

EFFECTS OF SUMMER AND WINTER BURNING ON VEGETATION AND
WILDLIFE IN A SAND SAGEBRUSH / HONEY MESQUITE SAVANNA

by

Matthew W. Poole

A Thesis Submitted in Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

MASTER OF SCIENCE

Major Subject: Biology

West Texas A&M University

Canyon, Texas

April 2009

ABSTRACT

There is substantial information on the generalized affects of fire in some grassland ecosystems. However, studies addressing seasonality of fire are less common. The Rolling Plains have high climatic variability with periodic droughts, however, little information is available on the potential role of burning in these communities under these conditions. Therefore, I initiated a project to explore the effects of seasonality of fire on a sand prairie ecosystem. We established 5 blocks of 3 18-ha plots at Matador Wildlife Management Area (WMA) in Cottle County, Texas. Each plot, within a block, was randomly assigned to a summer burn (August), winter burn (February), or a control (no fire) treatment. Herbaceous vegetation cover and frequency were measured twice annually (May-June and August-September) using 0.1 m² quadrats, while woody cover was measured during late summer using the line-intercept method. Invertebrates, herpetofauna, and small mammals were sampled utilizing drift fence arrays during the spring and summer. Invertebrates were also sampled in late summer using sweep nets and small mammals were also sampled twice annually using Sherman Live traps. Summer burning appeared to benefit forbs, species richness, evenness and diversity. In general, forbs were not affected by winter burning, but forbs were similar to grasses, in that individual species' responses to winter burning were variable. My results indicated that prescribed summer burning appears to be effective at reducing, but not eliminating

sand sagebrush, honey mesquite, prickly pear, yucca, and total woody canopy cover. Summer burning was the most effective treatment at reducing honey mesquite and sand sagebrush, which may have promoted the observed increases in herbaceous vegetation by making resources, such as light and water, available to grasses and forbs. However, many of the wildlife species examined did not respond to the application of summer and winter burning, but responded to onset of drought conditions. Therefore, a combination of both summer and winter burning treatments are recommended for suppressing woody plant cover and increasing overall plant diversity by promoting desirable herbaceous species for a wide variety of wildlife and livestock. Longer term research on the effects of summer and winter burning on herbaceous and woody vegetation, especially in drought years, is needed to fully evaluate the effects of burning in the Rolling Plains of Texas.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I am very grateful to Dr. Richard Kazmaier, chairperson of this thesis committee, for his never ending patience, time, dedication, advice, support and friendship. I would like to thank Michael Janis, Kory Perlichek, Larry Jones, and Fred Stice for their never ending support with this project and always willing to help in the many occasions I needed it. Additional thanks to Kara Gallagher, Mark Lange, Rachel Lange, and Steve Grant for their assistance with this project; I could not have done this project if it were not for your help. I would also like to thank my other thesis committee members, Dr. Raymond Matlack, Dr. Jim Rogers, and Chip Ruthven, for their reviews and suggestions for this thesis. I also thank the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and Quail Unlimited for funding this project.

This thesis is dedicated to my grandmother Helen; for her never ending love, support and encouragement. I only wish I was able to finish before she left us.

Approved:

Chairman, Thesis Committee

Date

Member, Thesis Committee

Date

Member, Thesis Committee

Date

Member, Thesis Committee

Date

Head, Major Department

Date

Dean, Graduate School

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Chapter	Page
I. INTRODUCTION.....	1
STUDY AREA.....	4
Matador Wildlife Management Area.....	4
METHODS.....	5
Burning and Experimental Design.....	5
Herbaceous Vegetation Sampling.....	5
Community.....	5
Frequency.....	6
Woody Vegetation Sampling.....	7
RESULTS.....	8
Herbaceous Vegetation Sampling.....	8
Community.....	8
Frequency.....	13
Woody Vegetation Sampling.....	19
DISCUSSION.....	22
Herbaceous Vegetation.....	21
Woody Vegetation.....	24
Management Implications.....	25

	Page
LITERATURE CITED.....	27
II. INTRODUCTION.....	52
STUDY AREA.....	54
Matador Wildlife Management Area.....	54
METHODS.....	56
Burning and Experimental Design.....	56
Invertebrate Sampling.....	56
Drift Fence Arrays.....	56
Sweep Netting.....	57
Herpetofauna Sampling.....	57
Small Mammal Sampling.....	57
Drift Fence Arrays.....	57
Sherman Live Trapping.....	58
Northern Bobwhite Sampling.....	59
Spring Whistle Counts.....	59
Fall Covey Call Counts.....	59
Analyses.....	59
RESULTS.....	62
Invertebrate Sampling.....	62
Drift Fence Arrays.....	62
Sweep Netting.....	65
Herpetofauna Sampling.....	67

	Page
Herpetofauna Individual Species.....	63
Small Mammal Sampling.....	68
Drift Fence Arrays.....	68
Sherman Live Trapping.....	70
Northern Bobwhite Sampling.....	73
Spring Whistle Counts.....	73
Fall Covey Call Counts.....	73
DISCUSSION.....	74
Invertebrates.....	74
Herpetofauna.....	78
Small Mammals.....	80
Northern Bobwhite.....	84
Management Implications.....	85
LITERATURE CITED.....	87
III. APPENDIX.....	136

LIST OF TABLES

Table	Page
<p>I.1. Treatment (Winter = W, Summer = S) Date, time, wind speed, wind direction, air temperature, and relative humidity for each burn treatment conducted at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas in 2005.....</p>	33
<p>I.2. Herbaceous vegetation comparisons across burning treatments for percent cover of bare ground, forbs, grasses, and litter, as well as species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from 100 quadrat (0.1 m²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$.....</p>	34
<p>I.3. Herbaceous vegetation comparisons between seasons for percent cover of bare ground, forbs, grasses, and litter, as well as species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from 100 quadrat (0.1m²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots.....</p>	35

I.4. Herbaceous vegetation comparisons between 2005 and 2006 for percent cover of bare ground, forbs, grasses, and litter, as well as species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness from 100 quadrat (0.1m²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots.....36

I.5. Herbaceous vegetation comparisons by burn treatment and year for percent cover of bare ground, forbs, grasses, and litter, as well as species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness from 100 quadrat (0.1 m²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$37

I.6. Herbaceous vegetation comparisons by burn treatment and season for percent cover of bare ground, forbs, grasses, and litter, as well as species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness from 100 quadrat (0.1 m²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$38

I.7.	Individual herbaceous species comparisons for frequency of occurrence across burning treatments from 100 quadrat (0.1 m ²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$	39
I.8.	Abundance of common herbaceous species occurrence between seasons from 100 quadrat (0.1 m ²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots.....	40
I.9.	Abundance of common herbaceous species occurrence between 2005 and 2006 from 100 quadrat (0.1 m ²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots.....	41
I.10.	Abundance of common herbaceous species occurrence by treatment and year for blue grama (BLGR), fringed signal grass (FRSG), sand dropseed (SADR), erect dayflower (ERDA), narrowleaf globe mallow (NAGM), peppergrass (PEPP), plantain (PLAN), western ragweed (WERA), and silver-leaf nightshade (SILN) from 100 quadrat (0.1 m ²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$	42

- I.11. Abundance of common herbaceous species occurrence by treatment and season for blue grama (BLGR), fringed signal grass (FRSG), sand dropseed (SADR), erect dayflower (ERDA), narrowleaf globe mallow (NAGM), peppergrass (PEPP), plantain (PLAN), western ragweed (WERA), and silver-leaf nightshade (SILN) from 100 quadrat (0.1 m²) samples per plot per season at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$43
- I.12. Pre burning canopy cover (cm) comparisons across treatments for common woody species collected from the line intercept method at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average of the 3 main transect across the 5 plots (3000 cm per line x 6 lines on the main transect = 18000 cm maximum). Within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$44
- I.13. Post burning canopy cover (cm) comparisons across treatments for common woody species collected from the line intercept method at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average of the 3 main transect across the 5 plots (3000 cm per line x 6 lines on the main transect = 18000 cm maximum). Within a row means followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$45

I.14.	Pre and post burning canopy cover (cm) comparisons across treatments for sand sagebrush (SASA), prickly pear (PRPE), honey mesquite (HOME), yucca and total cover (TOTAL) collected from the line intercept method at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average of the 3 main transect across the 5 plots (3000 cm per line x 6 lines on the main transect = 18000 cm maximum).....	46
I.15.	Density (plants/transect) of common woody plant species across treatments from the line intercept method at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Means represent the average of plants rooted within 1 m of the 6 lines along the 3 main transect across the 5 plots (30 m per line x 6 lines on the main transect = 180 m ² area). Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) followed by the same letter are not different $\alpha = 0.1$	47
II.1.	Treatment (Winter = W, Summer = S) Date, time, wind speed, wind direction, air temperature, and relative humidity for each burn treatment conducted at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas in 2005.....	96
II.2.	Invertebrate comparisons across burning treatments for abundance of total individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$	97

II.3. Invertebrate comparisons between the spring from 2005 and 2006 for abundance of total individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots.....98

II.4. Invertebrate comparisons by treatment and year for abundance of total individuals (INDI), species richness (SR), as well as diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness (EVEN) from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$99

II.5. Abundance of common invertebrate order comparisons across burning treatments from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$100

II.6. Invertebrate order comparisons for abundance ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) among 2005 and 2006 from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots.....101

II.7. Abundance of common invertebrate orders by treatment and year from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$102

II.8. Invertebrate comparisons across burning treatments for abundance of total individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness from sweep net sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$103

II.9. Invertebrate comparisons between 2005 and 2006 for abundance of total individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness from sweep net sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots.....104

II.10. Invertebrate comparisons by treatment and year for abundance of total individuals, species richness (SR), diversity [Modified Simpson’s (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H’)], and evenness from sweep net sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$105

II.11. Abundance of common invertebrate orders across burning treatments from sweep net sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, in 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$106

II.12. Abundance of common invertebrate orders between 2005 and 2006 from sweep net sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots.....107

II.13. Abundance of common invertebrate orders by treatment and year from sweep net sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$108

II.14. Herpetofaunal comparisons across burning treatments for abundance of total individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$109

II.15. Herpetofaunal comparisons between seasons for total abundance of individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots.....110

II.16. Herpetofaunal comparisons between 2005 and 2006 for individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots.....111

II.17. Table II.17: Abundance of common herpetofaunal species across burning treatments from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$112

II.18. Abundance of common herpetofaunal species between seasons from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots.....113

II.19. Abundance of common herpetofaunal species between 2005 and 2006 from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots.....114

II.20. Abundance of common herpetofaunal species across treatment and season from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, in 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$115

II.21. Small mammal comparisons across burning treatments for total abundance of individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$116

II.22.	Small mammal comparisons between seasons for total abundance of individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots.....	117
II.23.	Small mammal comparisons between 2005 and 2006 for individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots.....	118
II.24.	Abundance of common small mammal species across burning treatments from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$	119
II.25.	Abundance of common small mammal species between seasons from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each season across the 5 plots.....	120
II.26.	Abundance of common small mammal species between 2005 and 2006 from drift fence sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots.....	121

- II.27. Small mammal comparisons across burning treatments for abundance of total individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from Sherman live trap sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$122
- II.28. Small mammal comparisons between periods for abundance of total individuals, species richness, diversity [Modified Simpson's (Mod D) and Shannon-Weiner (H')], and evenness from Sherman live trap sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each period across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$123
- II.29. Abundance of common small mammal species across burning treatments for hispid pocket mouse (HPMO), northern grasshopper mouse (NGMO), white-footed mouse (WFMO), deer mouse (DEMO), and hispid cotton rat (HCRA) from Sherman live trap sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 2 seasons and 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$124

- II.30. Abundance of common small mammal species between periods for hispid pocket mouse (HPMO), northern grasshopper mouse (NGMO), white-footed mouse (WFMO), deer mouse (DEMO), and hispid cotton rat (HCRA) from Sherman live trap sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average for each period across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$125
- II.31. Abundance of common small mammal species by treatment and periods for hispid pocket mouse (HPMO), northern grasshopper mouse (NGMO), white footed mouse (WFMO), deer mouse (DEMO), and hispid cotton rat (HCRA) from Sherman live trap sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006. Means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent average for each period across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$126
- II.32. Abundance of northern bobwhite across burning treatments for fall covey and spring whistle counts conducted at the Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas 2005-2006. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$127
- II.33. Abundance of northern bobwhite between 2005 and 2006 for fall covey and spring whistle counts conducted at the Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots.....128

II.34.	Northern bobwhite comparisons by treatment and year for fall covey counts conducted at the Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Within a row means ($\bar{x} \pm SD$) represent the average across the 5 plots and within a row means followed by the same letter are not different at $\alpha = 0.1$	129
III.1	Number of individuals of each small mammal species captured from the 3 burning treatments using drift fence arrays at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006.....	136
III.2	Number of individuals of each species captured from the 3 burning treatments using Sherman live trap sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006.....	137
III.3	Number of individuals of each species captured from the 3 burning treatments using drift fence arrays at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006.....	138

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure	Page
I.1. Blowout map of my specific study site indicating the location of Cottle County within Texas (A), Matador WMA within Cottle County (B), Headquarters Pasture within Matador WMA (C), and my specific study plots within Headquarters Pasture (D).....	48
I.2. Annual monthly precipitation (cm) for 2005, 2006, and long term monthly averages from 1914-2006, recorded by the Forestry Service Remote Automated Weather Station located at the Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas.....	49
I.3. Diagrammatic representation of my specific study plots within Headquarters Pasture at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Headquarters Pasture was divided into a 3 x 5 grid with each of the 5 blocks containing approximately 3 18-ha plots. Utilizing a randomized block design, each of the 3 plots within a block was randomly assigned one of 3 treatments: winter burning (W), summer burning (S) and a control (unburned; C).....	50

I.4.	Diagrammatic representation of transect sampling regime for measuring post treatment canopy cover of woody vegetation within each plot. Three 200-m north and south parallel transects approximately 100-m apart. Perpendicular to each north and south running transect are 6 30-m east or west lines spaced at 40-m along the main transect, and randomized as to direction (east or west). Woody canopy cover and frequency were measured along these 30-m lines at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, in 2005 and 2006.....	51
II.1.	Blowout map of my specific study site indicating the location of Cottle County within Texas (A), Matador WMA within Cottle County (B), Headquarters Pasture within Matador WMA (C), and my specific study plots within Headquarters Pasture (D).....	130
II.2.	Annual monthly precipitation (cm) for 2005, 2006 and long term monthly averages from 1914-2006, recorded by the US Forestry Service Remote Automated Weather Station located at the Matador WMA in Cottle, County Texas.....	131
II.3.	Diagrammatic representation of my specific study site within Headquarters Pasture at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas. Headquarters Pasture was divided into a 3 x 5 grid with each of the 5 blocks containing approximately 3 18-ha plots. Utilizing a randomized block design, each of the 3 plots within a block was randomly assigned one of 3 treatments: winter burning (W), summer burning (S) and a control (unburned; C).....	132

II.4.	Diagrammatic representation of Sherman live trap transect sampling for small mammals within each plot. Three 200-m north and south parallel transects approximately 100-m apart consisted of 125 traps. Each trap within each transect was approximately 5 paces apart with each trap’s opening facing north. Sherman live trapping for small mammals was conducted during the summer of 2005 and the spring and summer of 2006 at the Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas.....	133
II.5.	Diagrammatic representation of sweep net sampling regime for invertebrates within each plot. Three east and west parallel transects were placed 100 paces apart. Each east and west transect consisted on 3 lines spaced 50 paces apart with each line consisting of 100 sweeps. Invertebrates were sampled along these 9 100 sweep net lines during early July at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, in 2005 and 2006.....	134
II.6.	Diagrammatic representation of permanent listening locations (open circles) for measuring northern bobwhite spring whistle counts and northern bobwhite fall covey call counts in Headquarter Pasture conducted at the Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, in 2005 and 2006.....	135

Table III.1: Number of individuals of each small mammal species captured from the 3 burning treatments using drift fence arrays at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006.

	Control		Summer		Winter	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
<i>Baiomys taylori</i>	48	1	99	4	109	0
<i>Chaetodipus hispidus</i>	2	1	1	0	2	0
<i>Cryptotis parva</i>	6	0	9	0	2	1
<i>Geomys bursarius</i>	1	1	0	0	0	0
<i>Mus musculus</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Notiosorex crawfordi</i>	0	0	1	0	0	0
<i>Onychomys leucogaster</i>	0	0	1	1	0	0
<i>Perognathus merriami</i>	0	0	2	5	0	1
<i>Reithrodontomys fulvescens</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Reithrodontomys montanus</i>	50	5	54	0	41	2
<i>Scalopus aquaticus</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Spermophilus mexicanus</i>	0	0	2	0	1	0
<i>Spermophilus spilisoma</i>	0	1	0	0	0	0

Table III.2: Number of individuals of each species captured from the 3 burning treatments using Sherman live trap sampling at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006.

	Control		Summer		Winter	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
<i>Baiomys taylori</i>	16	1	7	0	1	0
<i>Chaetodipus hispidus</i>	19	28	25	37	25	22
<i>Cryptotis parva</i>	0	4	0	29	2	37
<i>Geomys bursarius</i>	5	4	0	8	4	2
<i>Mus musculus</i>	2	1	3	0	1	0
<i>Notiosorex crawfordi</i>	0	2	0	1	1	6
<i>Onychomys leucogaster</i>	11	10	5	49	17	51
<i>Perognathus merriami</i>	13	17	15	14	11	9
<i>Reithrodontomys fulvescens</i>	25	10	13	9	15	2
<i>Reithrodontomys montanus</i>	4	3	8	1	0	2
<i>Scalopus aquaticus</i>	2	3	3	0	0	0
<i>Spermophilus mexicanus</i>	33	12	38	0	3	1
<i>Spermophilus spilisoma</i>	2	2	5	6	5	10

Table III.3: Number of individuals of each species captured from the 3 burning treatments using drift fence arrays at Matador WMA in Cottle County, Texas, 2005-2006.

	Control		Summer		Winter	
	2005	2006	2005	2006	2005	2006
<i>Ambystoma mavortium</i>	0	0	0	0	1	0
<i>Bufo debilis</i>	7	0	0	4	1	0
<i>Cnemidophorus gularis</i>	0	0	0	0	2	1
<i>Cnemidophorus sexlineatus</i>	2	9	0	4	2	14
<i>Eumeces obsoletus</i>	13	16	15	4	13	10
<i>Gastrophryne olivacea</i>	5	1	0	0	0	2
<i>Heterodon nasicus</i>	1	0	0	0	0	0
<i>Leptotyphlops dulcis</i>	3	5	6	1	6	4
<i>Masticophis flagellum</i>	2	1	1	0	2	1
<i>Phrynosoma cornutum</i>	1	0	0	2	0	1
<i>Scaphiopus couchii</i>	0	0	0	1	0	0
<i>Sceloporus undulatus</i>	8	13	10	0	4	4
<i>Sonora semiannulata</i>	0	2	2	0	2	0
<i>Spea bombifrons</i>	0	1	0	7	0	1
<i>Tantilla nigriceps</i>	3	0	0	0	0	1
<i>Terrapene ornata</i>	0	0	5	2	0	1