

# 2025 Mast Survey Report

Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources

Zak Danks, Cody Rhoden, Trey Prather, and Jimmy Woods

September 29, 2025



# **Introduction**

## **Our Agency**

The Kentucky Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources (KDFWR) is an agency of the Kentucky Tourism, Arts & Heritage Cabinet. KDFWR is overseen by a commission of members nominated by Kentucky's sportsmen and women from 9 districts across the state and appointed by the Governor. KDFWR employs about 400 full-time staff, including conservation officers, wildlife and fisheries biologists, conservation educators, and specialists in information technology, public relations, and administrative services. KDFWR receives no money from the state's General Fund; rather, the agency is funded through the sale of hunting and fishing licenses, boating registration fees, and federal grants based on the number of hunting and fishing licenses sold in the state.

KDFWR's Wildlife Division is responsible for the conservation and management of wildlife populations in the state to provide opportunity for hunting and viewing wildlife. Each year, KDFWR staff and partners from other agencies, universities, and non-governmental organizations conduct a mast survey in an effort to summarize mast conditions and shed light on population and harvest trends of various wildlife species. The Grouse & Turkey Program and Small Game Program coordinate the survey and prepared this report of survey findings.

## **Importance of Mast to Wildlife**

Mast refers to the fruit of woody vegetation, many types of which provide important foods for wildlife. "Hard mast" includes acorns, hickory nuts, beechnuts, walnuts, and hazelnuts, all of which are available to wildlife beginning in late summer through fall and winter. "Soft mast" includes the many types of soft fruits produced from late spring through the summer and early fall, such as serviceberries, wild plums, wild grapes, dogwood berries, and persimmons.

Both hard and soft mast are important for Kentucky's wildlife throughout the year, but fall and winter hard mast production is of primary concern for wildlife managers because of the great influence this food resource exerts on the movements, body condition, and thus population dynamics of many forest-dwelling wildlife species. Thus, the KDFWR Mast Survey focuses on surveying oak, hickory, and American beech trees.

Deer, bears, wild turkeys, ruffed grouse, squirrels, small mammals, and other species depend on nutritious hard mast to bulk up before winter and for sustenance during winter when few other foods are available. Research has shown that in years when acorn crops are large enough to be available in March and April, female ruffed grouse enter the nesting season in better condition. The same may be true for other species. Animal movement in fall and winter is related to the availability of high-energy hard mast foods. In years when little to no mast is available from oaks, hickories, or beech trees, wildlife may move more often and/or greater distances in search of limited food supplies. Higher rates of movement may lead to more encounters with wildlife, some positive (deer and turkeys using fields to a greater degree in search of waste grains) and some negative (bear nuisance activity may be higher).

Mast production may be highly variable year to year, especially among the many oak species in our forests. Harsh spring weather may hinder flowering and pollination, reducing the fall mast crop. However, weather does not explain all the variability in mast production and all factors influencing a given year's mast crop are unknown. Variability in production is buffered to some degree by having different hard mast species present in a forest stand, and most forests in Kentucky have multiple oak and hickory species. Some have walnuts and beech, as well.

## Methods


Since 1982, KDFWR has conducted a statewide mast production survey of important producers of wildlife foods. The KDFWR Mast Survey evaluates 4 broad groups of trees of importance to Kentucky wildlife: red oaks, white oaks, hickories, and beech. By monitoring mast production annually, we can detect trends in wildlife food availability in our forests in FBany given year. We may also compare these metrics to the number of animals harvested or observed in a given year to determine the relationship between mast and wildlife.

### Past Method

Beginning in 1982 the Mast Survey took the form of a survey card sent out to area biologists for completion on 3 separate areas in their respective regions. The survey card had 4 categories for each tree and shrub group: Heavy, Moderate, Light, and None. These subjective categories reflected the surveyor's personal evaluation of the amount of hard or soft mast occurring on each group of trees and shrubs in September and October (Figure 1). The trends observed from these data cannot be assimilated in the current survey method, but are valuable metrics in a historical context (Figure 2).


ANNUAL MAST SURVEY CARD		G-PR(44)		
County _____ Observer _____		Year <u>2005</u>		
	Heavy	Moderate	Light	None
The Hickories				
The Red Oaks				
The White Oaks				
Black Walnut				
American Beech				
Flowering Dogwood				
Other				

**Figure 1.** Old survey card method for mast assessment across Kentucky 1982 – 2007.



**Figure 2.** Mast Survey results, 1982-2006.

Ratings are mast production index values averaged annually across all trees surveyed. Species survey included various white oak, red oak, and hickory species, American beech, black walnut, and flowering dogwood.




**Figure 2b.** Mast Survey results by species group, 1982-2006. Ratings are mast production index values averaged annually across all trees surveyed within each of 4 groups: white oak species, red oak species, hickory species, and American beech.

## Current Method

Beginning in 2007 the Mast Survey changed to a more quantitative method of data collection. This change was motivated by the formation of a coordinated hard mast survey by several eastern states in 2007 based on recent research. The goal was to allow comparison of mast conditions regionally (Figure 3).

The current method requires individuals to scan the crown of each survey tree for 30 seconds and estimate the percentage of the crown bearing mast. This percentage, abbreviated as "PCA" (the "A" originally meant "acorns" but here denotes "any" mast) is quantitative, which is

preferable to the old qualitative method. To alleviate concern that PCA is still subjective, we reclassify the PCA ratings more broadly based on presence or absence of any mast, abbreviated as “PBA”. We group PBA ratings into categories: failure (0-19% PCA), poor (20-39% PCA), average (40-59% PCA), good (60-79% PCA), and bumper (80-100% PCA).



**Figure 3.** White oak mast survey locations for the regional mast survey consortium, 2016.


## Surveyors

The Mast Survey in Kentucky takes place across the state. The number of surveys conducted each year has varied but typically has included about 25 individual survey routes. Most routes include 100 trees per route, with 25 each in the white oak group, red oak group, hickory group, and American beech. Historically, KDFWR biologists completed surveys but the list of surveyors now includes volunteers from other natural resource agencies, universities, and non-governmental organizations.

## Results and Discussion

In 2025, surveys were completed along 35 individual routes in 32 counties (Figure 4). A total of 2,766 individual trees were sampled, including 797 white oak trees, 809 red oak trees, 799 hickory trees, and 361 American beech trees (Table 1).

**Figure 4.** Mast survey sites, 2025. Regional division based on U.S. Forest Service ecological and forest type classifications (<https://www.fs.usda.gov/land/pubs/ecoregions/ecoregions.html>, [https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/rastergateway/forest\\_type/index.php](https://data.fs.usda.gov/geodata/rastergateway/forest_type/index.php)).






**Table 1.** Mast survey results overall, 2025. This table provides quantitative and qualitative measures of masting. Region indicates how data are summarized. Tree Group refers to broad categories into which various tree species are grouped. Trees Surveyed is the number of individual trees surveyed across all routes. PCA is the percentage of a tree’s crown bearing mast averaged across all survey trees. PBA is the percentage of survey trees bearing any mast and is derived from PCA. Rating is the PBA value categorized into classes: “Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%.

Region	Tree Group	Trees Surveyed	PCA (median ± IQR*) <sup>a</sup>	PBA	Rating
Statewide	White Oak	797	10 (0-30)	62	Good
	Red Oak	809	10 (0-30)	66	Good
	Hickory	799	0 (0-15)	42	Average
	Beech	361	20 (0-60)	68	Good
East	White Oak	279	10 (0-25)	65	Good
	Red Oak	266	10 (0-20)	62	Good
	Hickory	277	0 (0-10)	40	Poor
	Beech	191	30 (10-60)	81	Bumper
West	White Oak	518	5 (0-30)	61	Good
	Red Oak	543	10 (0-40)	69	Good
	Hickory	522	0 (0-20)	43	Average
	Beech	170	5 (0-47.5)	54	Average

<sup>a</sup> Median is used like an average to show a middle PCA values (i.e., 50th percentile); interquartile range (IQR) is used to show average variation around the median (i.e., middle of the data between the 25th and 75th percentiles)

Across the state, mast production rated Good for white oaks, Good for red oaks, Average for hickories, and Good for beech (Figure 5, Figure 6). At eastern sites, mast production rated Good for white oaks, Good for red oaks, Poor for hickories, and Bumper for beech. At western sites, mast production rated Good for white oaks, Good for red oaks, Average for hickories, and Average for beech.

**Figure 5.** Percentage of trees bearing mast (PBA), 2025. This bar plot shows the distribution of PBA values when sampled trees are grouped by species group and survey region. PBA is presence or absence of mast derived from estimates of the percentage of tree crown area bearing any mast (PCA).







**Figure 6A.** Mast survey ratings by site for tree species groups, 2025. Ratings categorize the percentage of trees bearing any mast (PBA). At each site, “Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%. White Oak, Red Oak, Hickory, and Beech are 4 broad groupings of the various mast-producing tree species surveyed. Not all tree groups were surveyed at each site. Sites are shown regionally: darker green shading = East Region.

White Oak


- Bumper
- Good
- Average
- Poor
- Failure




**Figure 6B.** Mast survey ratings by site for tree species groups, 2025. Ratings categorize the percentage of trees bearing any mast (PBA). At each site, “Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%. White Oak, Red Oak, Hickory, and Beech are 4 broad groupings of the various mast-producing tree species surveyed. Not all tree groups were surveyed at each site. Sites are shown regionally: darker green shading = East Region.



**Figure 6C.** Mast survey ratings by site for tree species groups, 2025. Ratings categorize the percentage of trees bearing any mast (PBA). At each site, “Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%. White Oak, Red Oak, Hickory, and Beech are 4 broad groupings of the various mast-producing tree species surveyed. Not all tree groups were surveyed at each site. Sites are shown regionally: darker green shading = East Region.



**Figure 6D.** Mast survey ratings by site for tree species groups, 2025. Ratings categorize the percentage of trees bearing any mast (PBA). At each site, “Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%. White Oak, Red Oak, Hickory, and Beech are 4 broad groupings of the various mast-producing tree species surveyed. Not all tree groups were surveyed at each site. Sites are shown regionally: darker green shading = East Region.



Red oak acorn crops were good to bumper at 5 of 13 (38%) eastern sites and 10 of 26 (38%) western sites (Tables 2 and 3). White oak acorn crops were good to bumper at 1 of 13 (8%) eastern sites and 10 of 26 (38%) western sites. Hickory nut crops were good to bumper at 8 of 13 (62%) eastern sites and 8 of 26 (31%) western sites. Beechnut crops were good to bumper at 5 of 9 east sites (56%) and 2 of 10 west sites (20%). However, it should be noted that beechnut production values are questionable because we do not check for viability via float tests.

**Table 2.** Mast ratings by tree group, 2025. This table provides the number (and percentage) of survey routes in each of 5 mast rating categories for each of 4 tree species groups. Region indicates how data are summarized. Tree Group refers to broad categories into which various tree species are grouped. Trees Surveyed is the number of individual trees surveyed across all routes. PBA Rating refers to categories for the percentage of trees bearing any mast: “Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%. White Oak, Red Oak, Hickory, and Beech are broad categories into which various tree species are grouped.

Region	PBA Rating	White Oak	Red Oak	Hickory	Beech
Statewide	Bumper	7 (21%)	14 (40%)	5 (14%)	6 (35%)
	Good	12 (35%)	7 (20%)	2 (6%)	5 (29%)
	Average	9 (26%)	6 (17%)	11 (31%)	2 (12%)
	Poor	3 (9%)	6 (17%)	6 (17%)	2 (12%)
	Failure	3 (9%)	2 (6%)	11 (31%)	2 (12%)
East	Bumper	2 (17%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)	5 (56%)
	Good	5 (42%)	5 (42%)	1 (8%)	3 (33%)
	Average	4 (33%)	2 (17%)	6 (50%)	1 (11%)
	Poor	1 (8%)	3 (25%)	2 (17%)	0 (0%)
	Failure	0 (0%)	0 (0%)	3 (25%)	0 (0%)
West	Bumper	5 (23%)	12 (52%)	5 (22%)	1 (12%)
	Good	7 (32%)	2 (9%)	1 (4%)	2 (25%)
	Average	5 (23%)	4 (17%)	5 (22%)	1 (12%)
	Poor	2 (9%)	3 (13%)	4 (17%)	2 (25%)
	Failure	3 (14%)	2 (9%)	8 (35%)	2 (25%)

**Table 3.** Mast ratings by survey site, 2025. This table provides mast ratings for every site surveyed. Sites are ordered alphabetically within regions. PBA Rating refers to categories for the percentage of trees bearing any mast: “Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%. White Oak, Red Oak, Hickory, and Beech are broad categories into which various tree species are grouped. Blanks indicate that a tree group was not surveyed at a site.


		Mast Rating (% of trees bearing mast)			
Region	Site	White Oak	Red Oak	Hickory	Beech
East	Dewey	Good	Good	Failure	Bumper
	Fishtrap	Bumper	Poor	Failure	Bumper
	Fleming	Bumper	Good	Average	Bumper
	KY Ridge	Average	Poor	Failure	Good
	Little Shepherd	Good	Good	Average	
	Maywoods	Good	Poor	Average	
	Paintsville	Average	Good	Average	Good
	Pioneer Weapons	Average	Bumper	Average	Average
	Redbird	Good	Bumper	Average	Bumper
	Robinson Forest WMA	Poor	Good	Good	Good
	Shilalah Creek	Average	Average	Poor	
West	Yatesville	Good	Average	Poor	Bumper
	Ballard	Good	Average	Average	
	Barren River State Park	Bumper	Bumper	Bumper	Bumper
	Big Rivers	Poor	Good	Average	
	Bugwood-Wayne	Bumper	Bumper	Average	Good
	Central	Good	Bumper	Failure	
	Clay	Bumper	Bumper	Bumper	
	KY River	Average	Bumper	Failure	
	Green River	Bumper	Bumper	Bumper	Good
	H and H	Failure	Failure	Failure	

Mast Rating (% of trees bearing mast)					
Region	Site	White Oak	Red Oak	Hickory	Beech
	Jones-Keeney	Average	Bumper	Failure	Failure
	Salato	Good	Bumper	Average	
	Kleber	Good	Bumper	Failure	
	Knobs	Good	Poor	Failure	Poor
	L.B. Davidson	Poor	Average	Average	Failure
	Livingston Co.	Failure	Failure	Poor	
	Lloyd	Failure	Poor	Failure	
	Mammoth Cave NP	Good	Bumper	Bumper	Average
	Mullins		Average	Poor	
	Rich	Average	Average	Failure	
	Shanty Hollow	Good	Bumper	Bumper	Poor
	Taylorsville	Average	Bumper	Good	
	Tradewater	Bumper	Good	Poor	
	Yellowbank	Average	Poor	Poor	

As is typical and confounding to managers, mast production was highly variable (Table 3, Figure 7). Based on the inter-quartile range (i.e., the width of boxes in Figure 7), variability was higher at western Kentucky sites than in the east (0.9 times more for white oaks, 0.9% more for red oaks, 0.3% more for hickories, and 1.4% more for beech). As an example of how two nearby sites can vary, red oak mast rated as Failure at Rich WMA but as Good at nearby Kleber WMA. In contrast, red oak rated as Bumper at Ballard WMA in far western KY and at Clay WMA in northeastern KY.




**Figure 7.** Variation in percentage of trees bearing mast (PBA), 2025. Distribution of PBA values summarized by tree species group and site. The horizontal line inside each box represents median PBA (50% of values across all sites in the region are below this value). The lower bound of each box is the 25th percentile (25% of values below this value). The upper bound is the 75th percentile (75% of values below this value). The “whiskers” show maximum and minimum values, excluding outliers. Outliers, represented by individual dots, are 1.5 times greater than the upper quartile or lower than the lower quartile.




Long-term trends in PBA show substantial fluctuations year-to-year at the statewide level (Figure 8). However, white oak PBA has been stable since rebounding to the long-term average in 2018. Red oak PBA was low the past 2 two years but increased sharply this year. Hickory increased modestly back to the long-term average. Beech increased sharply to its highest level since 2019. Causes of variability in mast production are not well understood, particularly at local levels.

**Figure 8.** Trends in percentage of trees bearing mast (PBA) by species group, 2007-2025. PBA is presence or absence of mast derived from estimates of the percentage of tree crown area.




So far we have reported on PBA, a presence-absence metric. In terms of PBA, a white oak tree with 1 acorn rates the same as another white oak tree with 1,000 acorns, despite the large difference in acorn abundance (i.e., PCA) between trees. Trees commonly have low PCA values and PCA can be highly variable. Both conditions were observed this year (Figure 9, Figure 10). PBA and PCA are not related linearly in a 1-to-1 relationship (Figure 11). PBA tends to be higher at a given PCA, so slight changes in PCA can bump the PBA rating to a higher category (Figure 11A). At statewide and regional levels, the PBA-PCA relationship varies somewhat by tree group (Figure 11B). And across sites, the median and variance for PCA (500%, 2000%) are much lower than for PBA (6000%, 4600%).


**Figure 9.** Percentage of tree crown area bearing mast (PCA) statewide and in each survey region, 2025. In this plot, points are median PCA values (50% all trees are below this value) and the error bars are the interquartile range (middle 50% of the data, with 25% above and below the median, respectively).



**Figure 10.** Percentage of tree crown area bearing mast (PCA) by site, 2025. Plots show the distribution of PCA values among individual trees at each survey site. Tree species group are abbreviated (W = white oak, R = red oak, H = hickory, B = beech).



**Figure 11.** Relationship of PCA and PBA, 2025. Plot A shows the correlation of PCA values with PBA values by tree group for each survey site. Each dot is a site and colors represent tree species groups. The black diagonal line in each subplot is a reference for what would be a perfectly linear relationship; however, for each tree group, the relationship is not linear, with PBA values being higher for a given PCA level. Plot B shows the PCA-PBA correlation summarized statewide and regionally. Colors represent tree groups and dots are statewide or regionally summarized values of PCA and PBA. For (A) and (B), the white horizontal lines denote the PBA ratings described above (“Failure” = 0 to 20%, “Poor” = 21 to 40%, “Average” = 41 to 60%, “Good” = 61 to 80%, “Bumper” = 81 to 100%).



In summary, this year mastling was better than last year, being average to good overall across the Commonwealth. However, hunters should expect variation from place to place and scout for productive trees in the areas they hunt. Deer, turkeys, bears, squirrels, grouse, and other animals will be keyed in to those resources.

## **Acknowledgments**

Survey coordinators thank the many KDFWR staff, partners, and volunteers who battled bugs, briars, and poison ivy to collect mast data for this year's survey.

*The Department of Fish and Wildlife Resources is funded through the sale of hunting and fishing licenses. It receives no general fund tax dollars.*