

Connecticut Wild Turkey Program

Annual Report

Fall 2009 – Spring 2010



Department of Environmental Protection
Bureau of Natural Resources / Wildlife Division
79 Elm Street, Hartford, CT 06106-5127
860-424-3011 www.ct.gov/dep/wildlife

Department of Environmental Protection
Daniel C. Esty, *Commissioner*
Susan Frechette, *Deputy Commissioner*

Bureau of Natural Resources
William A. Hyatt, *Chief*

Wildlife Division
Richard A. Jacobson, *Director*

Prepared By
Michael A. Gregonis, *Deer/Turkey Program Biologist*
Howard J. Kilpatrick, *Deer/Turkey Program Biologist*



The Department of Environmental Protection is an affirmative action/equal opportunity employer and service provider. In conformance with the Americans with Disabilities Act, DEP makes every effort to provide equally effective services for persons with disabilities. Individuals with disabilities who need this information in an alternative format, to allow them to benefit and/or participate in the agency's programs and services, should call 860-418-35937, or e-mail Barbara.Viadella@ct.gov. Persons who are hearing impaired should call the State of Connecticut relay number 711.



This publication is 75 percent funded by Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration, the Pittman-Robertson (P-R) Program, which provides funding through an excise tax on the sale of sporting firearms, ammunition and archery equipment. The Connecticut DEP Wildlife Division matches the remaining 25 percent of the funding.

Table of Contents

Introduction.....	3
2010 Spring Gobbler Season	3
2010 Spring Hunter Survey Results.....	6
2009 Fall Firearms Turkey Season	9
2009 Fall Archery Turkey Season	9
Brood Survey Information	9
Hunter Safety and Ethics	13
Outlook	13
10 Commandments for Safe Turkey Hunting	14
Appendix A. Connecticut spring wild turkey harvest by town, 2000–2010	15
Appendix B. Spring turkey harvest from state-owned and managed lands, 2009 and 2010.....	19
Appendix C. Ruffed grouse observations from turkey hunter surveys, 2005–2010	21

List of Tables

- Table 1. Harvest and success rates of Connecticut’s spring turkey hunters on private and state land, 2009 and 2010.
- Table 2. Gobblers harvested during the spring 2009 and 2010 seasons by turkey management zone.
- Table 3. Number of spring hunter survey respondents hunting in each turkey management zone, 2010.
- Table 4. Economic and recreational benefits provided by the 2010 Connecticut spring turkey hunting season.
- Table 5. Wild turkey harvest by town during the 2008 and 2009 fall firearms seasons.
- Table 6. Turkeys harvested during the 2009 fall archery and firearms seasons by turkey management zone.
- Table 7. Age and sex of birds harvested during the 2009 fall firearms season.
- Table 8. Wild turkey harvest by town during the 2008 and 2009 fall archery seasons.
- Table 9. Wild turkey brood survey data, 2007–2010.

List of Figures

- Figure 1. Distribution of the 2010 spring turkey harvest in Connecticut.
- Figure 2. Connecticut’s 12 turkey management zones.
- Figure 3. Ratio of juvenile to adult gobblers taken during Connecticut’s spring wild turkey seasons, 1981–2010.
- Figure 4. Growth index (first day harvest/permits issued) for the wild turkey population in Connecticut, 1981–2010.
- Figure 5. Perception of hunters regarding wild turkey population growth from 2000–2010.
- Figure 6. Ruffed grouse population growth index reported on hunter surveys from 2005–2010.

Introduction

The goal of the Connecticut Wild Turkey Management Program is to manage wild turkey populations at levels compatible with available habitat and various land uses and to allow for a sustained yield of turkeys for use by the people of Connecticut. Wild turkeys continue to be abundant throughout Connecticut, providing the public with wildlife viewing and hunting opportunities.

Harvest and brood survey information during the past several years have indicated that annual productivity has had a downward trend. These declines may be attributed to spring weather conditions. During springs with wet and cold conditions, survival of poults and nesting hens declines, resulting in reductions in productivity. Harvest and brood survey information indicate that wild turkey productivity throughout Connecticut has declined during the past several years. Despite these apparent declines, Connecticut's wild turkey population remains relatively abundant. With just one year of warm and dry spring conditions, wild turkeys have the potential to dramatically increase their numbers.

Several changes were implemented to Connecticut's spring wild turkey hunting season in 2010. These changes included lengthening the season by one week; starting the season one week earlier; adding one additional junior hunter training day; and extending hunting hours until 5:00 PM during junior hunter training days.

This report presents a summary of the fall 2009 and spring 2010 wild turkey hunting seasons in Connecticut. For most Connecticut sportsmen, "turkey hunting" means spring gobbler hunting. Because of its popularity, information for the 2010 spring season is presented first, followed by highlights from the 2009 fall seasons.

2010 Spring Gobbler Season

Overall Results

The 28-day season (April 28– May 29) resulted in a reported harvest of 1,245 birds. This constitutes a 17.1% decrease from the spring 2009 harvest of 1,502 birds. Overall, 7,389 spring turkey hunting permits were issued, and 867 sportsmen took at least one turkey, for an 11.7% statewide hunter success rate. Harvest and success rates decreased between the 2009 and 2010 spring turkey hunting seasons, however permit issuance increased slightly (Table 1).

State Land Hunting

Of the state-managed properties, Natchaug State Forest (21), Cockaponset State Forest (14), and Housatonic State Forest (12) yielded the most turkeys in 2010. Based on harvest rates per square mile, Lebanon Cooperative Management Area, Aldo Leopold Wildlife Management Area, and Zemko Pond Wildlife Management Area are some of the most productive turkey hunting areas (Appendix B).

Harvest by Town

At least one bird was taken from 147 of Connecticut's 169 towns (Figure 1, Appendix A). Twenty or more birds were taken from 8 towns, and 30 or more birds were taken from 3 towns. The towns of Pomfret (35), Woodstock (32), and Lebanon (39) had the highest turkey harvest.

Harvest by Zone

Similar to 2009, the northeastern corner of the state (zone 5) reported the highest harvest among Connecticut's 12 turkey management zones in 2010 (Table 2, Figure 2). Prior to 2004, northwest Connecticut (zone 1) had typically held this distinction. The southeast (zone 10) and west-central (zone 6) parts of the state recorded the lowest harvest. Harvest levels were highest in zones 5, 1, 2, 12, and 7.

Table 1. Harvest and success rates of Connecticut's spring turkey hunters on private and state land, 2009 and 2010.

Permit Type	Total Number		Number of	
	of Hunters	Total Harvest	Successful Hunters	Success Rate
Private Land				
2009	5,195	1,283	845	16.3%
2010	5,255	1,048	733	13.9%
% Change 09-10	1.2%	-18.3%	-13.3%	
State Land				
2009	2,181	219	173	7.9%
2010	2,134	197	171	8.0%
% Change 09-10	-2.2%	-10.0%	-1.2%	
Overall Total				
2009	7,376	1,502	1,018	13.8%
2010	7,389	1,245	867	11.7%
% Change 09-10	0.2%	-17.1%	-14.8%	

Figure 1. Distribution of the 2010 spring turkey harvest in Connecticut.





Table 2. Gobblers harvested during the spring 2009 and 2010 seasons by turkey management zone.

Zone	Harvest		Percent Change	Zone	Harvest		Percent Change
	2009	2010			2009	2010	
1	152	136	-10.5%	7	122	109	-10.7%
2	140	132	-5.7%	8	72	72	0.0%
3	138	78	-43.5%	9	114	98	-14.0%
4A	72	55	-23.6%	10	92	61	-33.7%
4B	51	35	-31.4%	11	92	73	-20.7%
5	255	206	-19.2%	12	130	119	-8.5%
6	72	71	-1.4%				
Total					1,502	1,245	-17.1%

Figure 2. Connecticut's 12 turkey management zones.



Population Dynamics

The spring harvest consisted of 253 juvenile and 989 adult male birds and 3 bearded hens. The decreased ratio of juveniles to adults in the harvest (25.6% in 2010 versus 38.1% in 2009) may be due to either increased recruitment of young birds into the 2008 spring turkey population (Figure 3) or that hunters are becoming less selective (more willing to harvest jakes versus mature gobblers). Harvest statistics indicate the growth rate of Connecticut's wild turkey population varies annually, depending upon many variables, like weather and predation. Since 2000, the spring season harvest, adult to juvenile ratios, and the turkey population growth index (Figure 4) indicate that Connecticut's wild turkey population has been stabilizing at lower numbers than existed in the mid-1990s.

Figure 3. Ratio of juvenile to adult gobblers taken during Connecticut’s spring wild turkey seasons, 1981–2010.





Figure 4. Growth index (first day harvest/permits issued) for the wild turkey population in Connecticut, 1981–2010.



2010 Spring Hunter Survey Results

Turkey hunter surveys provide valuable insight into population growth trends, economic expenditures, and recreational benefits. In 2010, the spring turkey survey changed from a mail-in survey attached to the turkey permit to an online survey distributed to hunters by E-mail. Surveys were returned at a rate of 33.7% (n = 748). Overall, 14.4% of all respondents did not hunt. Most hunting activity occurred in turkey management zones 1, 5, and 9 (Figure 2; Table 3).

Information from surveys was used to estimate the economic and recreational benefits provided by spring turkey hunting. Overall, spring turkey hunters enjoyed 21,068 days afield and spent \$1,315,242 on hunting-related items. Permit sales generated an additional \$140,391 (Table 4).

Forty-two percent of spring turkey hunters responding to the survey believed the turkey population was stable. Of the remainder, 13% believed the population was increasing, and 45% believed it was decreasing. The mean statewide rank of Connecticut’s turkey population for 2010 was 2.2 (a rank of 3.0 suggests the population is stable). Based on results of the spring turkey hunter survey, hunters indicated

that populations appeared to decline in all zones from 2009 to 2010. Overall, since 2000, hunters have perceived the growth of the turkey population to be declining (Figure 5).

Table 3. Number of spring hunter survey respondents hunting in each turkey management zone, 2010.

Zone	Hunters	%
1	74	11.1
2	65	9.8
3	38	5.7
4A	26	3.9
4B	23	3.5
5	70	10.5
6	39	5.8
7	62	9.3
8	44	6.6
9	68	10.2
10	43	6.4
11	50	7.5
12	65	9.7
Total	667	100

Table 4. Economic and recreational benefits provided by the 2010 Connecticut spring turkey hunting season.

Permit Type	Total Permits		Hunting Expenses*		Hunter Days of Recreation*	
	No. Issued	Revenue	Average*	Total	Average	Total
Private	5,255	\$99,845**	N/A	N/A	3.4	17,867
State	2,134	\$40,546	N/A	N/A	1.5	3,201
Total	7,389	\$140,391	\$178	\$1,315,242		21,068

* Values for hunting expenses and hunter-days of recreation were derived from hunter surveys.


** Excludes landowner permits issued free-of-charge.

To collect baseline data on ruffed grouse distribution in Connecticut, an additional question was added to the turkey hunter survey starting in 2005. Hunters were asked to report whether they observed ruffed grouse or heard grouse drumming, and if so, provide the name of the town in which the encounter occurred. During 2010, hunters reported 68 encounters with ruffed grouse in 36 towns. The towns with the highest number of grouse encounters were Sharon (6), Goshen (4), and Hartland (4) (Appendix C). A grouse population index was derived from dividing total grouse observations by total number of surveys returned and then multiplying by 100. This represents the average number of grouse encountered by 100 spring turkey hunters. The 2010 index was 9.1, which was higher than 7.0 reported in 2008 and similar to 2007 (10.8), 2006 (9.2), and 2005 (9.2) (Figure 6).

In 2010, the spring wild turkey season underwent major revisions, such as moving opening day one week earlier; extending the season by one week; and allowing hunters to purchase both a state land and private land permit type. To evaluate these changes, spring turkey hunters were asked several additional questions on the survey. The majority of hunters (91%) liked the earlier season start date and hunters (93.2%) also liked the extended season. Hunters also were asked if they hunted more properties in 2010 compared to


2009; the response was mixed as 66.9% of hunters indicated that they hunted the same number of properties, 18.9% hunted more properties, and 14.2% fewer properties. Allowing the purchase of both state and private land permit types raised concern as to whether hunter interference would be an issue. It was found that 57.8 % of the hunters reported no interference, 28.8% reported the same interfere as in the past, 9.5% reported more, and 3.9% reported less. Overall, spring turkey hunters appear to have a positive opinion of the new regulation changes.

Figure 5. Perception of hunters regarding wild turkey population growth from 2000–2010.



* Data not available for 2002.

Figure 6. Ruffed grouse population growth index reported on hunter surveys from 2005–2010.



2009 Fall Firearms Turkey Season

Fall firearms hunters reported a harvest of 64 birds, representing a 60% decrease from the 160 birds harvested in 2008. Overall, 3,313 firearms permits were issued and 52 hunters took at least 1 turkey for a 1.6% overall success rate. Private land hunters (2,519) harvested 51 birds and state land hunters (794) harvested 13 birds. Fall firearms hunters reported taking at least 1 bird from 42 of 169 Connecticut towns (25%). The 5 towns reporting the highest harvest were Lebanon, Old Lyme, Voluntown, Willington, and Woodstock, each reporting a harvest of 3 birds (Table 5). In addition, turkey management zones 5 (10 birds) and 12 (8 birds) reported the highest zonal harvest (Table 6). The harvest included 18 adult males, 16 adult females, 16 juvenile males, and 14 juvenile females (Table 7). Over half of the harvested birds (53.1%) were adults. Of the 64 birds, the harvest was slightly skewed towards males (53.1%) over females (46.9%).

2009 Fall Archery Turkey Season

The fall archery turkey hunting season ran concurrent with the archery deer season. Archers reported a harvest of 41 birds, representing a 20% decrease from the 51 birds harvested in 2008. Overall, 2,523 archery permits were issued and 39 hunters took at least 1 turkey for a 1.5% overall success rate. Wild turkeys were taken in 31 of 169 Connecticut towns (18%). The highest reported harvest occurred in Brookfield (4), and the towns of Granby and Southbury each reported 3 birds (Table 8). Turkey management zone 11 (18 birds) reported the highest zonal harvest (Table 6). The harvest included 21 adult males, 9 adult females, 7 juvenile males, and 4 juvenile females.

Brood Survey Information

Since 2007, brood surveys have been conducted annually from June 1 to August 31 to assess annual fluctuations in wild turkey populations. Volunteers and departmental staff were requested to report turkey sightings, categorized by total hens, total poults, and total number of hens with poults. These observations were analyzed to obtain an annual productivity index and to evaluate recruitment into the fall population. By evaluating recruitment over time, biologists can quantify changes and trends in Connecticut's statewide wild turkey populations.

In 2010, 71 cooperators reported 278 wild turkey observations, including 472 hens – 367 with broods and 105 without broods. The 2010 brood index was 3.6 young per adult for all hens observed and 4.6 young per adult for hens observed with at least 1 poult (Table 9). In 2009, 75 cooperators reported 323 observations, which included 611 hens – 177 with broods and 434 without broods. The 2009 brood index was 1.7 young per adult for all hens observed and 2.4 young per adult for hens observed with at least 1 poult. The brood survey information indicates that wild turkeys had good productivity in Connecticut during 2010. The spring weather in 2010 was warm and dry throughout Connecticut, creating favorable conditions during the hatching and brooding period, resulting in higher productivity than in previous years.

Table 5. Wild turkey harvest by town during the 2008 and 2009 fall firearms seasons.

Town of Harvest	Number of Birds		Town of Harvest	Number of Birds	
	2008	2009		2008	2009
Andover	1	1	Middlefield	3	0
Ashford	3	0	Middletown	1	2
Beacon Falls	2	1	North Canaan	2	0
Berlin	4	0	North Haven	3	0
Brooklyn	0	2	New Hartford	8	2
Burlington	3	0	New Milford	1	0
Canaan	3	0	Newtown	5	1
Canton	4	0	Old Lyme	0	3
Chaplin	1	0	Oxford	0	1
Chester	0	1	Plainville	2	0
Clinton	0	1	Pomfret	3	2
Colchester	4	1	Preston	3	0
Colebrook	0	1	Putnam	1	2
Columbia	3	2	Rocky Hill	4	0
Cornwall	5	0	Roxbury	3	0
Coventry	4	1	Salem	1	0
Cromwell	1	0	Salisbury	2	0
Durham	1	0	Scotland	3	0
East Granby	1	0	Sharon	3	2
East Haddam	1	0	Shelton	2	0
East Haven	0	2	Somers	3	0
East Windsor	3	1	Southbury	1	1
Eastford	1	1	Stafford	0	1
Easton	2	0	Sterling	1	0
Ellington	1	1	Stonington	1	1
Franklin	1	0	Thomaston	1	0
Glastonbury	0	1	Thompson	1	0
Goshen	2	0	Tolland	1	1
Griswold	2	0	Torrington	0	1
Groton	1	0	Union	0	1
Haddam	1	2	Voluntown	0	3
Hampton	3	0	Wallingford	0	1
Hartland	1	0	Warren	3	0
Harwinton	4	2	Washington	2	0
Hebron	0	1	Waterford	0	1
Lebanon	12	3	Watertown	1	0
Ledyard	1	1	Willington	3	3
Litchfield	2	0	Winchester	2	1
Lyme	2	0	Woodbury	0	2
Mansfield	1	2	Woodstock	8	3
Marlborough	1	0	Total	160	64

Table 6. Turkeys harvested during the 2009 fall archery and firearms seasons by turkey management zone.

Zone	Harvest		Zone	Harvest	
	Firearms	Archery		Firearms	Archery
1	2	1	7	4	3
2	7	3	8	5	0
3	2	3	9	5	3
4	13	4	10	4	1
5	10	0	11	1	18
6	3	3	12	8	2
			Total	64	41

Table 7. Age and sex of birds harvested during the 2009 fall firearms season.

Age	Sex	Number Harvested
Adult	Male	18
Adult	Female	16
Juvenile	Male	16
Juvenile	Female	14
Total		64

Table 8. Wild turkey harvest by town during the 2008 and 2009 fall archery seasons.

Town of Harvest	2008	2009	Town of Harvest	2008	2009
Andover	2	0	Norwich	1	0
Bethany	1	1	North Stonington	0	1
Brookfield	1	4	Old Lyme	2	0
Canton	1	0	Orange	2	0
Cheshire	1	0	Oxford	1	0
Cornwall	1	0	Pomfret	1	0
Coventry	3	1	Portland	0	1
Durham	1	0	Redding	1	1
East Haddam	2	0	Ridgefield	1	1
East Hampton	1	1	Roxbury	0	1
Easton	1	1	Seymour	0	1
Ellington	1	0	Shelton	0	2
Enfield	0	1	Sherman	1	1
Fairfield	1	1	Somers	1	0
Franklin	0	1	Southbury	0	3
Glastonbury	1	0	Suffield	0	1
Granby	0	3	Stafford	1	0
Greenwich	1	2	Stonington	1	0
Guilford	1	0	Thomaston	2	0
Harwinton	1	0	Thompson	1	0
Kent	0	1	Tolland	0	1
Litchfield	2	0	Trumbull	1	1
Mansfield	0	1	Union	0	1
Marlborough	1	1	Waterford	1	1
Milford	0	1	Weston	0	1
Montville	0	1	Westport	1	2
Monroe	1	0	Windham	1	0
New Fairfield	1	0	Wolcott	0	1
New Milford	2	0	Woodbridge	1	0
Newtown	1	1	Total	51	41

Table 9. Wild turkey brood survey data, 2007-2010.

Year	Total Adults	Total Young	Total Adults & Young	Adults Without Young	Young Per Adult	Young Per Adult with Young	Number of Reports
2007	731	1,900	2,631	270	2.6	4.1	405
2008	448	988	1,436	330	2.2	4.3	224
2009	611	1,049	1,660	177	1.7	2.4	323
2010	472	1,686	2,158	105	3.6	4.6	278
Total/Mean	2,262	5,623	7,885	882	2.5	3.9	1,230

Hunter Safety and Ethics

Hunter Safety

No hunting incidents were reported during the 2009 fall seasons. However, one incident was reported during the 2010 spring season. Connecticut turkey hunters should be proud of their excellent safety record and should strive to maintain it. The DEP and the Connecticut Chapter of the National Wild Turkey Federation will continue to stress safe hunting practices as a pillar of Connecticut's Wild Turkey Program. Whether you are an experienced turkey hunter or a novice, safety should be your foremost concern each time that you enter the woods. You should know and abide by the 10 commandments for safe turkey hunting (see page 14).

Hunter Ethics

In addition to the various state laws and regulations that are enforced, there also is a code of conduct that hunters must obey when hunting. Legal and ethical behavior will result in a safe and quality turkey hunt for all. The Connecticut turkey hunter's code of ethics should include the following:

- Scout several locations. If you find another hunter in the area you wish to hunt, don't crowd in on him. Move to a backup site. (If the hunter is trespassing, notify the DEP's T.I.P. hotline at 1-800-842-HELP.)
- Know all boundaries and setback distances of the land where you have permission to hunt.
- Never call a bird that another caller is working and do not try to come between the hunter and the bird.
- If several hunters have permission to hunt a piece of private property, it may be beneficial to coordinate hunting activities. Do this in consultation with the landowner. Determine the maximum number of hunters the property can support on a given day and assign individuals certain days on which to hunt to prevent crowding and hunter interference.

Outlook

The current wild turkey population in Connecticut is estimated at about 35,000. Connecticut offers a diversity of habitat types that provide the wild turkey with all essential habitat components needed for survival. Population dynamic indices and hunter survey information seem to indicate that Connecticut's wild turkey population is declining. However, the 2010 brood survey indicates that there was good productivity, which will hopefully start an upward trend. Be sure to review the current Hunting and Trapping Guide thoroughly before going a field to ensure you are aware of new opportunities. Through continued cooperation among the DEP, National Wild Turkey Federation, sportsmen, other conservation organizations, and private landowners, the future of the wild turkey in Connecticut looks bright.

The National Wild Turkey Federation's 10 Commandments for Safe Turkey Hunting

- 1) Never stalk a turkey. The chances of getting close enough for a shot are limited and the chances of becoming involved in an accident are increased.
- 2) Eliminate the colors red, white, and blue from your turkey hunting outfit. Red is the color most hunters count on to differentiate a gobbler's head from the hen's blue colored head. White can also look like the top of a gobbler's head.
- 3) Never move, wave, or make turkey sounds to alert another hunter of your presence. A quick movement may draw fire. Yell in a loud voice and remain well hidden.
- 4) Never attempt to approach closer than 100 yards to a roosting turkey. The wild turkey's eyesight and hearing are much too sharp to let you get any closer.
- 5) Be particularly careful when using the gobbler call. The sound and motion may attract other hunters. (The Wildlife Division strongly discourages the use of the gobbler call due to the obvious safety risks that it presents.)
- 6) When selecting a calling position, don't try to hide so well that you cannot see what's happening around you. Remember, eliminating movement is your key to success, not total concealment.
- 7) Select a calling position that provides a background as wide as your shoulders, and one that will completely protect you from the top of your head down. Small trees won't hide slight movements of your hands or shoulders, which might look like a turkey to another hunter who might be stalking your calls. Position yourself so you can see 180 degrees in front of you.
- 8) Camouflage conceals you. It does not make you invisible. When turkey hunting, think and act defensively. Avoid all unnecessary movement. Remember, you are visible to both turkeys and hunters when you move even slightly.
- 9) Never shoot at sound or movement. Be 100% certain of your target before you pull the trigger.
- 10) When turkey hunting, assume that another hunter makes every sound you hear. Once you pull the trigger, you can never call that shot back.

Appendix A. Connecticut spring wild turkey harvest by town, 2000 – 2010.

Town	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Andover	11	8	13	14	7	8	2	3	4	4	10
Ansonia	0	0	0	2	0	0	0	1	0	0	3
Ashford	25	35	20	32	33	28	19	19	10	25	16
Avon	1	0	5	4	4	7	2	7	11	6	9
Barkhamsted	17	7	7	13	7	23	14	6	6	11	8
Beacon Falls	5	8	5	11	10	8	10	7	7	7	8
Berlin	9	9	8	10	5	4	5	2	9	9	5
Bethany	2	5	8	7	8	3	8	5	6	7	9
Bethel	7	6	4	6	11	2	2	10	5	3	2
Bethlehem	11	13	12	13	13	9	7	3	7	2	8
Bloomfield	9	5	4	6	7	10	5	3	3	4	6
Bolton	3	8	10	7	16	7	7	7	6	9	1
Bozrah	13	20	13	21	14	13	20	17	11	5	6
Branford	7	11	3	2	3	4	4	1	1	0	1
Bridgeport	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	8	0	0
Bridgewater	3	6	9	15	6	6	4	4	6	6	4
Bristol	3	5	2	2	1	1	5	5	0	0	0
Brookfield	5	3	4	14	11	8	5	5	6	7	3
Brooklyn	23	13	12	15	17	28	12	12	13	15	16
Burlington	8	12	16	13	14	16	5	27	12	11	12
Canaan	21	20	15	20	19	19	22	16	28	16	18
Canterbury	15	13	20	20	22	16	15	9	7	18	10
Canton	11	10	10	12	9	4	8	6	4	4	6
Chaplin	11	14	7	9	16	14	8	7	7	8	12
Cheshire	12	8	13	23	13	12	15	10	10	9	9
Chester	7	9	7	6	7	7	5	6	10	6	5
Clinton	1	0	4	1	1	2	3	0	0	3	4
Colchester	29	29	45	34	38	30	26	18	14	21	16
Colebrook	10	7	5	13	10	17	14	21	14	11	8
Columbia	9	7	16	22	23	13	12	14	6	9	2
Cornwall	27	27	25	35	33	31	44	37	37	31	20
Coventry	26	43	25	32	19	23	15	10	14	15	16
Cromwell	3	5	11	7	1	9	5	3	3	10	0
Danbury	9	6	6	12	5	7	5	5	1	6	3
Darien	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1
Deep River	2	7	6	6	5	4	1	1	3	2	8
Derby	0	1	3	2	0	1	2	0	3	0	1
Durham	13	9	9	17	16	21	14	5	9	9	4
East Granby	6	3	7	5	5	4	11	6	6	2	4
East Haddam	45	39	29	27	39	33	17	24	14	27	25
East Hampton	21	24	9	13	12	11	10	8	6	12	9
East Haven	1	0	1	0	1	0	0	0	3	2	3
East Lyme	29	33	18	29	26	26	23	23	18	16	13

Town	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
East Windsor	13	13	6	9	12	11	15	22	10	13	13
Eastford	16	20	12	20	13	11	17	13	15	14	13
Easton	21	23	20	21	25	22	8	13	18	8	2
Ellington	10	17	9	14	7	19	5	17	17	14	16
Enfield	8	7	12	7	14	8	13	6	9	16	7
Essex	2	2	13	7	7	6	5	7	7	4	4
Fairfield	2	3	3	1	0	2	3	4	8	4	0
Farmington	2	1	6	8	8	3	4	7	3	5	4
Franklin	27	17	21	28	15	19	19	17	18	10	13
Glastonbury	14	17	16	21	11	14	12	14	7	11	7
Goshen	31	35	25	39	38	27	24	18	17	20	10
Granby	13	10	8	17	13	10	9	7	12	7	15
Greenwich	2	1	2	2	2	0	2	0	4	2	2
Griswold	4	5	13	6	15	10	11	5	4	6	5
Groton	1	3	2	6	0	9	4	2	2	3	2
Guilford	10	13	21	27	19	20	13	20	15	11	17
Haddam	29	39	38	45	26	26	22	29	19	14	16
Hamden	15	12	16	17	11	11	7	7	9	7	8
Hampton	21	20	22	29	19	26	22	22	21	9	17
Hartford	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Hartland	11	12	14	14	12	13	9	18	10	7	15
Harwinton	13	16	16	22	11	14	17	12	14	10	14
Hebron	26	30	16	22	18	26	24	15	16	15	12
Kent	20	13	21	21	34	20	30	18	9	23	18
Killingly	12	8	12	10	9	11	11	13	13	9	2
Killingworth	26	22	22	30	20	15	16	10	17	7	7
Lebanon	59	48	70	76	69	63	52	33	37	39	30
Ledyard	9	11	4	18	21	21	35	29	18	9	8
Lisbon	15	11	12	10	13	3	14	10	11	4	3
Litchfield	29	38	33	38	41	27	31	27	29	14	23
Lyme	43	31	28	37	31	43	21	19	28	24	16
Madison	4	7	2	2	1	0	1	3	0	6	1
Manchester	4	6	4	4	5	7	5	2	3	2	0
Mansfield	22	27	26	28	28	13	12	12	13	14	6
Marlborough	10	18	10	17	19	12	10	4	2	7	3
Meriden	5	3	4	4	3	2	0	0	3	6	3
Middlebury	5	6	1	6	1	5	2	1	2	2	2
Middlefield	10	12	14	14	6	19	8	8	8	12	10
Middletown	30	17	18	39	27	30	22	30	20	18	18
Milford	2	0	2	3	5	3	2	2	0	0	2
Monroe	8	9	5	5	3	4	0	0	2	5	1
Montville	28	27	24	19	22	20	13	20	20	8	8
Morris	6	13	14	14	17	16	13	18	12	15	3
Naugatuck	9	10	9	7	7	10	8	7	8	6	11
New Canaan	3	6	0	3	3	2	1	2	2	1	3

Town	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
New Fairfield	10	9	10	8	12	10	6	8	8	1	6
New Hartford	12	19	9	19	17	22	25	18	14	22	14
New Haven	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	1	0	0	0
New London	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	0	1
New Milford	28	34	21	38	22	16	28	25	27	13	16
Newtown	30	30	23	35	19	27	29	21	22	14	12
Norfolk	14	15	3	16	12	15	18	13	15	13	9
North Branford	9	9	6	5	12	14	13	4	7	5	5
North Canaan	5	2	0	16	3	7	2	2	4	8	1
North Haven	1	3	3	1	5	4	5	2	4	11	3
N. Stonington	17	5	21	32	19	38	18	14	26	23	13
Norwalk	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	0	1	0
Norwich	4	3	6	9	5	5	7	3	5	7	8
Old Lyme	11	14	15	9	4	8	20	6	12	15	7
Old Saybrook	1	5	2	6	2	0	0	2	0	0	2
Orange	3	4	0	2	2	5	3	1	5	1	4
Oxford	27	26	25	30	21	13	17	9	8	10	17
Plainfield	13	15	8	17	9	14	8	14	25	15	9
Plainville	3	5	0	2	0	2	1	2	0	2	1
Plymouth	4	7	9	10	8	13	4	14	7	13	8
Pomfret	38	32	26	28	25	19	15	23	24	31	35
Portland	13	17	16	10	12	7	15	10	7	16	4
Preston	16	17	17	17	13	13	17	17	17	15	5
Prospect	8	6	3	3	4	5	7	5	1	5	1
Putnam	13	12	15	9	11	8	1	4	4	6	3
Redding	22	39	29	33	46	38	38	15	23	16	21
Ridgefield	5	3	5	4	11	6	5	3	2	2	3
Rocky Hill	2	3	0	5	7	10	7	3	3	6	7
Roxbury	4	17	7	8	5	13	5	6	3	4	4
Salem	31	20	20	22	21	12	13	8	6	7	14
Salisbury	25	27	19	27	28	18	26	25	20	19	16
Scotland	31	34	35	43	28	27	23	24	29	19	13
Seymour	9	5	8	5	2	1	2	2	2	1	1
Sharon	56	33	30	46	50	38	38	38	31	23	28
Shelton	3	4	6	15	10	7	2	5	6	8	4
Sherman	6	8	8	16	8	7	13	11	6	4	6
Simsbury	2	2	9	3	6	5	5	3	3	2	0
Somers	6	7	12	13	12	14	10	2	9	8	8
Southbury	11	13	20	21	19	19	15	12	13	13	11
Southington	10	5	10	5	8	3	3	0	9	7	3
South Windsor	11	9	13	10	9	12	12	15	7	10	4
Sprague	11	9	6	10	14	10	6	8	6	8	1
Stafford	12	12	6	18	16	24	9	8	15	17	8
Stamford	1	4	4	3	4	2	0	4	3	0	1
Sterling	19	12	18	15	10	10	20	12	14	19	7

Town	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Stonington	16	24	16	12	16	19	16	15	10	11	6
Stratford	0	0	0	0	0	7	3	4	2	3	0
Suffield	13	14	16	25	9	25	16	13	10	17	12
Thomaston	3	2	2	2	4	6	2	2	1	3	4
Thompson	19	27	22	28	37	21	27	11	22	16	15
Tolland	5	9	10	23	17	15	11	9	13	10	3
Torrington	16	9	10	14	18	19	8	10	17	11	13
Trumbull	2	0	1	3	2	1	0	0	1	0	0
Union	5	9	9	6	6	6	11	8	8	11	7
Vernon	2	4	2	0	1	0	1	1	1	0	0
Voluntown	16	14	11	11	10	7	9	18	7	10	5
Wallingford	7	10	10	11	12	10	5	8	4	9	6
Warren	13	22	15	32	18	29	10	20	17	18	12
Washington	24	18	16	28	27	10	16	15	18	19	11
Waterbury	3	1	1	3	0	0	0	0	1	0	0
Waterford	19	14	9	18	14	15	10	13	11	10	13
Watertown	15	15	10	18	12	11	9	13	9	5	10
West Haven	2	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	1	0	1
Westbrook	5	2	2	1	4	3	9	1	2	1	1
Weston	4	5	2	4	5	0	0	0	0	1	1
Westport	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	1	2	2	0
Wethersfield	0	0	0	4	3	0	0	0	1	0	0
Willington	21	13	7	8	13	10	18	14	14	12	13
Wilton	1	4	2	0	1	3	2	6	1	4	2
Winchester	17	17	12	12	9	14	13	9	15	13	8
Windham	18	19	17	17	18	12	8	6	5	4	6
Windsor	4	6	4	2	9	3	6	4	5	2	0
Windsor Locks	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
Wolcott	0	0	4	7	1	10	5	4	4	2	2
Woodbridge	6	3	2	5	2	1	1	3	0	3	0
Woodbury	30	25	20	27	11	21	9	5	17	8	4
Woodstock	50	50	52	48	35	52	40	49	38	47	32
Town not reported	25	27	14	13	24	0	0	0	0	0	0
Total	2,040	2,067	1,894	2,367	2,081	2,016	1,760	1,601	1,558	1,502	1,245

Appendix B. Spring turkey harvest from state-owned and managed lands, 2009 and 2010.

State Land	Number of Birds Harvested		Square Miles	Kills/Sq. Mile (2009 Only)	Kills/Sq. Mile (2010 Only)
	2009	2010			
Aldo Leopold WMA	3	7	0.87	3.49	8.05
Algonquin SF	0	2	1.04	0	1.92
American Legion SF	1	1	1.62	0.71	0.62
Barn Island WMA	0	1	1.58	0	0.63
Babcock Pond WMA	3	2	2.34	1.34	0.85
Bartlett Brook WMA	3	0	1.1	2.73	0
Bear Hill WMA	0	1	0.56	0	1.79
Bishops Swamp WMA	4	3	1.18	3.4	2.54
Bloomfield FCA (1)	0	2	0.51	0	3.92
Camp Columbia	1	0	0.94	1.06	0
Centennial Watershed SP	0	1	10.67	0	0.09
Cockaponset SF	27	14	26.85	1.01	0.52
Cromwell Meadows WMA	1	0	0.71	1.41	0
Eightmile River WMA	6	0	0.5	12	0
Ellithorpe FCA	0	1	0.63	0	1.59
Franklin Swamp WMA	3	1	1.07	2.8	0.93
Goshen WMA	3	1	1.51	2	0.66
Great Swamp FCA	0	2	0.53	0	3.77
Hancock Brook	4	2	1.1	3.64	1.82
Higganum Meadows	1	1	0.4	2.5	2.5
Housatonic River WMA	8	1	0.87	8.89	1.15
Housatonic SF	2	12	17.63	0.12	0.68
John Minetto SP	0	2	1.12	0	1.79
Larson Lot WMA	0	2	0.38	0	5.26
Lebanon Coop Mgmt. Area	0	5	0.33	0	15.15
Mad River Dam FCA	0	1	0.81	0	1.23
Mansfield Hollow Lake	0	3	3.14	0	0.96
Mansfield Leased FTA	0	1	0.47	0	2.13
Mattatuck SF	3	6	7.3	0.41	0.82
MDC Colebrook-Hogback	2	3	6.5	0.31	0.46
Meshomasic SF	9	1	14.22	0.64	0.07
Messerschmidt WMA	0	2	0.72	0	2.78
Mohegan SF	1	2	1.5	0.77	1.33
Mono Pond	0	1	0.44	0	2.27
Nassahegon SF	4	2	1.92	2.11	1.04
Naugatuck SF	17	11	21.15	0.82	0.52
Nathan Hale	0	2	2.27	0	0.88
Natchaug SF	14	21	7.93	2	2.65
Nehantic SF	5	9	7.91	0.65	1.14

State Land	Number of Birds Harvested		Square Miles	Kills/Sq. Mile (2009 Only)	Kills/Sq. Mile (2010 Only)
	2009	2010			
Nepaug SF	3	0	2.1	1.43	0
Newgate WMA	1	0	0.7	1.43	0
Nipmuck SF	4	0	14.4	0.28	0
NU-Maromas Coop WMA	1	4	2.19	0.46	1.83
NU-Skiff Mtn. WMA	3	1	1.11	2.73	0.9
Pachaug SF	15	8	40.84	0.37	0.2
Paugnut SF	4	0	2.6	1.54	0
Paugussett SF	0	4	3.04	0	1.32
Pease Brook WMA	2	0	0.32	6.25	0
Peoples SF	5	5	4.6	1.09	1.09
Pootatuck SF	0	3	1.72	0	1.74
Pomeroy SP	0	1	0.45	0	2.22
Quaddick SF	2	0	1.73	1.16	0
Quinebaug River WMA	3	2	2.57	1.17	0.78
Quinnipiac River SP	9	2	0.53	18	3.77
Robbins Swamp WMA	1	0	2.5	0.4	0
Roraback WMA	1	4	3.09	0.33	1.29
Rose Hill WMA	1	2	0.96	1.04	2.08
Salmon River SF	4	3	10.91	0.37	0.27
Salmon River and Haddam Neck WMA	2	0	0.15	13.33	0
Scantic River SP	2	2	0.92	2.17	2.17
Selden Island SP	0	1	0.83	0	1.2
Shenipsit SF	2	0	10.6	0.19	0
Simsbury WMA	1	1	0.35	2.86	2.86
Spignesi WMA	3	0	0.7	4.29	0
Sunnybrook SP	0	1	0.7	0	1.43
Talbot WMA	2	1	0.74	2.7	1.35
Thomaston Dam	0	1	1.33	0	0.75
Tunxis SF	11	10	14.87	0.74	0.67
Wangunk Meadows	4	1	1	4	1
West Thompson Dam	0	1	3.05	0	0.33
Wooster Mountain SP	0	1	0.56	0	1.79
Wyantnock SF	6	2	6.38	0.94	0.31
Yale Forest	0	3	12.03	0	0.25
Zemko Pond WMA	2	4	0.72	2.78	5.56

Appendix C. Ruffed grouse observations from turkey hunter surveys, 2005-2010.

Town	Number of Grouse Seen or Heard					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Andover	0	1	0	0	0	0
Ansonia	0	2	2	0	0	0
Ashford	2	5	4	1	6	2
Avon	1	0	0	0	0	0
Barkhamsted	7	9	5	7	5	1
Beacon Falls	0	2	0	0	1	0
Berlin	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bethany	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bethel	0	1	0	0	0	0
Bethlehem	0	1	1	0	0	0
Bolton	1	0	0	0	0	0
Bozrah	2	0	0	0	0	0
Bridgewater	1	0	1	0	0	0
Bristol	1	0	1	0	0	0
Brooklyn	1	0	0	0	0	0
Burlington	1	0	1	0	1	0
Canaan	5	7	4	7	7	0
Canterbury	2	1	1	0	0	0
Canton	1	0	2	0	0	0
Chaplin	2	1	5	4	2	0
Cheshire	0	0	1	0	1	0
Chester	0	1	2	1	1	0
Colchester	0	2	0	1	0	0
Colebrook	5	4	9	3	1	3
Columbia	0	0	0	0	1	0
Cornwall	2	11	7	7	1	3
Coventry	3	1	0	0	0	0
Danbury	1	0	0	0	0	0
Durham	0	0	0	0	2	0
East Granby	2	1	2	2	2	2
East Haddam	1	0	0	0	0	1
East Hampton	1	0	0	0	0	0
East Lyme	2	1	2	0	1	1
East Windsor	2	2	1	0	0	0
Eastford	4	6	2	4	0	1
Easton	0	0	1	1	0	0
Ellington	1	1	1	2	0	2
Enfield	3	2	1	1	1	0
Farmington	0	2	0	0	0	0

Town	Number of Grouse Seen or Heard					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Glastonbury	0	0	1	0	1	0
Goshen	7	18	17	6	9	4
Granby	6	5	3	1	2	1
Greenwich	0	0	0	0	1	1
Griswold	0	1	0	0	0	0
Guilford	0	0	4	2	0	0
Haddam	2	1	1	5	2	0
Hamden	2	0	0	0	0	0
Hampton	1	3	3	1	0	0
Hartland	9	13	15	5	7	4
Harwinton	4	2	1	4	1	0
Hebron	3	1	0	2	2	0
Kent	4	5	3	1	4	3
Killingly	1	1	0	1	0	0
Killingworth	1	0	2	0	1	0
Lebanon	3	1	1	1	0	1
Ledyard	2	0	3	0	1	0
Lisbon	0	1	0	0	0	0
Litchfield	3	4	1	5	2	1
Lyme	2	0	2	1	1	1
Mansfield	1	1	0	0	0	0
Marlborough	1	0	0	0	0	0
Meriden	0	0	0	1	0	0
Middlebury	0	1	0	0	0	0
Middlefield	1	0	0	0	3	0
Middletown	3	0	2	4	0	0
Monroe	2	0	0	0	1	0
Montville	0	2	0	0	0	0
Morris	0	0	1	1	2	0
Naugatuck	1	0	1	1	1	2
New Canaan	1	0	1	0	0	0
New Fairfield	1	1	0	7	1	0
New Hartford	4	4	5	0	6	0
New Milford	1	3	1	1	1	0
Newtown	0	2	1	2	1	0
Norfolk	2	4	4	2	6	1
North Canaan	2	0	2	1	0	0
North Haven	0	1	1	0	0	0
North Stonington	0	1	0	1	0	0
Old Lyme	0	1	0	0	0	0
Oxford	1	0	0	1	0	0

Town	Number of Grouse Seen or Heard					
	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Plymouth	2	0	2	1	0	2
Pomfret	4	3	1	0	2	0
Portland	3	1	0	3	0	1
Preston	1	0	0	0	0	0
Putnam	1	0	0	0	1	0
Redding	6	1	0	0	0	0
Ridgefield	0	0	0	1	0	0
Rocky Hill	0	0	0	1	0	0
Roxbury	0	0	1	0	0	0
Salisbury	7	4	6	6	3	3
Salem	0	0	0	0	1	0
Scotland	1	1	0	1	0	0
Sharon	9	7	9	10	6	6
Sherman	1	1	1	0	1	0
Simsbury	0	0	0	0	1	0
Somers	2	0	2	3	1	0
Southbury	2	0	1	1	1	1
Southington	1	0	0	0	0	0
Stafford	5	4	3	2	1	3
Stamford	0	0	1	0	0	0
Sterling	0	1	0	1	0	0
Stonington	1	0	0	0	0	0
Suffield	1	2	2	1	0	0
Thomaston	0	0	1	0	0	0
Thompson	1	2	3	3	1	1
Tolland	1	1	0	0	2	3
Torrington	1	4	5	3	7	3
Union	2	1	1	3	1	0
Voluntown	1	0	1	1	2	1
Wallingford	0	1	0	0	0	0
Warren	4	3	2	2	2	1
Washington	3	3	1	0	2	1
Waterbury	0	1	0	0	0	0
Waterford	3	0	0	0	0	1
Watertown	1	1	2	0	1	0
Westbrook	0	1	0	0	0	0
West Hartford	0	0	0	1	0	0
Wethersfield	0	1	0	0	0	0
Willington	5	0	0	1	1	2
Winchester	5	6	2	4	3	2

Number of Grouse Seen or Heard						
Town	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Windham	1	0	0	0	0	0
Windsor	0	0	0	0	1	0
Woodbury	1	1	0	0	1	1
Woodstock	6	11	5	6	6	1
Unknown	10	0	0	1	0	0
Total	217	205	184	147	138	68