application of metapopulation theory to northern bobwhite conservation. *Proceedings of the National Quail Symposium* 7:108.
- Stoddard, H. L. 1931. *The bobwhite quail: its habits, preservation and increase*. Charles Scribner's Sons, New York, New York, USA.
- Tomeček, J. M., B. L. Pierce, and M. J. Peterson. 2015. Quail abundance, hunter effort, and harvest of two Texas quail species: implications for hunting management. *Wildlife Biology* 21:303–311.
- Vance, D. R. and J. A. Ellis. 1972. Bobwhite populations and hunting on Illinois public hunting areas. *National Quail Symposium* 1:165-174.