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ABSTRACT

Fire is often prescribed for managing habitat for northern bobwhites (Colinus virginianus) in the southeastern United States, yet little is known about its use as a tool in more xeric portions of the species’ range. This study was conducted from 1994 to 1995 on 3 sites in the northern Edwards Plateau ecoregion of Texas to monitor immediate post-burn effects on bobwhite ecology. Each site included a burned pasture paired with an unburned control. We radiomarked 25 bobwhites at each study site with neck-loop transmitters just prior to burning and monitored their survival and nesting habits for 6 months post-burn. Survival was similar between burned and unburned areas. Predation was the leading cause of mortality, with mammals and raptors accounting for 68% and 31% of the predation, respectively. Nest initiation and success were low for both treatments. Nest sites occurred mostly in association with prickly pear cactus (Opuntia spp.). Our results suggest that relatively “cool” prescribed burns had few short-term effects on bobwhite survival in west-central Texas. However, reductions in cacti density and cover that often occur post-burn, especially if followed by an application of herbicide (i.e., picloram), may reduce the number of potential nesting sites for bobwhites.
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INTRODUCTION

Prescribed burning is a tool to improve northern bobwhite (Colinus virginianus) habitat throughout the southeastern United States. Additionally, fire has become an important tool for managing rangelands throughout the Great Plains (Wright and Bailey 1982: 91). Burning is a relatively inexpensive technique for increasing forage availability for livestock and wildlife while controlling less desirable species like juniper (Juniperus spp.) and cacti (Opuntia spp.) (White and Hanselka 1989).

The impacts of burning on bobwhite habitat are unclear. Late winter burning improves bobwhite habitat in southern pine forests (Stoddard 1931:402, Speake 1967, Rose 1969:293) and in the midwest (Ellis et al. 1969, Seitz and Landers 1972). Conversely, there is some evidence that bobwhites prefer to nest in unburned locations with adequate perennial bunchgrass cover (Rose 1969:198, Dinnick 1971). Because the western range of bobwhites is more xeric (<40 cm annual precipitation in west Texas versus >120 cm in Florida), the impacts of fire on bobwhite habitat may be less beneficial. Good nesting habitat typically consists of bunchgrasses that are several years old with a large overhead canopy (e.g., little bluestem [Schizachyrium scoparium]) (Lehmann 1984: 81, Townsend et al. 2001); fire typically consumes such vegetation.

Predators are the major causes of bobwhite mortality and nest failure (Stoddard 1931:187, Hurst et al. 1996, Rollins and Carroll 2001). Rollins and Carroll (2001) reported an average hatch rate of 28% across the range of published studies of bobwhites; meso-mammals (e.g., Procyon lotor, Mephitis mephitis) commonly depredate quail nests (Hernández et al. 1997). Raptors are also major predators of juvenile and adult bobwhites (Stoddard 1931:211, Mueller 1988). In northern Florida, raptors (primarily accipiters) were responsible for 60% of the annual predation of bobwhites (DeVos 1985). Almost 50% of the annual bobwhite mortality on the Tall Timbers Research Station in Florida occurs in February through April when raptors are localized in the region.

Prescribed burning may increase the vulnerability of bobwhites to predators (especially raptors) via reductions in escape cover (Mueller and Atkinson 1985; Guthery 2000:69). Likewise, the reduction of peren-
METHODS

Study Areas

We conducted our study during 1994–95 on 3 sites in the northern Edwards Plateau ecoregion of Texas in Irion, Tom Green, and Runnels counties (Fig. 1). Each study site consisted of a burned and unburned pasture located within 5 km of each other. Vegetation, soil type, and precipitation were similar within a particular study site, but varied somewhat across the 3 sites.

Site 1 was located in Irion County about 32 km west of San Angelo, Texas on the Funk Ranch. Average annual precipitation is 46 cm. Understory vegetation consisted primarily of cacti, three-awns (Aristida spp.), tobosa (Hilaria mutica), curlymesquite (H. belangeri) and buffalograss (Buchloe dactyloides). Overstory consisted of a mix of several small trees and shrubs, primarily mesquite (Prosopis glandulosa) and redberry juniper (Juniperus pinchotii). The burned site included 60 ha that was surrounded by the unburned site. Unburned areas were grazed with cattle, sheep, and goats at a heavy stocking rate (approximately 10 ha/animal unit [AU]). Predator control was conducted on this site for ranch management purposes (i.e., protection of sheep and goats). Predator species targeted for control were foxes (Vulpes vulpes and Urocyon cinereoargenteus), bobcat (Lynx rufus), and raccoon.

Site 2 was located on the north shore of O.C. Fisher Reservoir on the Angelo State University Management, Instruction, and Research (MIR) Center about 15 km northwest of San Angelo. Mean annual precipitation is 52 cm. Understory vegetation consisted of cacti, Texas wintergrass (Stipa leucotricha), Johnsongrass (Sorghum halepense), sideoats grama (Bouteloua curtipendula), and threeawns. Overstory vegetation was primarily dominated by mesquite. The burned area consisted of 60 ha and the unburned area was several pastures surrounding the burn but at least 1.6 km from the burn. Unburned areas were grazed with cattle, sheep, and goats at moderate stocking rates (approximately 15 ha/AU).

Site 3 was located 8 km east of Bronte, Texas on the Tidwell and Rocking Horse Ranches. Average annual precipitation is 56 cm. Dominant understory vegetation consisted of Texas wintergrass, sideoats grama, threeawns, and cacti. The dominant overstory vegetation was mesquite. The burned pasture was 284 ha, whereas the adjacent unburned area was 130 ha.

Burn dates were 27 January 1994, 27 February 1994, and 13 January 1995 for sites 1–3, respectively. Burns were conducted under prescriptions according to Natural Resource Conservation Service guidelines (United States Department of Agriculture 1988). Fine fuel loads were estimated at 2,500, 4,000, and 3,500 kg/ha for sites 1–3, respectively. Fuel continuity was greatest at Site 2, and similar between sites 1 and 3. Headfires were ignited between 1300 and 1600 hours. Weather conditions (relative humidity, air speed, ambient temperature) varied across the 3 burns. Weather conditions (i.e., lower humidity, higher wind speeds) resulted in a “hotter” burn at site 2. Higher humidity prevailed at site 1, with site 3 being intermediate.

Data Collection

We trapped bobwhites with standard Stoddard funnel-type traps (Day et al. 1980); 1–14 days prior to each burn. After capture, we fitted bobwhites with neck-loop radio telemeters weighing <6 g (Wildlife Materials, Inc., Carbondale, Illinois, USA). We monitored bobwhite movements and survival thrice weekly prior to the burn, continuously throughout the burn, and immediately thereafter for 4–6 hours (Curtis et al. 1988). Post-burn monitoring occurred thrice weekly through May or until nest incubation was initiated. We then monitored bobwhites twice weekly for the remainder of the study (September of the burn year).

Cause-specific mortality was determined by examining the collar and other physical evidence at the kill site. We assumed a bobwhite was dead or incubating a nest when no fluctuation in the bird’s daily location was detected. We classified the cause of mortality by inspecting kill sites. The main difference between a mammal and raptor kill is that a raptor leaves the bones and wings intact while mammals leave nothing but feathers (S. Cox, Oklahoma Department Wildlife Conservation, personal communication). The telemeter may also be used as evidence. A mammal leaves indentations on the softer parts of the telemeter, whereas a raptor typically leaves crimped marks on the antenna or the antenna is curled.

We inspected nest sites when incubation was suspected. When we located the nest, we placed an additional telemeter nearby to aid us in finding the nest in the absence of the incubating quail. We character-
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Table 1. Sex and number of bobwhites radiomarked at 3 sites in west-central Texas, 1994–95.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>1994 Males</th>
<th>1994 Females</th>
<th>1995 Males</th>
<th>1995 Females</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Irion</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Tom Green</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>35</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Runnels</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 2. Fates of radiomarked bobwhites at 3 study sites in west-central Texas, 1994–95.

RESULTS

Capture Success

We radiomarked 211 bobwhites across the 3 study sites (Table 1). Fifty-nine females were radiomarked at site 1: 28 from the burned plot and 31 from the unburned plot. Fifty-six birds were marked at site 2: 29 from the burned plot and 27 from unburned sites. Both females and males were marked at site 2 because of limited success of trapping females. The sample from the burned plot consisted of 15 females and 12 males, whereas the unburned plot included 20 females and 9 males. Site 3 included 57 (30 females, 27 males) on the burned plot and 39 (21 females, 18 males) on the unburned plot. Bobwhites on the burned area at site 3 were radiomarked during 2 separate trappings. Thirty-eight quail were radiomarked during January and 16 more during February. The additional collaring period was needed because a large number of the original birds died or were censored early in the study.

Survival

Across all 3 sites, 30 (14.2%) of the quail were excluded from the analysis because they did not survive or were censored within 7 days of radiomarking (Fig. 2). Twenty five (11.8%) of the remaining 181 quail were censored because of radio failure and 25 (11.8%) slipped their transmitters. Seventeen (8.1%) quail survived throughout the study, leaving 114 (54.0%) that were killed.

Survival did not differ between treatments \((P = 0.72)\), among sites \((P = 0.38)\), or between age classes \((P = 0.82)\). We accepted the null hypothesis that survival rates were similar between burned and unburned areas. Females lived longer \((P < 0.05)\) than males across all sites. Females lived an average of 72.2 \(\pm 7.7\) days, whereas males lived 48.7 \(\pm 7.7\) days. Radiomarked birds lived an average of 69.5 \(\pm 7.5\) days on site 1, 67.9 \(\pm 7.7\) days on site 2, and 55.3 \(\pm 7.1\) days on site 3.

No radiomarked bobwhites were killed directly as a result of the fire itself. Birds avoided the advancing flames by either moving ahead of, or flying over, the headfire. Predation was the primary cause of post-burn mortality, accounting for 93 (82% of the total) deaths (Fig. 3). Mammals were credited with 63 deaths (55%), raptors with 29 deaths (25%), and snakes with 1 death. Seventeen (15%) radiomarked bobwhites died from unknown causes and 4 (4%) died from exposure immediately following a hail storm.

Nesting Ecology

Of the 58 radiomarked bobwhites (44 females and 14 males) alive at the onset of nesting (i.e., 1 May), 19 females incubated a total of 21 nests from May through September. Thirteen nests were located in unburned areas and 8 in burned areas \((P = 0.25)\). The null hypothesis of equal nesting in burned and unburned sites was accepted. Nesting success was similar on burned and unburned sites. Eight nests were successful, 9 were abandoned, and 4 were depredated.

Bobwhites chose 3 microhabitats for nesting: grass, brush–grass, and cacti associations (Table 2). Overall, 5 birds nested in grass, 4 in brush–grass, and 12 in cacti associations. On burned sites, 7 nests were in cacti associations and 1 in brush–grass. On un-
burned sites, 5 nests were in grass, 5 in cacti associations, and 3 in brush-grass. Vegetation type chosen for nesting site did not affect nest success \((P > 0.05)\).

**DISCUSSION**

**Survival**

Similar survival rates of radiomarked bobwhites between burned and unburned sites suggested that prescribed burning had no effect on short-term survival rates under the conditions of this study. Northern harriers \((Circus cyaneus)\) were observed flying over burned areas on several occasions during the burns, but no radiomarked quail were killed during, or immediately after, burning. Raptor predation on bobwhites has been documented during and immediately following burning in south Texas (Tewes 1984) and in northern Florida (Mueller and Atkinson 1985).

Mean survival rate from March–August in this study was 64.2 days, slightly lower than the mean of 70.7 days reported by Hernández (1999) in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford County, Texas (about 150 km northeast of our study sites). His study sites in Shackelford Count...
The scale and intensity of the burns in this study may have minimized any potentially adverse impacts on survival. The best test of our hypothesis called for each treatment to burn uniformly to reduce any potential “island effects.” However, such was not the case, as considerable patches of vegetation (herbaceous, cacti, and woody) remained following our burns. Such islands of unburned vegetation within burned areas may provide adequate refuges for bobwhites (Mueller et al. 1988). Post-burn monitoring of radiomarked bobwhites during this study supported the use of islands as refuge areas; radiomarked birds tended to be localized near areas that did not burn. If no “islands” were available, bobwhites moved off the burned area. The resulting mosaic burn patterns, particularly on site 1, may explain the lack of difference in survival among burned and unburned areas. Mosaic burns are the rule when burning rangelands in west Texas due to discontinuous fuel loads. Such “patchy” burns are desirable for quail (Guthery 1986:30).

Nesting Ecology

The importance of prickly pear as nesting habitat for bobwhites has not been documented prior to this study. In south Texas, Lehmann (1984:81) found only 1 of 189 bobwhite nests located in prickly pear. We observed 12 of 21 nests situated in cacti the summer immediately following burning. Carter (San Angelo State University, San Angelo, Texas, unpublished data) found that 8 of 12 scaled quail (Callipepla squamata) from study site 1 also nested in prickly pear.

In semi-arid regions with limited nesting cover, prickly pear may be more important in bobwhite nesting ecology than described previously. In a subsequent study in west Texas, Slater et al. (2001) placed simulated nests in either cacti–grass associations or grass alone, and found greater nest survival for nests in prickly pear at sites that provided <690 potential bunchgrass nesting clumps/ha. Hernández (1999) also confirmed the relative importance of prickly pear as a nesting substrate in Shackelford County, Texas. He reported that 30% of bobwhite nests were in prickly pear even on sites that had an abundance of traditional nesting substrate (>618 little bluestem plants/ha). Bobwhite nests situated in prickly pear had a hatch rate of 58% (14 of 24 hatched) but only 38% of nests in grass hatched (18 of 57 hatched).

MANAGEMENT IMPLICATIONS

Prescribed burning is often used to increase available forage species for livestock and simultaneously suppress undesirable species like prickly pear. For optimal prickly pear control, a prescribed burn is followed by herbicide application (e.g., picloram) that usually kills >95% of the cacti present (Ueckert et al. 1988). Landowners interested in maintaining quail nesting habitat should consider use of cactus for quail nesting sites in the semiarid Southwest. Burning could be used without the follow-up picloram application to reduce prickly pear by 20 to 50%, or herbicides could be applied in a mosaic pattern to leave some cactus for nesting sites. Additional studies are needed to define optimum prickly pear and bunchgrass densities for increasing bobwhite nest survival.
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