

2022-23 North Carolina Avid Grouse Hunter Survey

Hannah Plumpton

NCWRC Upland Game Bird Biologist Mobile (984) 800-7222 hananh.plumpton@ncwildlife.org



Since 1984, the North Carolina Wildlife Resources Commission (NCWRC) has conducted an annual grouse hunter survey to estimate long-term grouse hunting trends and provide annual insight into grouse hunting demographics throughout the mountains of North Carolina. Volunteer grouse hunters participate by recording and submitting their annual hunting activity throughout the season. Grouse hunting activity is recorded by county and landownership type (Private Land or Game Land) within the two grouse management regions (Northern Mountains and Southern Mountains; Fig. 1). Reported hunting trips typically consist of a single day per hunting party.




Figure 1. Grouse Management Regions and Ranger Districts on Pisgah and Nantahala National Forests in Western North Carolina.

Forty-five avid grouse hunters reported information during the 2022-23 season, providing grouse hunting statistics for 382 hunting trips (Fig. 2). The gradual annual decline of total reported grouse hunting trips has primarily been a function of fewer hunters and fewer hunting trips per hunter. Presumably this is due to fewer grouse and poor hunting in recent years. Since the inception of the survey in 1984, Ashe and Madison Counties have had the most grouse hunts reported, with over 4,500 hunts occurring in each of these counties (Fig. 3). During the 2022-23 season, Macon and Clay Counties were most often reported, with more than 50 hunts reported from each.




Figure 2. Total number of reported hunts by volunteer avid grouse hunter survey participants, 1984-85 through 2022-23.




Figure 3. Total number of hunts by county as reported by volunteer avid grouse hunter survey participants, 1984-85 through 2022-23.

During the 2022-23 season, avid grouse survey participants hunted an average of 8.5 times (Fig. 4). It is clear that participants are now hunting considerably fewer times than during the 1980's and 1990's. The average length of a hunting trip has declined somewhat over that time period as well, with an average trip length of just 3.5 hours reported during the 2022-23 season (Fig. 5). This may be a result of aging hunters, fewer grouse, or a combination of both.




Figure 4. Average number of hunting trips per hunter based on avid grouse hunter survey participants, 1985-86 through 2022-23.




Figure 5. Average length (hours) of hunting trips of avid grouse hunter survey participants, 1984-85 through 2022-23.

Flush rates are presented both by hunting trip and by hours hunted in this report. Flush rates by hour may provide a more precise index to grouse abundance, while flush rates by hunting trip are more applicable from grouse hunting perspectives. However, we recognize that hunters will change their hunting locations over time to areas with relatively more grouse. This selective hunting behavior has a tendency to skew trend estimates such that they may not represent actual annual abundances or changes in abundance across the full landscape.

The avid grouse hunter survey has documented overall long-term declines in hourly flush rates. While some years have shown slight increases, the overall trend has been a steady decline. This has been true on both private land and game lands and in both the northern and southern mountain regions (Fig. 6). Historically more grouse were reported in the southern mountain region, however flush rates reported from the northern mountains have been very comparable for much of the last decade, and flush rates in both regions have declined to all-time lows (Fig. 7).




Figure 6. Average grouse flushed per hour by land type by avid grouse hunter survey participants, 1989-90 through 2022-23.




Figure 7. Average grouse flushed per hour by region by avid grouse hunter survey participants, 1984-85 through 2022-23.

Grouse hunting during the 2022-23 season was very poor in comparison to what hunters encountered when this survey began in the 1980's. In fact, grouse hunting this season was the one of the worst on record for the numbers of grouse flushed and bagged per trip (Figs. 8-9). On half (50%) of trips hunters did not flush any grouse (Fig. 10).




Figure 8. Average number of grouse flushed per hunting trip by avid grouse hunters, 1984-85 through 2022-23.




Figure 9. Average number of grouse bagged per hunting trip by avid grouse hunters, 1984-85 through 2022-23.




Figure 10. Percent of reported grouse hunting trips with no flushes by avid grouse hunters, 1984-85 through 2022-23.

Not surprisingly, during the 2022-23 hunting season, avid hunters reported more hunting activity later in the winter after big game hunting seasons have closed (Fig. 11). Grouse hunters made substantially more trips in January and February than earlier in the season. However, the number of grouse killed did not increase in a similar fashion. Hunters reported killing between 5 and 17 grouse each month of the season.




Figure 11. Total reported grouse hunting trips and harvests during the 2022-23 hunting season by avid grouse hunter survey participants.

Funding for the avid grouse hunter survey report was partially provided through a Pittman-Robertson Wildlife Restoration Multi-state Grant. The Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration Act, popularly known as the Pittman-Robertson Act, was approved by Congress on September 2, 1937, and began functioning July 1, 1938. The purpose of this Act was to provide funding for the selection, restoration, rehabilitation and improvement of wildlife habitat, wildlife management research, and the distribution of information produced by the projects. The Act was amended October 23, 1970, to include funding for hunter training programs and the development, operation and maintenance of public target ranges.

Funds are derived from an 11 percent Federal excise tax on sporting arms, ammunition, and archery equipment, and a 10 percent tax on handguns. These funds are collected from the manufacturers by the Department of the Treasury and are apportioned each year to the States and Territorial areas (except Puerto Rico) by the Department of the Interior on the basis of formulas set forth in the Act. Funds for hunter education and target ranges are derived from one-half of the tax on handguns and archery equipment.

Each state's apportionment is determined by a formula which considers the total area of the state and the number of licensed hunters in the state. The program is a cost-reimbursement program, where the state covers the full amount of an approved project then applies for reimbursement through Federal Aid for up to 75 percent of the project expenses. The state must provide at least 25 percent of the project costs from a non-federal source





Respondent Age Trips/Hunter Hours/Trip 44 * 4.16	Appendix 1. Reported nunting activity from avid grouse nunter survey respondents, 1984-65 through 2020-21 nunting seasons.				0						
	# Grouse	use Grouse	e Grouse	Flushed/Hour - Northern	<u> </u>	Grouse Flushed/Hour	Grouse Flushed/Hour	# Grouse Harvests	Grouse	Grouse	No Grouse
اما		륜	윤	_			- Private Land	Reported	larvested/Trip	Harvested/Trip Harvested/Hour	_
	5,962	52 4.42	1.05	92'0	1.18			933	69.0	0.17	172
4.33	4,553	53 4.62	1.07	92'0	1.20			641	0.65	0.15	140
4.07	4,240		1.20	0.84	1.39			512	09.0	0.15	104
4.16	4,8	11 5.08		06'0	1.24			613	0.64	0.15	109
4.29	5,618			1.15	1.19			692	0.71	0.17	126
4.35	7,890			1.19	1.45	1.20	1.48	1151	0.91	0.21	111
4.34	8,036			1.27	1.49	1.27	1.51	1142	0.89	0.20	109
_	6,749		_	1.17	1.35	1.05	1.45	1008	0.81	0.19	131
4.03	5,706	\dashv		08.0	1.08	0.94	1.04	817	0.58	0.14	197
3.91	5,0			0.95	1.16	0.90	1.23	769	0.66	0.17	176
4.05	8,653	53 5.55		1.23	1.42	1.08	1.56	1213	0.78	0.19	192
2	6,0		1.18	1.01	1.26	0.74	1.44	865	29.0	0.17	198
3.96	8,898			1.28	1.37	1.15	1.53	1152	0.70	0.18	193
4.09	7,071			1.00	1.27	0.94	1.41	1008	69.0	0.17	182
4.02	4,160	3.50	0.87	1.07	0.78	0.62	1.11	512	0.43	0.11	239
3.88	5,245	45 4.08	1.04	1.08	1.02	0.89	1.20	713	0.55	0.14	246
3.88	5,050	50 4.09		1.00	1.05	0.79	1.26	929	0.55	0.14	204
3.83	5,228	28 4.43		1.08	1.13	0.82	1.35	692	0.59	0.15	174
3.86	4,128	28 4.32	1.08	0.80	1.17	0.88	1.27	595	0.59	0.15	152
3.96	3,2			0.77	0.98	0.81	1.05	434	0.51	0.13	152
3.97	3,238			98.0	1.07	0.74	1.26	400	0.50	0.13	132
3.92	2,601	\dashv		0.65	1.12	0.79	1.16	313	0.47	0.12	122
3.91	2,855			0.88	1.07	0.88	1.19	365	0.52	0.13	131
3.75	+	4		0.72	0.73	0.52	96.0	249	0.36	0.10	177
3.00	1,835	35 2.50	0.08	17.0	0.08	0.48	10.94	400	0.30	80.0	213
377	1,405	+		0.09	0.72	0.00	0.77	184	0.23	0.03	194
3.72	3.8	57 3.93		1.00	1.07	0.94	1.22	200	0.51	0.14	203
3.92	2,475			0.70	99.0	0.54	0.88	303	0.33	80.0	261
3.82	2,303		0.72	0.75	0.72	0.58	0.95	249	0:30	80.0	238
3.60	1,6			29'0	0.53	0.35	0.91	190	0.23	90'0	330
3.56	1,8			0.84	0.71	0.63	0.93	229	0.33	60'0	183
3.43	1,360			0.55	0.58	0.50	0.71	154	0.22	90'0	245
3.58	1,074		0.47	0.50	0.46	0.28	0.79	127	0.20	90.0	306
			0.65	0.53	29.0	0.59	0.85	112	0.22	90'0	168
	3.53 69	8 1.54		0.37	0.45	0.41	0.51	09	0.13	0.04	193
	3.28 594			0.32	0.42	0.35	0.52	99	0.12	0.04	230
		0 1.56	0.46	0.29	0.50	0.43	09:0	59	0.14	0.04	206
3.46	99			0 30	97.0	•	000		0.46	400	161