INDEXING SEES OF FERAL PIG POPULATIONS IN A VARIETY OF HAWAIIAN NATURAL AREAS

STEPHEN J. ANDERSON¹ · Research Division, Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, P.O. Box 52 Hawaii National Park, HI 96718

CHARLES P. STONE, Research Division, Hawaii **Volcanoes** National **Park, P.O. Box 52,** Hawaii National **Park,** HI **96718**

ABSlZbICT: **Twelve linear models** for estimatingferal pig population **density were geaerated from** data on feral pig **sign** and densities collected in 5 habitat types in Hawaii. Densities were back-calculated from population reconstructions with data collected from pigs eradicated within fenced units. Indices to feral pig populations included frequency of pig digging, scats, tracks, plant feeding, beds, and rubs. Three age classes of sign were recorded. Sampling intensity ranged from 50 to 310 plots/km² in the 5 areas. Significant models for fresh digging exhibited considerable variability in the densities predicted, probably dependent on substrate available for digging. Densities predicted from fresh scat models were consistent in 2 areas, but models failed to predict densities in the other 3 areas. The model for all fresh sign encompassed **variability in all** habitats sampled **and gave the** most precise predictions **across** habitats. None **ofthe models was** useful **at population densities of <1 pig/km².**

1994 TRANSACTIONS OF THE WESTERN SECTION OF THE WILDLIFE SOCIETY 30:26-39

Accurate **and** precise indices **of** feral pig **(Sus scrofa)** populations are useful to those managing for sustainable vield, reduction, or eradication. Yet pigs are difficult to count because of their wide-ranging **movements,** preference for dense vegetation, generally low densities, **highly** aggregated distribution **patterns, and** rapidly changing densities resulting **from** high productivity (Barrett 1982).

Indices to feral pig numbers include **area** counts, **spotlight** strip transects, diurnal **grwnd and** aerial strip transeds, **bounty payments,** and numbers **of** pigs killed in an **area** (Hone 1987, 1988). Indices have rarely **been** compared with actual pig densities **determined** independently (Barrett 1982, Hone 1987). In the Great **Smoky Mountains National Park (USA) Bratton (1977) demonstrated** large differences in rooting or digging frequencies among vegetative communities, supporting Barrett's (1982) view **that** optimum indices likely depend upon habitat. Hone (1988) found that digging **and scat** counts were repeatable measures in a **given** area, and **that** digging **was** a more acauate **index to past pigpresencethanscatsorcountsoflivepigs.**

In **Hawaii,** pig population sizes have **been estimated** using **dogs** to flush pigs along strip **census** routes in several habitats, with **estimates of** flushing distances **used** to **determine area surveyed** *(Gifhn* 1978). Ralph **and** Maxwell (1984) indexed pig densities in montane rain forest with counts of **scats** or dung in 2 x 10 **m** contiguous plots along transects **and** digging frequency in 1 m^2 plots at 20 m intervals along transects. The area dug up in 3×5 m plots along belts

and the frequency of plots in which fresh digging or fresh or old scats occurred, along with other indices (hacks, plant feeding, rubbing, resling places, **live** pigs, or dead pigs), were used by Cooray and Mueller-Dombois (1981), **also** in montane rain forest. F.R **Warshauer** (unpublished U.S. Fish **and** Wildlife Service data) used an 11-category scale for damage **caused** by pigs based on a combination of indicator plant **species, ground** cover, **and** digging for plants along U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Hawaii Forest Bird Survey transects. Damage was generally a less variable index than digging (lower coefficient of variation) and a more sensitive indicator of differences in disturbance, both among vegetational communities and in distances from roads **and trails.** However, the **botanical** experience and judgment needed to **apply** the damage scale extensively **seems** prohibitive aver large areas. **Because** "damage" is cumulative aver time, it is more useful in habitat assessment than in estimating population **density.** No **independent estimates of feral** pig densities were available to compare with **the** various indices used in **the** above studies in Hawaii, with **the** exception of **the study** by Cooray and Mueller-Dombois (1981); this study will be **discussed** later.

In our study, data recorded during the process of complete feral pig eradication in fenced management units provides a near-absolute accounting for the standing population in a unit **at any stage of** control. **These** critical **data** on pig densities, integrated into linear **models with** different indices to pig **activity,** have

Present address: Resources Management D'Nision, Haleakala National Park, **P.O.** Box 369, Makawao, Hawaii **96768**

been **used** to produce **models** for estimating feral pig **densities** in avariety **ofhabitats** in Hawaii.

We thank the numerous individuals employed by Hawaii Volcanoes and **Haleakala** National Parks who helped with this project **through** the years. Included are: P.C. Banko, D. Brown, L.W. Cuddihy, M. Ednie, L. Eharis, M. Eharis, S.D. Fellows, C.M. Forbes, B.H. **Gagne,** W. **Hahn,** C. Haurez, P.K. Higashino, L.K. **Katahira,** A.H. Kikuta, P.Y. Lockwoad, L.L. **Loope,** R Mattos, R Nagata, H. Pagan, G.L. Santos, D.B. Stone, L. Stumley, and J.M Yoshioka. **T.** Hauptman went beyond his job **as** helicopter pilot to help. D.B. Stone word processed the manuscript and helped edit it, and ML. Fulton and J.M Yoshioka prepared the **figures.** We also thank Martha **Schauss** and an anonymous reviewer.

DESCRIPTION OF STUDY SITES

The study was conducted in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park (HAVO) (Fig. *1)* and in **the** Kipahulu **District of Haleakala** National **Park** (HALE) (Fig. *2).* **Within** HAVO, **we investigated** *4* fenced management units **that** traverse a range **of** elevation, **topogaphy, and** vegetation representative **of** feral pig **habitat** in the Park The National Park Service has eradicated pigs from all *4* units.

The Kipuka Kulalio management unit (22 km²) extends from 1,500 m elevation up the slope of Mauna Loa Volcano to 2,200 m. This area is vegetated with a mosaic of koa (Acacia koa) forest or parkland, native shrublands, **and** native or alien **gtasslands** (Fig. *3)* in *areas with* **good** soil development Nearly half the unit is covered by the sparsely vegetated Keamoku aa lava **flow.**

Farther downskp? *from 1,200 to 1,350 m* elevation, is the Kipuka Ki unit (9.2 km²). The thick volcanic **ash** substm& **of** Kipuka Ki (Fig. *4)* **supports** vegetation similar to **that** of Kipuka Kulalio. Native grasslands and much of the forest ground cover in **KipukaKihavebeenreplacedbyintroduadgrassesdue** to **the effects of** cattle grazing **and** h. **The koa** forest within Kipuka Ki contains a greater diversity **of** subcanopy native trees than the forested areas of the Kipuka Kulalio unit

The remaining *2* HAVO management units are in montane rain forest. The 'Ola'a unit (2.7 km²) ranges in elevation *from 1,240* to *1,380* m, *and* the **thick** volcanic ash substrate is vegetated with very dense tree fems *(Cibotiwn spp.) and* numerous other species under a sparse **canopy of** 'ohi'a *(Mebvsideros polymorpha)* (Fig. *5).* The Puhimau unit *(6.2* kn?) ranges in elevation fiam *1,100* to *1,140* **m,** is drier than 'Ola'a, **and** is dominated by 'ohi'a with an understory **of tree** ferns **and** native shrubs (Fig. *6).* The introduced **tree** *MHca* faya is spreading **throughout the** unit **and** dominates **the tree canopy at** lower elevations. Puhimau contains substantial **areas** where the **ground** cover is dominated by uluhe *(Dicranopferis* **spp.),** a native fern **that** forms **dense thickets,** *and* **intmdmed** *grasses (Paspalwn spp., Andmpogon* **spp.).** *The* dominance **of** alien grasses is the result of years of forest canopy thinning **caused** by **the** digging **and** trampling of feral pigs.

The upper Kipahulu unit *(7.8* kn?) **of** *HALE* ranges in elevation *from 1,220* to *2,470 m and* contains **diverse,** intact native 'ohi'a **rain** and cloud forests, native grasslands, bogs, **and** riparian communities (Fig. 7). The upper Kipahulu unit (Fig. *2)* is **the** only unit in HALE where feral pigs are nearly eradicated. Unfenced boundaries are in terrain **that** is steep enough to prevent or severely limit pig ingress.

METHODS

Transeds for monitoring pig activity **as** an index **of** population density were distributed throughout the fenced management units in HAVO **and** Kipahulu **The** Kipuka Kulalio, Kipuka Ki, and 'Ola'a units transects were **spaced systematically at** intervals *(150-500 m)* from a randomized starting point. The Puhimau unit transects were also **systematically spaced from** a randomized starting point where topography **and** vegetation permitted. Two supplementary but non**systematically spaced** transects crossed **the** unit in conidon where topography **and** vegetation **permitted.** Unfoxtuxdy? **the** sampling **design** for the Puhimau unit did not provide **systematic** coverage **of** pig habitat **The** upper Kipahulu valley unit is **characterized** by numerous steeply sloped ravines **and** cliffs, preventing a randomized, systematic transect network. Transects in Kipahulu were placed in major vegetation **types** over **the** range **of** elevations **that** comprised pig **habitat within the** valley.

Sampling intensity ranged *from 50* plots *per* kn? in Kipahulu to 310 plots per km^2 in the 'Ola'a unit (Table *1).* Periodicity of sampling ranged *hm* **every** *3.8* months on the average in Kipahulu, to **every** *10.5* months in **the** Kulalio unit Other management units were sampled **at** intermediate time intervals. Pig activity **was** sampled in continuous *5-m wide (2.5 m* on

Fig. 1. Feral pig mamgement units in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park Four fenced units were studied.

Fig. 2. Feral pig management units and pig activity tmnwts **in Kipahulu Valley, Haleakala National Park The upper management unit is located above the upper fenceline.**

TRANS. WEST. SECT. WILDL. SOC. 30:1994 Feral Pig Activity - **Anderson** & **Stone 29**

Fig. 3. *Kipuka* **Kulalio management unit (22** &) **in Hawaii Volcawes National Park**

Fig. 4. Kipuka Ki management unit (9.2 &) **in** Hawaii **Volcanoes National Park**

Fig. 5. 'Ola'a management unit (2.7 km²) in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

Fig. 6. Puhimau management unit (6.2 km²) in Hawaii Volcanoes National Park.

Fig. 7. Upper Kipahulu management unit (7.8 km²) in Haleakala National Park.

a Two **supplementary** transeds **were not systematidly placed See text.**

each side **of the** transect), 10-m long plots. Transects **were marked** at 10-m intervals with vinyl **fhgging tape,** which was numbered to indicate distance from the starting **point** Frequency **of** pig digging, **scats,** tracks **(trails),** plant feedin& **beds,** and **Nbs were** recorded in 3 age classes (Table 2). The initial pig **activity** indices for each unit were obtained prior to or coincided with **the** initiation **of** control.

Table 2. Pig *acthity* **criteria** guide.

Digging

 $A.$ Fresh - (F)

Fluffy soil; soil clumps on **rootlets;** digging moist in comparison to surrounding dry soil, but dependent upon weather, litter distribution uneven or different from surrounding. Dug-up plants green, **not** withered or wilted.

B. Intermediate - (l)

No seedlings, or seedlings with cotyledons only; litter distribution uneven, but with pockets of continuous litter layer, dug-up plants partially green with browning leaf tips.

C. Old - (0)

Seedlings emerging, **litter** cover uniform and/or accumulated in pits; dug-up plants drying, dead, or rerooting.

- TrailsandTracks
- AFresh-(F)

Green and broken vegetation; fresh scats; **backs** well defined, **edges of** prints **sharp** or **not eroded; soil in** print **marks moist** looking, different from surrounding soils.

B. Intermediate $-$ (I)

Broken vegetation browning, trampled; track **prints slightly eroded.**

C. Old - (0)

Untrampled look; **regrowth of** vegetation; eroded track pattern.

Scat

AFresh-(F)

Odor, steaming; mucus coating; wet looking **(dependent upon** weather); flies or other insect activity; fresh tracks or plant feeding nearby; doesn't crumble when smashed.

B. Old - (0)

Gray or black, dried; eroded; seedlings emerging; hardened; fragmented; dung beetles; fungal growth on scat.

³²Feral Pig Adi . **Anderson** & **Stone TRANS. WEST. SECT. WILDL. SOC. 30:1994**

Plant Feeding*

 $A.$ Fresh (F)

Damaged plant material **green,** fiesh looking, **uprooted plants green; soil still clinging to exposed rootlets.

B.** Intermediate \cdot (I) *exposed* rootlets.

Affected plant material browning.

C. Old - (0)

Plant material brown and dead; **eaten** plant shoots regenerating: regrowth of shoots from tubers, **rhizomatous** or corm plants; **uprooted** plants dead or rerooted; vertical plant **growth** from horizontally lying plants.

Edible plants **fa pigs** (dry **habitats)** *Vaccinim* fruits, *StVphelio* fruit, *Dicmella* fiuit and leaves, *Moclraerina* leaves, *Myrica faya* fruit, *Sadleria* spp.

Pigs were eradicated in each management unit area through hunting, trapping, **and** snaring as part **of** control methodology research and resource management programs. The ages of removed pigs were **estimated** using tooth eruption **and** wear **(Matschke** 1967). Dates of birth were back-calculated from the **dates of** kill and age of each animal. Standing populations **were** estimated for each time **period** during which pig **activity** data were **recorded** by **using** estimated birth **dates to** determine **how** *many* animals had **been born** into the population and not **removed** by **the date of the pig activity sample. Estimated feral pig** densities and frequencies of fresh sign during initial sampling for each unit are shown in Table 3 as an example of some relationships examined. example **of some** relationships **examined**

Table 3. Relationship of feral pig density to frequency **of** fresh feral pig **sign** in five management units.

Data **Analysis.**—Frequencies of pig activity in **sample** plots were tallied **separately** for presence **of** digging, scats, **and all sign** combined From 3 age

classes of **sign recorded** in **the** field, 4 categories **were** chosen for analysis, as follows: Plots with fresh and intermediate **sign** were **counted** separately, a third category of plots that had either fresh or intermediate sign were then counted. Finally, a fourth count of plots with fresh or intermediate sign was performed by weighting plots that had both fresh and intermediate sign. If a plot contained both fresh and intermediate sign, it was given a value of 2 ; plots with only fresh or intermediate were given a value of 1. Because fresh and intermediate sign were not well defined in Puhimau. the **first** unit sampled, they were categorized **as** fresh for **analysk. Subsequent** monitoring **emphasized** training and calibrating observers in aging and identifying sign. **Frequency** count **categories that were tallied** for **the** periodic samples obtained from each control unit and abbreviations that will be used in subsequent figures and for discussion **are given** in Table 4.

Twelve linear models (Table 4) were generated for **each** of the 5 units to explore the potential predictive value of **types,** ages, and combinations of the **recorded** pig sign for the reconstructed pig population densities. Pig activity frequencies were transformed to arcsin values in **radians** to **normalize** distributions. Twelve additional linear models were constructed using the combined data from all units, to check for similarity **among** units and determine whether any single model had predictive value for all of the habitats studied. Plots **of** residuals **against** predicted values did not reveal **that data** transformation or inclusion of additional terms would improve fit of any of the models. The "REG" procedure of the **SM software system for personal** computers **was used** to perform **statistical** analyses (Anonymous 1985), **and** the **"CLI"** option **was specified** to determine the 95% confidence limits for individual predicted values.

RESULTS

A plot of \mathbb{R}^2 vs. standard error of the y estimate for all of the models provides a means of determining the fit and relative predictive values of the models (Fig. 8). For simplicity, the plot axes were truncated at 0.60 for R^2 and 6 for standard error (Fig. 8); models falling **outside these limits** $(n = 41)$ **are not discussed here.** (Conpnents for all models **are** available from the authors.) The **models** for fresh digging **OF) as** an indication of pig **density** pravided the best fit **(highest** $R²$ with lowest standard error of the v estimate) for all units **(KDF, OLDF, KKDF, PDF)** except for the Kipuka Kulalio unit. which has shallow, rocky soils or aa lava flows not easily dug by pigs. Kipuka Kulalio was sampled only 3 times, twice at zero density, but the **model (KUSF) generated** from occurrence of fie& **scats** indicates a correlation $(R^2 = 0.96)$ with feral pig density. The frequency of fresh scats provides a good model fbr the upper Kipahulu rain forest unit **(KSF).**

Combining tallies of fresh and intermediate digging **(DFAI)** decreased the standard error in the Kipuka Ki model from 5.3 to 2.4 but increased the error and decreased the \mathbb{R}^2 in the models for digging in the other units. The model generated from tallies of fresh and intermediate scat **(SFAT)** in the Kipuka Kulalio unit did not provide as good a fit as the model for fresh scat alone *(SF)*. Combining fresh and intermediate scat (SFAJ) for the Kipahulu unit **resulted** in a better fit than that for fresh scat alone (SF); the standard error of the y estimate was decreased from 3.4 to 2.0. Overall, little or no improvement of fit was realized by combining occurrence of different **ages** of **sign** in either digging **or scat models. Frah sign** alone provided the most consistent method **of** indexing pig population **density** (Table 5).

Digging

Of the control units where linear **models** for digging were significant (Table 5), the Kipuka Ki unit provided the model with best fit (Fig. 9a). The regression equation for Kipuka Ki is $y = 0.19 + 36.65x$, my where significant (1 and 5), the Kipuka Ki unit
provided the model with best fit (Fig. 9a). The
regression equation for Kipuka Ki is $y = 0.19 + 36.65x$,
where $y = \text{pig density/km}^2$ and $x = \text{frequency of fresh}$ pig digging **(arcsin** transformed in **radians). The** model predicts pig **density** within the 95% individual prediction bound to be within ± 0.70 to ± 0.80 pigs/km² of the **actual** pig **density.**

The Kipahulu fresh digging model (Fig. 9b) y $= 0.23 + 30.45x$ predicts pig density within the 95% confidence interval to be between \pm 1.3 and

 \pm 1.6 pigs/km² of the actual pig density for any given prediction.

Control unit	Degrees of Freedom	Fresh Digging	Fresh Scat	Fresh All Sign
Kulalio		NS	0.96'	NS
Kipuka Ki		382 0.90	NS	0.68
Puhimau	2	0.81	0.78	0.81
`Ola`a	2	0.92 **	NS	0.79
Kipahulu	7	$0.95***$	0.93	$0.92***$
Kulalio				
and Kipahulu	8		0.93 ^{****} 0.56 ^{****}	
All Combined	24	***		*** 0.81

 $\frac{1}{2}p < 0.1$

```
p = 0.05
```

```
\mathbf{\bar{p}} < 0.01
```
 $NS = not$ significant.

The predictive value of the **'Ola'a** digging model (Fig. 9c) is diminished by a low sample size $(n = 4)$. The model equation is $y = 0.62 + 16.98x$. The range of error expected for individual predictions is between ± 4.8 and \pm 5.1 pigs/ km^2 . The correlation coefficient for the model is 0.92 ($p < 0.05$), which indicates that the predictive **em of** the model is due **to** the low sample size and that the error associated with the model is probably less than that predicted.

The Puhimau unit was sampled only 4 times, and **the** predictive value **of** the **digging model** is **also low** (Fig. 9d). The model equation is $y = 2.03 - 19.12x$, and **the** error associated with **an** individual prediction is approximately ± 6.5 pigs/ km^2 . The negative y intercept **of the** model (-2.03 arcsin value) indicates that digging **was recorded** in plots until eradication

The fresh digging and reconstructed population **density data** fhm **the** periodic samples **of all units were** α **consolidated** to *c***wercome** the differences in error associated with small sample **size** in **some of the units** and to test if a significant model could be generated for **all** of the habitats encompassed within **the** control **units.** The model for fiesh digging in **all units** combined $(Fig. 9e)$ is $y = 0.45 + 15.59x$ and has an error for any individual prediction of about ± 2 pigs/ km^2 .

Scats

Two significant **models** (Table 5) were **generated** for the frequency of fresh scats found on the activity transeas. The Kulalio unit **was** sampled **the** least frequently of all the units $(n=3)$, and no pig scats were found in the plots for 2 of the 3 samples. The model (Fig. $10a$) is $y = 0.25 + 32.38x$. Individual predictions using **this** model are **subject to gross** error $(\pm 5 \text{ pigs/km}^2)$.

The fresh scat model from the Kipahulu unit (Fig. 10b) is $y = 0.53 + 34.49x$, where $y =$ predicted pig. density/ km^2 and x is the frequency of fresh pig scat (arcsin transformed). The confidence of an individual prediction (95%) using this model is between ± 1.45 and ± 1.82 pigs/km². A combined model frequency of fresh **scat** in **all units was calculated and** resulted in a low correlation coefficient of 0.56; this relationship was not **grwped**

An additional model used the frequency of fresh scat data from Kipahulu and Kipuka Kulalio, the 2 units that had significant correlations between fresh scat frequency and pig density. The correlation coefficient for this model is 0.93 ($p < 0.01$). The equation for the model is $y = 0.46 + 34.16x$, and the confidence interval **of individual** prediction (95%) **using** this **model** is **between** ± 1.1 **and** ± 1.4 **(Fig. 10c).**

All Sign

A final model was developed using the frequency of any kind of fresh pig sign in all of the units for all of **the periods** sampled with the corresponding reconstructed pig densities. The all fresh-sign model (Fig. 10d), $y = 0.28 + 13.85x$, predicts pig density ± 1.5 to 1.8 pigs/ km^2 (95% confidence).

DISCUSSION

The sampling *fi-equency* **in this study** is low (Table I), but the number **of** plots read for each **of the** samples is **quite** large (390-5,580), lending confidence **to** each individual sample. The significant models (Table 5) for fiesh digging **exhibited** variabiity in **the** number of pigs predicted for each management unit **per** observed frequency of sign. The Kipuka Ki model predicts **the greatest density of** pigs fhm **the** least amount of digging $(slope = 36.7)$. No measure was made of the amount of **ground** available for digging, but of the **units** where pig digging has predictive value, Kipuka **Ki** certainly **has** the least amount **of** diggable soil. The unit is transversed by the Keamoku lava flow, a pamally vegetated **aa** or rough flow of clinker **lava**

TRANS. WEST. SECT. WILOL. *SOC.* **30:1994 Feral Pig Activity** . **Andemn** (L **Stone ³⁵**

Fig. 8. Plot of R² vs Standard error of y estimate for linear models of predicting feral pig density from feral pig sign.

Fig. 9. Significant relationships of frequency of fresh feral pig digging and pig density in 4 management units and all **units combined.**

ť

Fig. 10. Significant relationships of fiqmcy of feral pig scat and pig density **in 2 management units and 2 units combii and relationship of all** fie& **sign to** density **in 5 management** units.

 $\overline{}$

TRANS. WEST. SECT. WILDL. SOC. 30:1994

The model for the Kipahulu rain forest unit **(slope** $=$ **30.5)** predicts fewer pigs for a given **fresuency of** plots dug than **Kipuka Ki. Although** most **of the Kipahulu** unit contains diggable **soil,** portions **of the** unit contain topography too steep for pigs to root. Additionally, the **thickly** vegetated, relatively pristine nature of Upper Kipahulu makes pig-rooting more difficult than in degraded forests.

The 'Ola'a and **Puhimau** models **(slopes: 17, 19.1)** predict **even fewer** pigs in relation to **the** amount **of** digging observed than **the Kipahulu** model. Nearly 100% of the substrate in these units is suitable and available to pigs **for** digging. **The** vegetation in the Puhimau unit is the most disturbed, with most of the area easily dug by pigs. The number of pigs predicted **1** br a **given** hpenq **of** scat *obsend* **was** consistent (**:slopes: 34.5, 32.4)** for the **Kipahulu and Kipuka 1** Culalio units, **but scat** models failed **to** predict pig (knsities in the **other 3 units studied**

kpplication of Models to Other Areas

Previous studies **of** kral pig **activity** indices have En conducted in a **variety of** habitats with different nethods, including variation in **size and** anangement of **)lots** and transects, sampling **intensity** and **periodicity,** and types and ages of sign recorded. Pig densities have also been estimated by various methods less definitive ban complete eradication **of animals, as achiwed** in his **study.** Nonetheless, it is usefbl to **compare densities** hined fnnn **appropriate models** developed in the)resent **study** and **density atimates** from other **studies** in which indices are **also available.**

Barrett et d.'s **(1988) study of** feral pigs **in** Annadel State Park in California resulted in population estimates **msed** on popuiation **reconstruction,** using **age and** emoval **data from nearly complete** eradication. **lowevery he** did not **attempt** to **correlate** feral pig **sign to** population density. Reconstructing the population for *mly* **stages of** control **provided** a **maximum estimate \$90** pigs **(4.5** pi@ &) for **the 2,000-ha park rhefkqmg of occurrence of all sign** for **the same ime period was** 25%. Prediction **of density** from **our** all fresh sign model developed in the present study $(y = 0.28 + 13.85x)$ is 7.5 pigs/km². The fresh digging model for all units in this study $(y = 0.45 + 15.59x)$ **provides a better estimate (6.3 pigs/km²) for the 13.5%** digging frequency reported. The Annadel data were characterized as fresh or old in the field, but the distinction was not retained in analysis. Fresh scat models from the present study grossly overestimated

 $(8.2-9.1)$ pigs/km²) the reconstructed population (4.5 pigs/km^2) for the 6% scat frequency reported at Annadel. **Barrett et ai. (1988) noted that** pig **sign was** de6nitely more *abundant* in certain vegetation **types** dehed by **Wainwright and** Barbour **(1984),** irrespective of **type** abmdamx in Annadel. Clearly, **models** developed in this study will be most functional in habitats similar to those in **which** they were developed, *eqedly* if similar methodologies **and** sampling **schemes are** used.

Cooray **and** Mueller-Dombois **(198 1)** found recent (fresh) scats in 4.0 to 17.5% of plots in a 4-year study of **^aHawaiian rain** fixes& Feral pig **density eseimated** by **flush** counts with **dogs** along a strip transect in **the** area ranged from 25 to 100 pigs/km². Density estimates for the fresh scat model developed in our study $(y = 0.46 +$ **34.16~; Kipahulu and** Kulalio) **ranged** from **7.3 to** 15.2 pigs/km². In their study, recent digging occurred in **49.3 to 92.0% of** sample plots. **Our** digging model from the adjacent 'Ola'a Tract $(y = 0.62 + 16.98x)$ predicted 13.8 to 22.4 pigs/km², higher than those obtained from the scat model. The high estimate obtained with our digging model **approaches** the lower **density** they estimated **by flush counts.** However, based on **our wrience** in areas where pigs have **eventuaUy** been eradicated, **flush counts** produce **inflated estimates.** Fewer animals than expected can do extensive damage **over** time.

Hone **(1988)** found digging **in 18.1 to 26.6% of** plots **and** that **the** percentage **of** plots **with** fresh **scats** varied from 1.4 to 8.3% in a dry Eucalyptus woodland **in Ausrralia. The density** (visual **counts)** of feral pigs in the study area was 0.89 pigs/ km^2 . Habitat in our study was not similar to <u>Eucalyptus</u> woodland, but the Kipuka **Ki** digging model ($y = 0.19 + 36.5x$) predicted densities of 16.3 to 20.1/ km^2 , whereas the 'Ola' a digging model $(y = 0.62 + 16.98x)$ predicted 8.1 to 9.8 km^2 . The **combined** fish **scat** model from **Kipuka** Kulalio **and** Kipahulu $(y = 0.25 + 32.38x)$ predicted densities of 4.1 to 9.7 pigs/km². This model predicted fairly low density from few **scats,** but **still** higher **density than** *oixewed* for **Eucalvotus woodland, as** did digging **models.** Hone **(1988) suggested** that **his** pig densities in Namadgi National **Park** in **Australia were underestimates** because the relationship of observed density to dung counts would require defecation rates of 300 pellets/day. Pen **studies** at HAVO **suggest** that defecation rate **would** be closer **to 301day. If** the **&wed density** in Namadgi (0.89 pigs/km^2) is increased by a factor of 10 (to 8.9 pigs/km²), the population estimate is within the variation predicted by the model.

CONCLUSIONS AND MANAGEMENT RECOMMENDATIONS

The model for all fresh sign may be the most useful management tool. It encompasses **the** variability **of all the** habitats sampled in the **study and** provides **estimates** within \pm 2 pigs per km^2 . Habitats sampled include a broad spectrum, from sparsely vegetated lava flows **through grassiands and shrublands to** densely **vegetated** r **rain and cloud forests. This model allows the habitat to dictate** the **sign** observed **and thus is not biased** by conspicuousness of a certain type of sign. Frequency of digging is apparently quite variable in relation to habitat, so models used for digging will be most useful if they match the habitat, especially in availability of diggable substrate and abundance of starchy roots and tubers or soil invertebrates. Models generated for fiesh scats seem least useful. Variability in defecation rates in different habitats, **and** differences in rate of disappearance with temperature, rainfall, and decompasition organisms, make **these models less** accurate.

None of the models provide much predictive value
 Proprietion densities **helow** 1 pig/km² When at population densities below 1 pig/km². populations are below this threshold, sampling on frequency transects *genemUy* **results** in little or **no** recorded activity. The **maximum** estimated density available for comparison with pig activity **data was** 6.5 pigs/ km^2 in the Puhimau unit. Extrapolation of the models beyond **the highest** pig density that **was known for** a unit is conjecture **because the** relationship of variables in the model may not be linear outside of the range of real data. Models were extended to densities beyond those recorded by extrapolating the prediction line along **the same slope. There** is less potentiai for error in extrapolation than in using **the** other **methods** available for estimating feral pig population density. Further verification of the **models** should be ongoing **as** pigs **are** removed from **areas and** more **data** are available.

LITERATURE CITED

- Anonymous. **1985.** SAS procedures guide for **personal** computers, version 6 edition. SAS Institute, Carv. N.C.
- **Barrett, R.H.** 1982. Wild pigs. Pages 243-244 in D.E. Davis, ed. CRC handbook of census methods for terrestrial vertebrates. CRC Press, Inc., **Boca** Raton, Fla.
- Barrett, R.H., B.L. Gootcher, P.J. Gogan, and **E.L. Fitzhugh.** 1988. Removing feral pigs from Annadel State Park Trans. West Sect Wildl. **Soc. 24:47-52.**
- Bratton, S.P. **1977.** The **effect** of the **European** wild boar on the flora of the Great Smoky Mountains National Park. Pages 47-52 in G.W. Wood, ed. Research and management of wild hog populations. Belle W. Baruch Forest Sci. Inst., **Georgetown, S.C.**
- *Cooray,* RG., and D. **Mueller-Dombois. 1981.** Feral pig activity. Pages 309-317 in D. Mueller-Dombois, K.W. Bridges, and H.L. Carson, ed. Island ecosystems: biological organization in selected Hawaiian communities. Hutchinson Ross Publ. Co., Stroudsburg, Penn.
- Giffin, J. 1978. Ecology of the feral pig on the island of **Hawaii.** Pitman-Robertson Proj. **W-15-3,** Stud, 11. Hawaii Dept. Land Nat. Resour., Div. Fish and Game. **122 pp.**
- **Hone,** J. **1987.** Theoretical and practical **aspects** of feral pig control. PhD Thesis, Australian National University, **Canberra.**
- . **1988.** Evaluation of **methods** for **ground** survey of feral pigs **and** their sign Acta Theriol. **33:451-465.**
- **Matschke,** HG. **1%7.** Aging European wild hogs by dentition J. Wildl. Manage. **3 l(1): 109-1 13.**
- Ralph, C.J., and B.D. Maxwell. 1984. Relative effects of human and feral hog disturbance on a wet forest in **Hawaii.** Biol. *C~I~S~N.* **30:291-303.**
- Wainwright, T.C., and M.G. Barbour. **1984.** Characteristics of mixed evergreen forest in Sonoma mountains of California. Madrono **3 1(4):2 19-230.**