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An Evaluation of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP)

Executive Summary

IRAP Participants

Results of IRAP participant survey suggest that it was difficult to gain access to private property for recreating in Illinois, and many respondents were unsuccessful in past attempts to do so. Although public land was used most often by respondents, private land was preferred. The majority (91%) of respondents believed that IRAP was needed to improve access to private lands. Most respondents (92%) agreed that IRAP provided additional hunting opportunities, and 97% believed that IRAP was beneficial to Illinois. Among IRAP participants, mean hunting experience in Illinois was 16 years, with 40% of participants hunting less than 5 years and 58% hunted less than 10 years. The usefulness of the program as a recruitment tool may be limited to youth hunting activities as there were very few new hunters identified. The IRAP program seems to spread the number of hunters across the landscape more than recruit new ones. The program received an overall satisfaction rating of 3.84 out of 5, suggesting that many participants were satisfied with the program. About 87% were likely to participate in future IRAP activities, with Sport Fishing and Spring Youth Turkey Hunting being the most popular among respondents.

IRAP Landowners

Approximately 95% of the landowners surveyed reported that they were currently enrolled in IRAP. The most frequent reasons for enrollment in the program were, wanting to provide hunting opportunities, receive financial incentives, and improve habitat for wildlife. Over 90% of respondents were satisfied with the service provided by IDNR staff. Almost 70% have allowed hunters on their property prior to IRAP, and many have denied hunters asking for permission. Landowners that previously allowed hunting gave permission mostly to “friends and
neighbors”, but after the introduction of IRAP there was a marked decrease in “friends and neighbors” with an increase in resident Illinois hunters. Although 61% of respondents had initial concerns about enrolling in IRAP, including the behavior of recreationists on their property, landowners seemed to be very satisfied with IRAP. The overall satisfaction rating was 4.26 on a 5 point-scale. Eighty-seven percent of respondents were satisfied with behavior of hunters or recreationists on their property and 90% indicated that they would recommend IRAP to a friend.

Illinois Recreationists

Majorities of statewide recreationists surveyed participated in fishing (85%) and hunting (78%). Although respondents generally preferred to access private land, they often recreated on public land because it was difficult to gain access to private land. A minority (16%) of respondents were aware of IRAP before receiving our questionnaire; about 63% believed that IRAP was beneficial to Illinois and 27% to them personally. Fifty-five percent of Illinois recreationists believed that IRAP provided additional hunting opportunities and 52% felt that IRAP was needed to improve access to private lands. The mean score of support for IRAP on a 7-point scale was 3.84. Of the 78% of respondents who considered themselves a hunter, 65% were denied hunting access to private lands in the past; a minority (41%) reported that they would be likely to participate in IRAP in the future. The most common reasons why respondents were unlikely to participate in IRAP was that they lacked free time or interest.

Illinois Landowners

About 40% of landowners throughout Illinois felt that it is difficult to find places to hunt or recreate in Illinois, and 50% agreed that gaining access to private property was difficult. Seventy-one percent of landowners agreed that landowners have become less willing to grant permission to access their land, but only 29% agreed that some type of program is needed to
improve access to private land. Just 17% of landowners were aware of IRAP before receiving our survey, and 20% were unaware that landowners who provide free access to their property have their liability reduce under Illinois. Of the 67% of landowners who have allowed hunting on their property, 80% were satisfied with the behavior of the hunters. Only 2% of respondents indicated that they were likely to enroll in IRAP in the future; 80% had concerns about enrolling in IRAP, generally about the behavior of hunters on their property, personal liability, potential damage, and overall safety. Many landowners indicated they were unlikely to participate because they did not want stranger hunting on their property and that their land was for them and their families to use.

**Background**

With 4.1% of the total acreage of the state in public ownership, Illinois ranks 46th in the proportion of public lands among states of the U.S. (U.S. Bureau of the Census, 1991, 2012). A significant amount of this public land (415 mi²) lies in the Shawnee National Forest in southern Illinois (U.S.D.A Forest Service). This ratio of public to private land necessitates that recreation occurs primarily on private land. To address the growing need for land for recreation and the importance private land plays outdoor recreation, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (INDR) created the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). The primary goal of this program is to increase public access to private lands and provide more outdoor recreation opportunities, as well as provide recruitment, retention, and reengagement in outdoor recreation. The program was initiated in 2011 under a grant from the U.S. Department of Agriculture to connect interested recreationists with opportunities provided by landowners willing to open their land to specified recreation activities. In turn, landowners receive assistance with non-native species removal, prescribed burning, prairie plantings and timber stand improvement. Further,
landowners received a stipend for participation; the amount is based on the number of acres enrolled. To date, the program has grown to include close to 16,000 acres of private land in 38 counties. Current program activities include hunting (youth and adult turkey, upland, small game, waterfowl, and archery deer), fishing and boating, bird watching, wildlife photography and viewing.

Purpose

The intent of this study was to (a) evaluate both recreation and landowner participants in the Illinois Recreation Access Program (IRAP), and b) investigate the attitudes and needs of Illinois recreationists and landowners as a whole toward access and enrollment of private lands for recreation use in Illinois.

Methods

This study involved mail surveys of both recreationists and landowners in IRAP as well as statewide recreationists and landowners not necessarily involved in the program. Survey Sampling International provided names and addresses of participants. Each of the four mail surveys were conducted using the same methodology.

The IRAP Recreationist/Hunter sample consisted of 534 randomly selected people who were enrolled in IRAP. The IRAP Landowner sample included 75 people who had land enrolled in IRAP. Both IRAP sample groups had the same mailing timeline. Subjects were first mailed the questionnaire (Appendices A.1 & B.1) and cover letter (Appendices A.2 & B.2) on February 15, 2016. The first thank you/reminder postcard mailing to non-respondents was sent on March 2, 2016 (Appendices A.5 & B.5). A second copy of the questionnaire and cover letter were mailed March 18, 2016 (Appendices A.3 & B.3). Non-respondents received a second reminder
The Statewide recreationist sample consisted of 3,000 hunting license buyers randomly selected from the 2015 license database of IDNR. The Statewide Landowner sample \((N = 1,000)\) was randomly selected from those who owned \(\geq 40\) acres of private land. The initial mailed questionnaires (Appendices C.1 & D.1), cover letters (Appendices C.2 & C.3), and stamped return envelopes (hereafter referred to as “survey packet”) were mailed April 9, 2016, followed by a Thank you/Reminder postcard March 2, 2016 (Appendices C.5 & D.5). A second mailing of the survey packet (Appendices C.3 & D.3) was sent March 18, 2016 followed by a second Thank you/Reminder postcard May 8, 2016. A final survey packet (Appendices C.4 & D.4) was sent May 21, 2016.

Survey instruments were developed by Human Dimensions Research Program researchers in cooperation with and approval of IRAP program staff.
1. IRAP Participant Survey

Results

Of the initial 534 IRAP participants sampled, 34 were removed as undeliverable, resulting in a usable sample of 500 individuals. We received 289 completed questionnaires for a response rate of 58%.

Participant Profile

Respondents were mostly male (90.6%) (Figure 1), had lived in Illinois an average of 31 years, and were an average of 36 years old. Over 97% of respondents reported that they had internet access.

The most common types of areas respondents reported living in were small city (27.2%) followed by small town (25.4%) (Figure 2). About 45% of people had a total gross household income of $90,000 or more, whereas more than forty percent (43.2%) had a household income of less than $75,000 (Figure 3). This higher than the state average because there is a disproportionate number of IRAP participants living in suburbs.

Figure 1. Gender distribution of respondents (n=286).
The majority (61.2%) of respondents completed the questionnaire as an IRAP adult participant, and the other 38.8% responded as a youth IRAP participant (Figure 4). The most popular outdoor recreational activities among respondents were fishing (85.1%) and hunting (84.4%), followed by boating (48.1%), hiking (43.3%), and birding (13.1%) (Figure 5). Fishing was rated as the most important activity; 85.8% of respondents ranked it as either moderately or very important (Table 1).
Figure 4. Person who completed survey \((n=286)\).

Figure 5. Outdoor recreational activities participated in \((n=289)\).

### Table 1. Level of importance for recreational activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not at all important (%)</th>
<th>Slightly important (%)</th>
<th>Moderately important (%)</th>
<th>Very important (%)</th>
<th>I do not participate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting ((n=279))</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking ((n=257))</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birding ((n=247))</td>
<td>17.4</td>
<td>17.0</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>47.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing ((n=283))</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>67.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating ((n=264))</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The type of land most often used for recreation was public lands (44.7%), followed by private property not owned by the respondent (30.3%) (Figure 6). A majority (87.4%) of respondents agreed that it was difficult to gain access to private properties, landowners have become less willing to grant permission to recreate on their private land (84.2%), and it was difficult to find places to hunt or recreate in Illinois (70.9%) (Table 2). Over sixty percent (61.6%) of respondents disagreed to some extent with the statement “It is easy to establish and maintain private landowner contacts in Illinois” (Table 2). Eighty-five percent of respondents agreed that some type of hunter or recreation program was needed to improve access to private land in Illinois (Table 2).

Figure 6. The type of land used most often for hunting or recreation purposes (n=208).
Table 2. IRAP participants’ level of agreement with statements regarding land access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean* ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to find places to hunt/recreate in Illinois ((n=285))</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>36.5</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>3.87</td>
<td>1.114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to gain access to private properties for recreating in Illinois ((n=286))</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>9.1</td>
<td>36.0</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>4.35</td>
<td>0.814</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have become less willing to grant permission to recreate on private land ((n=286))</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>51.7</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to establish and maintain private landowner contacts in Illinois ((n=286))</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>34.3</td>
<td>28.3</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.24</td>
<td>1.023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some type of hunter/recreation program is needed to improve access to private land in Illinois ((n=285))</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>4.31</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

IRAP Participation

More than half (54.7%) of respondents became aware of IRAP by the IDNR website (Figure 7). Other common ways participants became aware were by a family member (24.1%) or friend (22.1). The most popular IRAP activity that respondents participated in during 2015 was Sport Fishing (24.6%) followed by Spring Youth Turkey Hunting (22.1%). Fifty-six percent of respondents reported that they have never participated in a naturalist IRAP activity, such as bird watching, and 55% have never participated in IRAP non-motorized boat access (Table 3).
Figure 7. How respondents became aware of IRAP (n=289). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)

Table 3. IRAP activity participation, by year (n=289).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2011 (%)</th>
<th>2012 (%)</th>
<th>2013 (%)</th>
<th>2014 (%)</th>
<th>2015 (%)</th>
<th>Never Participated (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Youth Turkey Hunting</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Deer Hunting</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>50.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist (e.g. Bird watching)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Fishing</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>24.6</td>
<td>45.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized Boat Access</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>55.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Many respondents participated in IRAP for hunting, recreation in new places in Illinois (84.8%), or to find private access for outdoor activities (78.7%); whereas 11.2% of respondents participated to try hunting for the first time (Table 4). Seventy-two percent of respondents preferred to access private land over public land for outdoor recreation, however, more than half (55.3%) reported that they were unsuccessful in their attempts to gain private land access.

Table 4. Responds for statements regarding IRAP land access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to access private land over public land for outdoor recreation (n=288)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have time to meet with private landowners to obtain access to private land (n=287)</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>2.91</td>
<td>1.204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been unsuccessful in my attempts to gain private land access (n=289)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>19.7</td>
<td>3.56</td>
<td>1.040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public land for hunting/recreation is too crowded (n=287)</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>3.96</td>
<td>0.919</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in IRAP to try hunting for the first time (n=278)</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>34.9</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>1.130</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in IRAP to find private access for outdoor activities (n=286)</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>4.08</td>
<td>0.954</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I participate in IRAP to hunt/recreate new places in Illinois (n=284)</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>43.3</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree
Respondents applied to participate in an IRAP activity an average of 2.62 times ($n=274$), and have been drawn to participate in IRAP activities 1.83 times ($n=267$). Of the 22.6% of respondents who have applied to access IRAP properties and were not selected, 56.7% reapplied (Figures 8 & 9). Thirty-four percent of respondents traveled 26-50 miles on average to participate in IRAP activities, whereas 27.2% traveled less than 26 miles, and 38.5% traveled more than 50 miles (Figure 10).

Figure 8. Percentage of respondents who have applied to access IRAP properties and being have not been selected ($n=270$).

Figure 9. Percentage of respondents who reapplied to access IRAP properties after not selected ($n=60$).
IRAP Experience

Respondents rated a series of statements relating to their IRAP experience on a 5-point scale (1=strongly disagree, 5=strongly agree.) The majority of respondents (51.4%) strongly agreed that IRAP was beneficial for Illinois and 56.5% strongly agreed that IRAP was needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands (Table 5). Eighty-two percent of respondents agreed that IRAP was beneficial to them personally (Table 5).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands ((n=282))</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>39.4</td>
<td>51.4</td>
<td>4.38</td>
<td>0.796</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial for Illinois ((n=283))</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>40.3</td>
<td>56.5</td>
<td>4.52</td>
<td>0.603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial to me personally ((n=281))</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>13.5</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>47.7</td>
<td>4.24</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP causes more hunters/recreationists to lease places for themselves ((n=279))</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>52.0</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.934</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP decreases the number of hunters that are leaving the sport ((n=278))</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>14.0</td>
<td>36.3</td>
<td>30.2</td>
<td>13.7</td>
<td>3.32</td>
<td>1.059</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP creates new opportunities to hunt/recreate on private land ((n=280))</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>48.2</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>0.690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters/recreationists ((n=277))</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>37.2</td>
<td>35.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.38</td>
<td>0.946</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When landowners enroll in IRAP, hunters lose access to sites ((n=279))</td>
<td>21.1</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>37.3</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>0.854</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

When asked how satisfied they were with the program, 74.1% of respondents were satisfied with the application process for IRAP activities (Table 6). Fifty percent of respondents were dissatisfied with the availability of IRAP properties in their area, but were satisfied with the quality of private lands selected for IRAP sites (55.4%) and the quality of wildlife habitat on the properties (54.8%) (Table 6). Overall, 71% of respondents were satisfied with IRAP, 10% were dissatisfied, and 19% were neither (Figure 11). When asked if there were any activities in which
respondents would not participate if IRAP was not available, 26% reported that they would not participate in spring youth turkey hunting and 14% would not participate in naturalist activities (Figure 12).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Application process for IRAP activities ((n=274))</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>57.3</td>
<td>16.8</td>
<td>3.82</td>
<td>0.811</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lottery selection process for IRAP activities ((n=267))</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>47.9</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Availability of IRAP properties in your area ((n=274))</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>36.9</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>26.6</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>1.124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Timing of activities for IRAP properties ((n=271))</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>34.7</td>
<td>45.4</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of wildlife habitat on IRAP properties ((n=270))</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>7.8</td>
<td>35.6</td>
<td>40.4</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality of private lands selected for IRAP sites ((n=271))</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>8.1</td>
<td>36.2</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>3.62</td>
<td>0.856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Abundance of wildlife on IRAP properties ((n=271))</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>41.0</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>3.44</td>
<td>0.936</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\)1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied
Figure 11. Overall satisfaction with IRAP (n=277, 5-point scale 1=extremely dissatisfied, 5=extremely satisfied).

Figure 12. Activities in which respondents would not participate without IRAP (n=289). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
**IRAP and Hunting**

Eighty-nine percent of respondents considered themselves a hunter (Figure 13), have been hunting an average of 17 years, and 16 years in Illinois. Friends (58%), parents (51%), and myself (46%) were the most common people with whom participants hunted (Figure 14).

![Figure 13. Percentage of respondents who considered themselves a hunter (n=219).](image)

![Figure 14. People with whom respondents reported hunting (n=195).](image)
Respondents who hunted an IRAP site hunted an average of 1.64 IRAP sites in Illinois (n=132). Most IRAP hunters visited one IRAP site for one or more hunting activities (66.4%) and the other third of IRAP hunters visited different IRAP sites for hunting (Figure 15). Thirty percent of respondents reported harvesting game whereas hunting on IRAP property (Figure 16). Overall, 45% of hunters were satisfied with the number of shooting opportunities they had whereas hunting IRAP, 26% were dissatisfied, and 29% were neither satisfied nor dissatisfied (Figure 17).

Figure 15. How respondents described their use of IRAP (n=128).
Almost 70% of respondents participated in IRAP youth turkey hunting, and 57% of those would also apply for statewide turkey permits during seasons 3 and 4 if IRAP was not an option (Figures 18 & 19). About 80% of IRAP youth turkey hunters were somewhat, moderately, or extremely interested in the IRAP youth turkey season occurring later to avoid bad weather and/or Easter weekend (Figure 20).
Figure 20. Interest in having IRAP youth turkey season occurring later to avoid bad weather and/or Easter weekend (n=89, 5-point scale: 1=not at all interested, 5=extremely interested).

The majority of hunters (89.4%) who applied and received a Spring Youth Turkey Hunting IRAP Permit were either satisfied or extremely satisfied with the IRAP application process (Table 7). The same applied for the Archery Deer Hunting IRAP Permit; 84% of those who applied were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the process (Table 7). Those who applied and did not receive a permit for Spring Youth Turkey Hunting and Archery Deer Hunting were generally less satisfied (\(\bar{x}=3.33\) compared to \(\bar{x}=2.77\)) (Table 7).

When asked about interest in having youth waterfowl hunting as an IRAP activity, 81.4% of hunters showed some degree of interest, whereas the remaining 18.5% of respondents were not at all interested (Figure 21).
Table 7. Satisfaction rating with the IRAP application process.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Permit Type</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neutral (%)</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Mean (\bar{x})</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Youth Turkey Hunting IRAP Permit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.642</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied and received permit (n=57)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied and did not receive permit (n=6)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>3.33</td>
<td>1.211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Deer Hunting IRAP Permit</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>64.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>0.707</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied and received permit (n=25)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applied and did not receive (n=13)</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>46.2</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.77</td>
<td>1.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\) 5-point scale: 1=Extremely Dissatisfied, 5=Extremely Satisfied

Figure 21. Interest in having youth waterfowl hunting as an IRAP activity \(n=124, \bar{x}=3.48\). (5-point scale: 1=not at all interested; 5=extremely interested).
Almost all (98%) of respondents would still hunt in Illinois if IRAP was not available, however, approximately 40% would hunt less than they currently participate (Figures 22 & 23). If IRAP was not available, respondents would most likely hunt on public property (68%), private property owned by friends (39%), or private property not owned by themselves, family, or friends (29%) (Figure 24).

Figure 22. Percentage of respondents who would still hunt in Illinois if IRAP was not available (n=130).

Figure 23. How often respondents would hunt if IRAP was not available (n=124).
Forty-seven percent of respondents reported that they were either likely or extremely likely to seek permission to hunt private property that was not enrolled in IRAP (Table 8). Eighty-eight percent of hunters were likely to participate in additional IRAP activities, and the majority (86%) of respondents would recommend IRAP to a friend.

When asked about having a mentor program for IRAP hunters in need, 19% of respondents were uninterested, 53% were interested, and 28% were neither (Table 9). Forty percent of hunters were interested in having a mentor whereas hunting on IRAP properties, whereas 46% were interested in becoming a mentor for IRAP hunters in need (Table 9). Almost one-third of respondents (31%) were uninterested in having a mentor when hunting and 24% were uninterested in becoming a mentor (Table 9).
Eighty-seven percent of IRAP participants reported that they would be likely to participate in IRAP in the future, whereas 6.2% of respondents stated future participation would be unlikely (Figure 25). The most common reason for why future participation in IRAP is unlikely was that there are not enough IRAP properties close to home.

Table 8. Likelihood to perform the following actions regarding IRAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Likely (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Likely (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek permission to hunt private property not enrolled in IRAP (n=129)</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>36.4</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>13.2</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>1.213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Participate in additional IRAP activities (n=130)</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>38.5</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend IRAP to a friend (n=130)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>10.8</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>43.1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.827</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1=Extremely Unlikely, 5=Extremely Likely

Table 9. Interest level in the following actions regarding IRAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Extremely Uninterested (%)</th>
<th>Uninterested (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Interested (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Interested (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have a mentor program for IRAP hunters in need (n=131)</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>27.5</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3.46</td>
<td>1.025</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a mentor whereas hunting on IRAP properties (n=131)</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>22.9</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>3.08</td>
<td>1.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a mentor for IRAP hunters in need (n=131)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>30.5</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>3.34</td>
<td>1.012</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1=Extremely Uninterested, 5=Extremely Interested
Comparison Youth and Adult Hunters

Though most participants in both groups would continue to hunt in the absence of IRAP (Figure 26), we are unable to discern which species they would hunt. However, over 40% of youth hunters and 25% of adult hunters would have hunted less if it were not for IRAP lands (Figure 27). Additionally, over 50% of youth indicated they would not have participated in youth turkey hunts if not for IRAP (Figure 28). Of archery hunters 10% of adults said they would not have participated without IRAP (Figure 29). The difference between hunters who would continue to hunt and the number of hunters who would not hunt without IRAP illustrates how IRAP provides a variety of hunting opportunities for different species. Although a hunter may hunt a single species every year, IRAP allows hunters the opportunity to pursue a variety of species. In these cases Illinois hunters are using IRAP properties to hunt species they normally lack access to. Though they still hunt annually IRAP allows these hunters to hunt for species that are normally prohibited.
Figure 26. Percent of adults and youths who would still hunt without IRAP. ($\chi^2=0.878$, $p=0.349$)

Figure 27. Relative amount of hunting adult and youths would hunt without IRAP. ($\chi^2=9.873$, $p=0.043$, $V=0.229$)

Figure 28. Percent of youth who would participate in youth turkey if it were not for IRAP.

Figure 29. Percent of adults and youths who would participate in archery deer if not for IRAP. ($\chi^2=37.814$, $p<.001$, $V=0.375$)
When asked where they would hunt in the absence of IRAP property adults were more likely to indicate they would hunt on private land owned by a friend (Figure 30). Youth may have a more difficult time securing hunting areas close to home than adults. Access may help explain why youths are more likely to report they would hunt less in the absence of IRAP (Figure 27). This could also explain why youth were more likely to be satisfied with the proximity of IRAP properties (Figure 31).

![Figure 30. Percent of adults and youths who would hunt private property owned by a friend if IRAP was not available. (χ²=17.586, p<.001, V=0.248)](image)

![Figure 31. Percent of adults and youths satisfied with the availability of IRAP property in their area. (χ²=25.212 p<.001, V=0.304)](image)

Youths had the highest rate of overall satisfaction (Figure 32). They were more likely to state they were satisfied with abundance of wildlife (Figure 33), quality of habitat (Figure 34), and quality of IRAP lands chosen (Figure 35). Whereas, adults were more likely to indicate that they were neither satisfied or dissatisfied. Youth perceptions of quality may not be as refined or high as adults. However, satisfaction with these variables is highly important to cultivate and continue interest in hunting as a recreation. Satisfaction with any recreation is vital as youths explore which recreation options to pursue.
Figure 32. Adult and youth overall satisfaction with IRAP. 
($\chi^2=20.07$, $p<.001, V=0.270$)

Figure 33. Percentage of adults and youths satisfied with the abundance of wildlife on IRAP habitat properties. 
($\chi^2=31.402$, $p<.001, V=0.341$)

Figure 34. Percentage of youths and adults satisfied with the quality of IRAP habitat where they hunted. 
($\chi^2=37.814$, $p<.001, V=0.375$)

Figure 35. Percentage of adults and youths satisfied with the quality of private lands selected for IRAP property. 
($\chi^2=20.392$, $p<.001, V=0.275$)

The greatest potential to use IRAP as a recruitment tool will depend on programs targeting youth. Youth hunters were significantly more likely to respond that they had applied to IRAP in their attempt to try hunting for the first time (Figure 36). Additionally, youth were more
likely to participate in IRAP in the future (Figure 37). Though more youth than adults expressed an interest in participating in additional IRAP activities the difference was not statistically significant (Figure 38).

Figure 36. Percent of adults and youths who applied to IRAP to try hunting for the first time. ($\chi^2=22.475$, $p<.001$, $V=0.286$)

Figure 37. Likelihood that adults and youths will participate in IRAP in the future. ($\chi^2=10.955$, $p=.027$, $V=0.206$)

Figure 38. Likelihood that adults and youths will participate in other additional IRAP activities. ($\chi^2=7.353$, $p=.196$)
Discussion

Results of the survey of participants strongly suggests IRAP is providing private land access and opportunities for hunting and other forms of recreation. Though the program is not recruiting new hunters it allowing some access to privately areas. Generally, IRAP was rated highly among participants. Overall satisfaction on a 5-point scale was $\bar{x} = 3.84$, and over 85% of respondents would recommend IRAP to a friend. Almost 90% of respondents said they were likely to participate in a future IRAP activity.

IRAP participants were in agreement that IRAP is beneficial for Illinois and beneficial to them personally. The program creates new opportunities to hunt and recreate on private land, by opening areas that had been previously reserved to friends and neighbors of the landowners. The program is drawing those that were previously relying on public lands and is needed to improve recreation access to private lands. Generally, respondents were satisfied with the application process for program activities but were not satisfied with the availability of IRAP properties in their area. A lack of IRAP properties available close to home was also the most common reason for unlikely future IRAP participation, but it is important to note that uncertain future participation was cited by a minority of respondents. Although most hunters would still hunt in Illinois if IRAP was not available, 40% indicated they would hunt less than they do now without the program. About one fourth of respondents indicated they would not participate in spring youth turkey hunting without IRAP.

Respondents were in favor of having IRAP youth turkey season occurring later to avoid bad weather and/or Easter weekend, as well as introducing youth waterfowl hunting as an IRAP activity. Over half of hunters were interested in having a mentor program for IRAP hunters in need. The best example of the IRAP programs ability to recruit new hunters may lie in the youth
turkey program as over 40% would not have participated if it were not for IRAP. The popularity of this use of IRAP lands may be useful in recruiting new hunters through a series of mentorship programs. A program that focuses on learning hunting skills through small game hunts could increase IRAP’s ability to recruit new hunters.

Although respondents typically preferred to access private land over public land for outdoor recreation, public property was the type of land used most often. Many hunters reported that it was difficult to gain access to private properties for recreating, and were often unsuccessful in their attempts to gain private land access. Almost all respondents believed that some type of recreation program is needed to improve access to private land in Illinois.
2. IRAP Landowner Survey

Results

We sampled 75 IRAP landowners for this study, and 3 individuals were removed as addresses undeliverable. This left a usable sample of 72 individuals. We received 59 usable questionnaires for an 82% response rate.

Landowner Profile

Respondents were mostly male (94.8%) (Figure 39), and had an average age of 58 (±12.073, $n=58$) years old. Less than half of landowners (42.4%) were living on the property enrolled in IRAP, and were often the sole-decision maker on the private property or shared decision making with their spouse (Figures 40 & 41). IRAP properties were located in 23 counties in Illinois; according to respondents, the most common counties containing IRAP properties were Macoupin, Fulton, Pike, Schuyler, and Sangamon ($n=58$). The majority (59.0%) of respondents’ private land made up only 0-10% of their total net household income (Figure 42).
Figure 39. Gender distribution of landowners (n=58).

- Male: 94.8%
- Female: 5.2%

Figure 40. Percentage of respondents who lived on the property enrolled in IRAP (n=59).

- Yes: 57.6%
- No: 42.4%

Figure 41. Primary decision-makers on IRAP properties (n=59).

- I am the sole decision-maker: 54.2%
- Share decision-making with spouse: 23.7%
- Share decision-making with relatives: 15.3%
- Share decision-making with non-family business partner: 6.8%
The most common IRAP activity allowed on respondents’ properties was spring youth turkey hunting (93.2%), followed by naturalist activities (27.1%) and first-time adult turkey hunting (20.3%) (Figure 43). The top three reasons why respondents chose to enroll their land in IRAP were to provide hunting and recreation opportunities, receive financial incentives, and improve habitat for wildlife (64.4%, 62.7%, and 61.0%, respectively) (Figure 44).
Figure 43. IRAP activities allowed on property since programs’ inception in 2011 (n=59). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)

Figure 44. Reasons for choosing to enroll properties in IRAP (n=59). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)

Ninety-five percent of respondents reported that they were currently enrolled in IRAP (Figure 45). Three respondents reported they were not currently enrolled in IRAP; two of those
respondents indicated that they were dissatisfied with the program, whereas the third indicated they wanted to be in control of all activities performed their property.

Before and After IRAP Enrollment

Slightly less than one-third (61.4%) of landowners reported they had concerns about enrolling their land in IRAP; however, 88.6% of these property owners felt that these concerns were adequately addressed (Figures 46 & 47). Behaviors of hunters and other recreationists on their land, personal liability, and the use and possible damage to the property were among the top concerns of respondents (Figure 48). Other concerns landowners reported included people littering or driving where not permitted (2.9%), trespassing (2.9%), and not knowing who or when people might be on their property (2.9%).
Figure 46. Percentage of respondents who had concerns about enrolling in IRAP ($n=57$).

Figure 47. Percentage of respondents who felt their concerns were adequately addressed ($n=35$).

Figure 48. Respondents’ concerns about enrolling in IRAP ($n=35$).
(Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
Almost 90% of respondents have denied access to hunters asking for permission to hunt on their land (Figure 49). Respondents were asked how often they would deny hunting access on their property, using a 7-point scale. The scale was reduced to a 3-point scale, with respondents denying hunting access on their property infrequently, frequently, or always. Responses were somewhat evenly distributed; 32.4% infrequently denied hunting. 38.2% frequently denying hunting, and 29.4% always denying hunting. Sixty-eight percent of respondents allowed hunters to access their property before enrolling in IRAP (Figure 50).

![Figure 49. Percentage of respondents who have ever denied access to hunters asking for permission to hunt their property (n=55).](image1)

![Figure 50. Percentage of respondents who allowed hunters to access their property before enrolling in IRAP (n=40).](image2)

A majority (77.8%) of landowners allowed 1 to 5 people to hunt on their property before IRAP, but after enrollment, 34.5% of landowners did not know how many people hunted on their property (Figure 51). Before and after IRAP enrollment, landowners reported that they, friends, neighbors, and family most commonly hunted on the property (Figures 52 & 53).
Figure 51. The number of people allowed to hunt on the respondents’ property each year before and after IRAP enrollment.

Figure 52. Types of people allowed to hunt on property before IRAP enrollment (n=27). (Percentages are greater than 100 because respondents selected all that applied.)

Figure 53. Types of people allowed to hunt on property after IRAP enrollment (n=59). (Percentages are greater than 100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
Prior to IRAP enrollment deer was the most common game hunted on landowner property (96.3%) (Figure 54). After enrollment in IRAP turkey became the most common species hunted (81.5%) (Figure 54). Those who had previously allowed hunting on their property were more likely to allow 2 or more types of hunting. Those who were new to allowing hunting generally allowed only 1, which was mostly turkey. Also following enrolling in IRAP, respondents perceived less need to contact an Illinois DNR Conservation Officer with problems on their property involving hunters, and almost 90% never need to do so after enrolling in IRAP. This percentage is 61% higher compared to 56% of landowners who stated they never felt the need to contact a CPO before enrolling in IRAP (Figure 55). In addition, landowners who felt the need to contact a CPO infrequently declined from 40.7% before IRAP enrollment to 3.4% afterward.
Figure 54. The type of game hunted on respondents’ properties before and after IRAP enrollment (Percentages are greater than 100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
When asked about their satisfaction with hunters who hunted their property, close to 90% of landowners were “satisfied” or “extremely satisfied” both before and after IRAP enrollment (Figure 56). Slightly more than one-third (38.2%) of respondents reported that, following enrollment, they were extremely satisfied, whereas only 12% were extremely satisfied prior to enrollment (Figure 56). Only 4.0% before and 1.8% after IRAP enrollment reported being dissatisfied with hunters who hunted their property (Figure 56).

Eighty-five percent of respondents indicated that they hunt about the same amount now as they did before enrolling their land in IRAP, whereas 12.5% reported hunting less often (Figure 57).
Figure 56. Satisfaction rating of respondents with the hunters who hunted their property before and after IRAP enrollment.

Figure 57. Amount of time hunting own property compared to years before enrollment in IRAP (n=40, 5-point scale: 1=much less often, 5=much more often).
**IRAP Experience**

Respondents indicated whether or not they were satisfied with the service they received from IDNR representatives regarding IRAP; 91.2% were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the service received (Table 10). Eighty-six percent of respondents were satisfied to some degree with the procedures required for participation in the IRAP program, and 84% were satisfied with the amount of communications between themselves and IDNR representatives (Table 10).

Table 10. Satisfaction level for respondents experience with IRAP (5-point scale, 1=Extremely Dissatisfied; 5=Extremely Satisfied).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service you received from the IDNR representatives for IRAP (n=57)</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Dissatisfied (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied (%)</th>
<th>Mean ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>4.39</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procedures required for participation in the IRAP program (n=57)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>43.9</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amount of communication between yourself and IDNR representative for IRAP (n=57)</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>35.1</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>4.25</td>
<td>0.931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service and professionalism of persons who performed habitat work on your IRAP property (n=54)</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.8</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>48.1</td>
<td>4.22</td>
<td>0.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Behavior of hunters/recreationists who have visited your IRAP property (n=54)</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>63.0</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>4.06</td>
<td>0.763</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, 90% of landowners rated their experience with IRAP somewhere between good and excellent (Figure 58). When asked about to value habitat improvements made on the property whereas enrolled in IRAP, 58% of respondents valued them high or very high, 31% valued them low or moderate, and 10% found the improvements not at all valuable (Figure 59).

Figure 58. Overall experience with IRAP ($n=57$, $\bar{x}=5.89$, $\sigma=1.291$).

Figure 59. Value of habitat improvements made on property whereas enrolled in IRAP ($n=48$).
One-hundred percent of IRAP participants responded that none of their neighbors complained about IRAP hunters or other recreationists behavior on the enrolled property during or after the season ($n=56$). Most landowners were satisfied with the timing of IRAP activities during their enrollment (86%), and 37% of landowners had recommendations for the program (Figures 60 & 61).

![Figure 60. Satisfaction level with the timing of IRAP activities during enrollment ($n=55$; 5-point scale: 1=extremely dissatisfied, 5=extremely satisfied)](image)

![Figure 61. Percentage of respondents who have recommendations for IRAP ($n=57$).](image)
Of those who had recommendations for IRAP, the most commonly mentioned recommendation was a way for landowners to know when hunters are signed up to hunt on the property (19%) (Figure 62). Other recommendations included knowing names of the hunters on their property, property access, participant behavior, and parking (each response received 14% of respondents) (Figure 62).

![Figure 62. Recommendations for IRAP program (n=21). (Percentages are greater than 100 because respondents selected all that applied.)](image)

One-hundred percent of respondents did not know of any incidents that were handled by an IDNR Conservation Officer regarding their IRAP property. Slightly less than half (48%) of respondents were contacted by an IDNR representative to check on how the program was progressing from the landowner’s perspective. Three quarters of respondents felt that regular follow-up from IRAP personnel was important (Figure 63 & 64). Overall, landowners were 93.2% satisfied with IRAP, 3.4% were dissatisfied, and 3.4% were neither (Figure 65).
Figure 63. Percentage of respondents who were contacted this year by an IDNR representative to “check in” on how things were going (n=58).

Yes 71.7%  No 48.3%

Figure 64. Importance of a regular “check in” by an IDNR representative (n=57, 5-point scale: 1=extremely unimportant, 5=extremely important).

Unimportant 8.8%  Neither 15.8%  Important 75.4%

Figure 65. Satisfaction rating with IRAP (n=58, 5-point scale: 1=extremely dissatisfied, 5=extremely satisfied)

Dissatisfied 3.4%  Neither 3.4%  Satisfied 93.2%
A majority (91.4%) of respondents reported that they were likely or extremely likely to recommend a friend to enroll in IRAP (Table 11). The mean score on a 5-point scale (extremely unlikely to extremely likely) was $\bar{x} = 4.26$ for respondents’ likeliness to re-enroll in IRAP (Table 11). Thirty-eight percent were likely to enroll additional acres in IRAP, 36% were unlikely, and 26% of respondents were neither likely nor unlikely to enroll additional acres (Table 11).

Table 11. Likelihood of performing the following actions involving IRAP. (5-point scale: 1=Extremely Unlikely, 5= Extremely Likely)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Likely (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Likely (%)</th>
<th>Mean ($\bar{x}$)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ($\sigma$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend a friend to enroll in IRAP ($n=58$)</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>34.5</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>0.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Re-enrolling in IRAP ($n=57$)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>47.4</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>4.26</td>
<td>0.813</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enroll additional acres in IRAP ($n=55$)</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.02</td>
<td>1.240</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Eighty-nine percent of landowners agreed to some extent that IRAP has provided additional hunting opportunities, and 86% agreed that IRAP has introduced new hunters to the sport of hunting (Table 12). Almost half (47.3%) of respondents neither agreed nor disagreed that IRAP has decreased the number of hunters leaving the sport, but 65% of respondents disagreed that IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters in Illinois.
Table 12. Level of agreement or disagreement with statements about IRAP. (5-point scale: 1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean ((\bar{X}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has introduced new hunters to the sport of hunting ((n=56))</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>51.8</td>
<td>33.9</td>
<td>4.18</td>
<td>0.716</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has provided additional hunting opportunities ((n=56))</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>46.4</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>4.30</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has decreased the number of hunters leaving the sport ((n=55))</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>10.9</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>0.940</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has provided hunting opportunities to the same people who hunted my property ((n=55))</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>38.2</td>
<td>12.7</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>2.53</td>
<td>1.086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has displaced hunters who previously hunted my property ((n=54))</td>
<td>35.2</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>2.02</td>
<td>1.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters in Illinois ((n=54))</td>
<td>25.9</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>2.11</td>
<td>0.816</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Discussion

Landowners participating in IRAP reported that they were satisfied with the program. 90% of landowners rated their experience with IRAP somewhere between good and excellent. The majority of respondents (91.4%) reported that they were likely to recommend a friend to enroll in IRAP, and 89% were likely to reenroll in the program. Almost all (95%) landowner respondents were currently enrolled in IRAP at the time of this study. Although slightly less than two-thirds of landowners had concerns prior enrolling their land in IRAP, 87% of them felt their concerns were addressed. These concerns included behavior of recreationists on their property, personal liability, and possible damage to their property. After IRAP enrollment, landowners needed to contact IDNR Conservation Officers about problems involving hunters on their property less than before enrollment. Overall, respondents had a higher level of satisfaction with hunters who hunted their property after enrolling in IRAP.

Many respondents chose to enroll their land because they wanted to provide hunting opportunities, receive financial incentives, and improve habitat for wildlife. Seventy-nine percent of landowners valued habitat improvements made on the property through IRAP enrollment as moderate, high, or very high. Over 90% of respondents were satisfied or extremely satisfied with the service received from IDNR representatives, and 84% were satisfied with the amount of communications with IDNR representatives. Seventy-five percent of respondents felt that a regular “check in” by an IDNR representative is important; however, slightly less than half (48%) of respondents were contacted during the 12-month period prior to this study.

The majority of landowners allowed spring youth turkey hunting on their property. Deer was the most common species hunted on landowners’ properties before IRAP. Turkey was most common after IRAP, most likely due to the Spring Youth Turkey Hunting program.
Many landowners reported that, prior to enrollment, they have denied access to hunters asking for permission on their property, but 68% have allowed hunters on their property prior to IRAP enrollment. Friends, neighbors, and family were the most common people that were allowed to hunt on their property, typically only 1-5 people a year. After enrolling in IRAP, 35% of respondents were not sure the number of people that hunted on their property. Some recommendations landowners had for the program were knowing when hunters are signed up to hunt, knowing names of the hunters on their property, property access, participant behavior, and parking.
3. Illinois Statewide Recreationist Survey

Results

We surveyed 3,000 Illinois resident hunting license purchasers; 141 were removed as undeliverable, which reduced the sample to 2,859. We received 1,160 usable questionnaires for a 41% response rate.

Recreationist Profile

Respondents were mostly male (89.0%) (Figure 66), had lived in Illinois an average of 45 years, and were an average of 50 years old. Eighty-seven percent of respondents reported they had internet access. Most respondents lived in a rural area (36.1%) or small town (24.8%) (Figure 67). Approximately 32% of respondents had a total gross household income of $90,000 or more, whereas 55% had a household income of less than $75,000 (Figure 68).

Figure 66. Gender distribution of respondents (n=1156).
Outdoor Recreation in Illinois

The most popular outdoor recreational activities reported were fishing (85%) and hunting (78%). Twenty-eight percent of respondents reported having children under the age of 18 living at home. The most common outdoor activities children participated in were fishing (83%) and camping (63%) (Figure 69 & 70).
Eighty-five percent of respondents ranked fishing as either moderately or very important, and 81% ranked hunting as moderately or very important (Table 13). The most frequented types of land that recreationists in Illinois used were public lands (34%) and private property owned by someone else (34%) (Figure 71).
Table 13. Importance rankings for recreational activities.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not at all important (%)</th>
<th>Slightly important (%)</th>
<th>Moderately important (%)</th>
<th>Very important (%)</th>
<th>I do not participate (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>70.3</td>
<td>11.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>20.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birding</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>20.7</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>7.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>42.3</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 71. The type of land used most often for hunting or recreation purposes ($n=778$).
About 56% of respondents agreed that it was difficult to find places to hunt or recreate in Illinois, and 70% agreed that gaining access to private properties was difficult (Table 14). Three-quarters (75.6%) of recreationists agreed that landowners have become less willing to grant permission to access their land; 13% of respondents agreed that it was easy to establish and maintain private landowner contacts. Over half (56%) of recreationists agreed that some type of hunter/recreation program was needed to improve access to private land.

Table 14. Recreationists’ level of agreement with statements regarding land access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean* (x̄)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (σ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to find places to hunt/recreate in Illinois (n=1130)</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>36.8</td>
<td>18.7</td>
<td>3.40</td>
<td>1.181</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to gain access to private properties (n=1125)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>29.6</td>
<td>3.86</td>
<td>1.017</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have become less willing to grant permission (n=1120)</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>39.7</td>
<td>35.9</td>
<td>4.05</td>
<td>0.900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to establish and maintain private landowner contacts (n=1104)</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>32.8</td>
<td>38.9</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.52</td>
<td>0.979</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some type of hunter/recreation program is needed to improve access to private land (n=1118)</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>1.188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree
**IRAP Participation**

Eighty-four percent of recreationists surveyed were not aware of IRAP before receiving the study questionnaire (Figure 72). Of the respondents who were already aware of IRAP, most heard of the program through the IDNR website (57%) or a friend (33%) (Figure 73). The National Wildlife Turkey Federation (NWTF) was another way 12% of respondents heard about IRAP (Figure 73).

![Figure 72. Percentage of respondents who were aware of IRAP before this survey (n=1144).](image)

![Figure 73. How respondents became aware of IRAP (n=186).](image)
Of those who were aware of IRAP, 8% of respondents reported that they have applied to access IRAP properties and were not selected (Figure 74). More than half (62%) reapplied after not being selected (Figure 75). About 68% of hunters have attempted to hunt on private land in Illinois (Figure 76).

Figure 74. Percentage of respondents who have applied to access IRAP properties and have not been selected (n=186).

Figure 75. Respondents who reapplied to access IRAP properties after not being selected (n=13).

Figure 76. Respondents who have ever attempted to hunt on private land in Illinois (n=1121).
Recreationists in Illinois generally preferred to access private land over public land for outdoor recreation (69%) (Table 15). About one-third of recreationists agreed that they have been unsuccessful in their attempts to gain private land access, whereas one-third disagreed, and one-third neither agreed nor disagreed. Sixty-three percent of respondents agreed that public land used for hunting or recreation was too crowded.

Although 27% of respondents agreed or strongly agreed that IRAP is beneficial to them personally, over half (63.2%) agreed to some degree that IRAP is beneficial for the state of Illinois (Table 16). Fifty-nine percent of recreationists neither agreed nor disagreed with the statement “IRAP decreases the number of hunters that are leaving the sport”, whereas 28% agreed or strongly agreed (Table 16). Just over half (52%) of respondents agreed that IRAP is needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands, whereas 39% neither agreed nor disagreed (Table 16).

Table 15. Level of agreement with statements regarding IRAP land access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to access private land over public land for outdoor recreation</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>42.1</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>3.84</td>
<td>0.972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((n=917))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t have time to meet with private landowners to obtain access to</td>
<td>11.5</td>
<td>36.1</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.68</td>
<td>1.034</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>private land ((n=911))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been unsuccessful in my attempts to gain private land access</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>25.5</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>1.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((n=905))</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public land for hunting/recreation is too crowded ((n=906))</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>37.6</td>
<td>25.8</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>1.006</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree
Table 16. Level of agreement with statements regarding IRAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean$^a$ ($\bar{x}$)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ($\sigma$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial to me personally ($n=1087$)</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>12.1</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial for Illinois ($n=1085$)</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>31.4</td>
<td>46.1</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP causes more hunters/recreationists to lease places for themselves ($n=1069$)</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>8.6</td>
<td>64.1</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.706</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands ($n=1079$)</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>39.3</td>
<td>40.2</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>3.51</td>
<td>0.895</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP decreases the number of hunters that are leaving the sport ($n=1071$)</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>58.5</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>0.787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP creates new opportunities to hunt/recreate on private land ($n=1073$)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>46.5</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>3.58</td>
<td>0.756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters/recreationists ($n=1072$)</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>21.5</td>
<td>64.5</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.82</td>
<td>0.692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When landowners enroll in IRAP, hunters lose access to sites ($n=1073$)</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td>63.8</td>
<td>11.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.90</td>
<td>0.729</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

On a 7-point scale, the mean score for overall IRAP support was $\bar{x}=3.95$; two-thirds (64.3\%) of respondents reported somewhere between “Somewhat supportive” and “Moderately supportive” (Figure 77).
Figure 77. Overall level of support for IRAP (n=1033, 7-point scale: 1=not at all supportive, 7=extremely supportive.

IRAP and Hunting

Respondents reported hunting an average of 31 years, and an average of 29 years in Illinois. Ninety-two percent of hunters reported hunting in Illinois during the 2015-16 seasons. Over three-fourths (78.4%) of respondents considered themselves a hunter (Figure 78).

Figure 78. Percentage of respondents who consider themselves a hunter (n=1114).
Respondents were asked to rate a series of hunting questions on a scale of 1-7, with one being strongly disagree and seven being strongly agree. In response to the statement “Hunting is one of the most important activities in my life,” 87% of respondents agreed to some extent (Table 17). Three-quarters of respondents slightly to strongly agreed that they spent a lot of time in the off-season planning for hunting.

Table 17. Level of agreement with statements regarding attitudes toward hunting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Unsure (%)</th>
<th>Slightly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean $^a$ ($\bar{x}$)</th>
<th>Std. Deviation ($\sigma$)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting is one of the most important activities in my life ($n=863$)</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>32.9</td>
<td>5.68</td>
<td>1.396</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend a lot of time in the off-season planning for hunting ($n=862$)</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>29.9</td>
<td>25.4</td>
<td>19.3</td>
<td>5.06</td>
<td>1.586</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I plan vacation time around hunting seasons ($n=862$)</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>5.01</td>
<td>1.915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hunting determines much of my lifestyle ($n=861$)</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>23.3</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>17.9</td>
<td>4.68</td>
<td>1.844</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I spend a lot of time before the season scouting the area I will hunt ($n=863$)</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>9.2</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>1.683</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would rather hunt than do any other recreation ($n=865$)</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>9.9</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>20.1</td>
<td>23.7</td>
<td>4.80</td>
<td>1.877</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

$^a$1=Strongly Disagree, 7=Strongly Agree
Approximately 75% of respondents reported that they hunted with family, 70% hunted with friends, and 60% hunted by themselves (Figure 79). Deer was the most commonly hunted species (87%) followed by small game (57%), turkey (43%), upland birds (42%), predators (41%), dove (40%), and waterfowl (26%) (Figure 80).

Figure 79. People who respondents reported hunting with (n=873).
Slightly less than half of hunters (45%) traveled between 1-25 miles to hunt and almost 30% traveled over 50 miles (Figure 81). Game species hunted less now than 5 years ago, included small game (34%), dove (25%), but 24% reported “None” (Figure 82).
Figure 82. Types of game hunted less now than five years ago (n=873).

Reasons cited most for decreased hunting effort included lack of time (38%), no land to hunt on (36%), and not enough game (29%) (Figure 83). Deer, both archery and shotgun, was the most commonly reported species hunted more now than five years ago (Figure 84). Slightly more than 30% of respondents indicated that there were no species hunted more now than five years ago. Of those who have increased their hunting effort, the most commonly reported reasons were increased free time (30%), availability of land to hunt (21%), and increased interest (20%) (Figure 85).

Respondents were asked what they felt was the single greatest problem contributing to the decline in hunting. “Not enough land” was the top response (27%), followed by “declining game species” (18%), and “not enough time” (15%) (Figure 86).
Figure 83. Reasons for decreased hunting effort ($n=873$).
Figure 84. Types of game hunted more now than five years ago ($n=873$).

Figure 85. Reasons for increased hunting effort ($n=873$).
Figure 86. What respondents feel is the single greatest problem that contributes to the decline in hunting ($n=855$).

Over half (65%) of respondents reported that they have been denied access for hunting private land in Illinois (Figure 87). Respondents were asked how often they were denied access, using a 7-point scale. The scale was reduced to a 3-point scale, with respondents getting denied hunting access infrequently, frequently, or always. Thirty-seven percent of respondents have been denied access infrequently, 52% have been denied access frequently, and 12% have been denied access always ($n=560$). Some of the reasons why recreationists believed they were denied permission include “other hunters had permission” (38%), “liability concerns” (36%), “previous bad experience with hunters” (31%), and “no one was allowed to hunt the property” (27%) (Figure 88). Eighty-three percent of hunters have paid a property owner to hunt private land in Illinois (Figure 89).
Figure 87. Percentage of respondents who have ever been denied access for hunting private land in Illinois (n=858).

Figure 88. Why recreationists believe they were denied permission to hunt private land (n=873). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
Approximately 15% of hunters reported that they have taken a youth turkey hunting during an Illinois Youth Turkey Hunt (Figure 90). When asked about the youth turkey dates, 49% of respondents reported that they moderately or extremely supported having the season later to avoid bad weather and/or Easter weekend. Thirty-nine percent of hunters slightly or somewhat supported this change, and 12% did not support it (Figure 91). More than half (61%) of the respondents moderately or extremely supported allowing youth turkey hunters to hunt during all 5 regular spring turkey seasons until the youth hunter was able to harvest a turkey with their youth turkey permit; twenty-seven percent of hunters were slightly or somewhat supportive, and 12% did not support this at all (Figure 92).

Half of respondents indicated that they would likely seek permission to hunt private property not enrolled in IRAP, whereas 28% reported that they were unlikely to do this (Table 18). Thirty-eight percent of recreationsits were likely, 21% unlikely, and 42% neither likely nor unlikely to recommend IRAP to a friend (Table 18).
Figure 90. Percentage of respondents who have ever taken a youth turkey hunting during an Illinois Youth Turkey Hunt ($n=848$).

Figure 91. Support of Illinois youth turkey season occurring later to avoid bad weather and/or Easter weekend ($n=407$, 5-point scale: 1 = “Do not at all support,” 5 = “Extremely support”).
Figure 92. Support of allowing youth turkey hunters to hunt during all 5 regular spring turkey seasons until the youth hunter is able to harvest a turkey with their youth turkey permit (n=409).

Table 18. Likelihood to perform the following actions regarding IRAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Likely (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Likely (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{X}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Seek permission to hunt private property not enrolled in IRAP (n=835)</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>3.27</td>
<td>1.216</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recommend IRAP to a friend (n=824)</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>13.1</td>
<td>41.5</td>
<td>29.1</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>1.022</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1=Extremely Unlikely, 5=Extremely Likely

The majority of respondents moderately or extremely supported allowing youth archery deer hunting (62%) and youth waterfowl hunting (61%) as IRAP activities. Only 8% of respondents did not support either of these becoming IRAP activities (Figures 93 & 94).
Figure 93. Support for allowing youth archery deer hunting as an IRAP activity ($n=833$).

Figure 94. Support for allowing youth waterfowl hunting as an IRAP activity ($n=832$).
A minority (9%) of Illinois recreationists wanted to participate in IRAP because they wanted to try hunting for the first time (Table 19). Forty-four percent of respondents wanted to participate in IRAP to find private access for outdoor activities in Illinois, and 47% wanted to participate to hunt or recreate in new places in Illinois (Table 19).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean (\bar{X})</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (σ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to participate in IRAP because I want to try hunting for the first time ((n=1056))</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>1.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to participate in IRAP to find private access for outdoor activities in Illinois ((n=1084))</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>29.8</td>
<td>14.2</td>
<td>3.22</td>
<td>1.201</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to participate in IRAP to hunt/recreate new places in Illinois ((n=1087))</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>8.8</td>
<td>31.1</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>1.212</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(a\=1=\text{Strongly Disagree}, \ 5=\text{Strongly Agree}\)

Participants were asked about their likelihood to participate in IRAP in the future; 41% reported that they were likely to participate, 34% were unlikely, and 25% were neither (Figure 95). Of the respondents who were likely to participate in IRAP, 55% were interested in archery deer hunting, 53% were interested in sport fishing, and 53% were interested in small game hunting (Figure 96). Sixty-eight percent of respondents would hunt more often in Illinois if IRAP participation was likely, whereas 30% reported they would hunt the same amount (Figure 97).
Figure 95. Likelihood to participate in IRAP in the future ($n=1091$).

Figure 96. IRAP activities respondents are interested in ($n=450$).
Thirty-four percent of recreationists indicated that they were interested in having a mentor program for IRAP hunters in need, whereas 26% were not interested and 40% were neither interested nor not interested (Table 20). A quarter of respondents were interested in having a mentor when hunting on IRAP properties and 18% were interested in becoming a mentor (Table 20). The most common reasons why participation in IRAP was unlikely were lack of free time (26%) and lack of interest (25%) (Figure 98).

Table 20. Interest level in the following actions regarding a mentor program for IRAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Extremely Uninterested (%)</th>
<th>Uninterested (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Interested (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Interested (%)</th>
<th>Mean* ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Have a mentor program for IRAP hunters in need ((n=1064))</td>
<td>9.8</td>
<td>15.9</td>
<td>39.9</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>3.06</td>
<td>1.050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have a mentor whereas hunting on IRAP properties ((n=1060))</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>20.3</td>
<td>42.7</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>2.85</td>
<td>1.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a mentor for IRAP hunters in need ((n=1057))</td>
<td>17.7</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>42.4</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>2.65</td>
<td>1.061</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*1=Extremely Uninterested, 5=Extremely Interested
Figure 98. Reasons why participation in IRAP is unlikely (n=365).
(Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
Discussion

This study of statewide hunters allows for a better understanding of awareness of and support for IRAP. Recreationists in Illinois were primarily involved in fishing and hunting, and ranked these as important activities to them. They usually recreated on public or private land that was owned by someone else, and often found it difficult to gain access to private land. Most respondents indicated that they generally preferred to access private land over public land for recreation, and over half of the respondents agreed to some extent that some type of hunter recreation program was needed to improve access to private land.

A minority of survey respondents were aware of IRAP before receiving the questionnaire. This finding suggests a need for increasing awareness of the program. A majority of those who were aware of IRAP became familiar with it through the IDNR website or a friend. This low awareness may reflect the limited geographic extent of the program to date, combined with the proportion of hunters who depend entirely on public lands. The finding that 92% of those who applied to access IRAP properties were selected is positive and may help promote the program among other hunters. Moreover, that 63% of all respondents agreed to some degree that IRAP was beneficial for the state of Illinois and 82% were somewhat to extremely supportive of the program is indicative that support for the program exists on a statewide basis. One of the most popular responses to the question “What do you feel is the single greatest problem that contributes to the decline in hunting?” was “Not enough land” (27%). Sixty-five percent of hunters reported that they have been denied hunting access on private land, and 83% said that they have paid property owners to hunt private land. These findings are consistent with results of other studies in Illinois that point to lack of access as the leading cause of hunter attrition in the state (Miller and Vaske 2003).
Survey respondents generally were supportive of expanding opportunities offered by IRAP, especially youth archery deer and youth waterfowl hunting. Further, a strong plurality were likely to participate in future IRAP activities. Archery deer hunting, sport fishing, and small game hunting were among the top IRAP activities in which respondents were most interested. Findings suggest IRAP can be a means to increase hunter participation, as a majority of respondents indicated that they would hunt more if they participated in IRAP. The most common reason why respondents were unlikely to participate in IRAP was lack of free time – this is consistent with other studies conducted in Illinois (Miller et al. 2001, Alessi et al. 2013). Lack of time can be attributed to not only time for actual participation, but associated travel time to access sites and time required to locate lands open to hunting. Providing access to private lands within an acceptable range of hunters’ homes will add to the program’s appeal. In conclusion, findings of this study suggest support for IRAP among hunters in Illinois.
4. Illinois Statewide Landowner Survey

Results

Of the 1,000 Illinois landowners in our initial mailing, 60 were removed as undeliverable for a sample of 940. We received 400 usable questionnaires, resulting in a 43% response rate.

Landowner Profile

Approximately three-quarters (73.8%) of respondents were male (Figure 99), and averaged 69 years of age. Forty-seven percent of respondents shared private property decision making with their spouse, whereas 39% were the sole decision-maker (Figure 100). One-quarter of landowners indicated that 10% or less of their gross household income came from their private land, whereas another quarter of respondents reported 76%-100% of their income came from their private land (Figure 101).

![Figure 99. Gender distribution of respondents (n=386).](image)
Figure 100. The primary decision maker on the private property owned ($n=400$).

Figure 101. Approximate percentage of total net household income that comes from owned private property ($n=378$).
The average acres owned by respondents was 248.5 acres \((n=286)\) and the average number of parcels owned was 4. Most respondents’ private land was reported as agricultural fields (90%), followed by forest (45%) and pasture (43%) (Figure 102). Fifty-two percent reported that farming was their primary source of income and 38% had livestock on their property (Figures 103 & 104).

![Figure 102. Types of land-cover that best describes private property \((n=400)\). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)](image)

![Figure 103. Percentage of respondents who reported that farming is their primary source of income \((n=400)\).](image)

![Figure 104. Percentage of respondents who have livestock on their property \((n=400)\).](image)
In terms of conservation practices performed by respondents, the most common practices included grassed waterways (83%), filter strips (29%), cover crops (27%), and tree plantings (27%) (Figures 105 & 106).

Figure 105. Percentage of respondents who perform any conservation management practices on their property (*n*=372).

Figure 106. Conservation practices performed by respondents (*n*=272).
Thirty-two percent of respondents reported that they currently participated in the Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) (Table 21). Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) and the Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) were the next highest for respondent participation (6% and 4%, respectively).

Table 21. Respondent participation in various USDA and Illinois state conservation programs, in order of participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Never participated (%)</th>
<th>Participated in the past, but not now (%)</th>
<th>Currently participate, but will not renew (%)</th>
<th>Currently participate and will renew (%)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserve Program (CRP) (n=344)</td>
<td>52.6</td>
<td>15.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP) (n=281)</td>
<td>90.7</td>
<td>2.8</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP) (n=274)</td>
<td>93.1</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Acres for Wildlife Enhancement (SAFE) (n=274)</td>
<td>95.6</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>2.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Reserve Program (WRP) (n=270)</td>
<td>96.3</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP) (n=269)</td>
<td>98.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other conservation program (n=268)</td>
<td>81.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>11.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

When asked if they would continue participating in a conservation program if they were not receiving payment, 44% of respondents reported “probably yes” or “definitely yes” (Figure 107). Twenty-seven percent were not sure whether or not they would continue to engage in the conservation practices, and 29% said they would “probably not” or “definitely not” continue.
Of the 60% of respondents who have experienced crop damage from wildlife in the past 12 months (Figure 108), eating young plants (82%), eating mature grains or fruits (73%), and damaging newly planted fields (58%) were among the top types of damage experienced. Damage was commonly perceived to be caused by deer (98%) or turkeys (40%).
Private Land Hunting in Illinois

Thirty percent of landowners agreed that it was easy to find places to hunt or recreate in Illinois, 40% disagreed, and 30% neither agreed nor disagreed (Table 22). Slightly more than 70% of respondents were in agreement that landowners have become less willing to grant permission to access their land, whereas almost 11% disagreed. Approximately 30% of respondents agreed that some type of hunter/recreation program was needed to improve access to private land, whereas 40% disagreed, and 31% neither agreed nor disagreed (Table 22).

Table 22. Landowners’ level of agreement with statements regarding land access.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean a (x̄)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (σ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to find places to hunt/recreate in Illinois (n=356)</td>
<td>10.7</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.84</td>
<td>1.067</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to gain access to private properties (n=354)</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>41.8</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>3.31</td>
<td>1.037</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have become less willing to grant permission (n=362)</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>54.7</td>
<td>16.0</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>0.955</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has become less difficult to establish and maintain private landowner contact (n=346)</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>24.9</td>
<td>49.1</td>
<td>18.5</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>2.86</td>
<td>0.846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some type of hunter/recreation program is needed to improve access to private land (n=353)</td>
<td>18.4</td>
<td>21.2</td>
<td>31.2</td>
<td>24.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>1.158</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree
More than 75% of respondents were aware that landowners who provided hunters free access to their property have their liability reduced under Illinois law (Figure 109). Slightly more than forty percent reported carrying an umbrella liability insurance coverage on their property, whereas 20% did not; the other 38% of respondents indicated that they did not allow others to recreate on their property (Figure 110).

![Figure 109. Percentage of respondents who are aware that landowners who provide hunters free access to their property have their liability reduced under Illinois law (n=380).]

![Figure 110. Landowners who currently carry an umbrella liability insurance coverage on their property (n=374).]

More than 75% of landowners have denied hunters asking for permission to hunt on their property (Figure 111). The most common reasons why landowners denied access were “I keep it for myself, family, and friends” (65%), “ LIABILITY” (49%), and “Hunters were inconsiderate of my land” (30%) (Figure 112). Forty-one percent of respondents reported that they denied hunting access infrequently, 19% denied access frequently, and 12% denied access always (Figure 113).
Figure 111. Percentage of respondents who have ever denied access to hunters asking for permission to hunt their property (n=371).

Figure 112. Why landowners denied hunters permission to hunt on their land (n=284). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
Sixty-seven percent of landowners were currently allowing hunting on their property, 19% used to but not anymore, and 15% did not allow hunting (Figure 114). The majority (74%) of those who allowed hunting on their property allowed themselves and family to hunt as well as friends and neighbors (70%) (Figure 115). Over half (61%) of respondents considered removing nuisance wildlife a benefit of having hunters on their property (Figure 116). Another commonly reported benefit of allowing hunters on their property included discouraging trespassers (16%) (Figure 116). The majority (81%) of respondents had between 1-5 people hunt on their property each year (Figure 117).
Figure 114. Percentage of landowners who have ever allowed hunting on their property \((n=373)\).

Figure 115. Types of people allowed to hunt on property \((n=319)\).
(Percentages are greater than 100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
### Figure 116: What respondents consider to be the benefits of having hunters on their property ($n=319$). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Remove nuisance wildlife</td>
<td>60.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discourage trespassers</td>
<td>15.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide me with wild game</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of income</td>
<td>7.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Source of goods and services</td>
<td>3.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Figure 117: The number of people allowed to hunt on the respondents’ property each year ($n=312$).

- 1-5: 13.1%
- 6-10: 3.2%
- 11-15: 1.0%
- >15: 1.6%
- I don't know: 81.1%
The species that was hunted most often on respondents’ properties was deer (87%), followed by predators (55%) and turkey (38%) (Figure 118). The majority (94%) of respondents reported they never contacted a Conservation Officer with problems involving hunters who had permission to use their property (Figure 119). Asked about problems involving hunters who did not have permission, 78% reported they never contacted a Conservation Officer about problems (Figure 120).

When asked about overall satisfaction of hunters who have hunted their property, 8.4% reported that they were extremely dissatisfied or dissatisfied, 79.5% were satisfied or extremely satisfied, and 12.2% were neither (Figure 121).

![Bar chart showing the type of game hunted on respondents’ properties.](image)

**Figure 118.** The type of game hunted on respondents’ properties (n=319). (Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
Figure 119. Frequency with which respondents needed to contact a Conservation Officer with problems on their property involving hunters who had permission to use their property ($n=315$).

Figure 120. Frequency with which respondents needed to contact a Conservation Officer with problems on their property involving hunters who did not have permission to use their property ($n=314$).
4.2% 4.2% 12.2% 60.9% 18.6%

Figure 121. Satisfaction of respondents with the hunters who hunted their property (n=312).

**IRAP Participation**

Before receiving the survey, 17% of respondents reported they were previously aware of IRAP (Figure 122). Ways in which respondents became aware of IRAP were through friends (46%), IDNR website (21%) or the National Wild Turkey Foundation (NWTF) (6%) (Figure 123).

Figure 122. Percentage of respondents who were aware of IRAP before this survey (n=374).
Slightly more than one-quarter (26%) of landowners were not at all supportive of IRAP and 59% reported that they were somewhat to extremely supportive (Figure 124).

Figure 123. How respondents became aware of IRAP ($n=63$).

Figure 124. Overall level of support for IRAP ($n=353$, $\bar{x}=2.81$, $\sigma=1.484$). Seven-point scale from 1=not at all supportive to 7=extremely supportive.
Sixty-percent of landowners were uninterested in implementing a habitat management plan on their property and 62% were uninterested in enrolling their property into a conservation management program (Table 23). Forty-three percent of respondents were uninterested in improving habitat conditions on their property to benefit wildlife, 34% were interested, and 23% were neither. Slightly less than half (49%) of respondents were not interested in receiving financial incentives for conservation management, whereas 28% indicated that they were interested. Majorities of respondents were uninterested in providing outdoor recreational opportunities to the public (83%), providing hunting opportunities to youth and adult hunters (76%), and having controlled recreational activities on their property (75%).

Table 23. Respondent interest in specific actions on their property.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Action</th>
<th>Extremely Uninterested (%)</th>
<th>Uninterested (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Interested (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Interested (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{x}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a habitat management plan implemented on your property ((n=355))</td>
<td>27.3</td>
<td>33.0</td>
<td>26.8</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.28</td>
<td>1.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolling your property into a conservation management program ((n=354))</td>
<td>28.8</td>
<td>33.1</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>12.4</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td>1.048</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving habitat conditions on your property to benefit wildlife ((n=357))</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.73</td>
<td>1.215</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving financial incentives for conservation management ((n=356))</td>
<td>24.7</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>2.60</td>
<td>1.224</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
When asked about various statements regarding IRAP, the most popular response was always “neither agree nor disagree” (Table 24). Thirty-six percent of respondents agreed that IRAP created new opportunities to hunt/recreate on private land whereas 14% disagreed. Whereas only 5% of landowners felt that IRAP was beneficial to them personally, 33% agreed that IRAP was beneficial to Illinois.

Table 24. Level of agreement with statements regarding IRAP.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Disagree (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Agree (%)</th>
<th>Strongly Agree (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ((\bar{X}))</th>
<th>Standard Deviation ((\sigma))</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands ((n=343))</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>45.5</td>
<td>23.0</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td>0.994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial for Illinois ((n=342))</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>44.7</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.03</td>
<td>0.983</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial to me personally ((n=337))</td>
<td>20.5</td>
<td>22.0</td>
<td>52.8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.43</td>
<td>0.887</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
IRAP causes more hunters/recreationists to lease places for themselves $(n=336)$

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Likely (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Likely (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ($\bar{x}$)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (σ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP decreases the number of hunters that are leaving the sport $(n=333)$</td>
<td>11.4</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td>62.2</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.81</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP creates new opportunities to hunt/recreate on private land $(n=337)$</td>
<td>8.9</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>50.7</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>0.882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters/recreationists $(n=331)$</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>15.7</td>
<td>68.6</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>1.2</td>
<td>2.76</td>
<td>0.740</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When landowners enroll in IRAP, hunters lose access to sites $(n=330)$</td>
<td>9.7</td>
<td>16.1</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>2.72</td>
<td>0.752</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1=Strongly Disagree, 5=Strongly Agree

Four percent of landowners surveyed said they were at all likely to recommend IRAP to a friend, whereas 52% said that recommending IRAP to a friend was unlikely (Table 25). Almost 80% were extremely unlikely or unlikely to consider enrolling their property into IRAP and just over 2% would be likely or extremely likely to enroll.

Table 25. Likelihood to perform the following actions regarding IRAP enrollment.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Unlikely (%)</th>
<th>Neither (%)</th>
<th>Likely (%)</th>
<th>Extremely Likely (%)</th>
<th>Mean(^a) ($\bar{x}$)</th>
<th>Standard Deviation (σ)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recommend IRAP to a friend $(n=350)$</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>31.7</td>
<td>44.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2.33</td>
<td>0.841</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consider enrolling your property in IRAP $(n=365)$</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>39.2</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>1.84</td>
<td>0.831</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^a\)1=Extremely Unlikely, 5=Extremely Likely
For those interested in enrolling their land in the program, archery deer hunting, spring youth turkey hunting, and small game hunting were among the top IRAP activities in which respondents were interested (Figure 125). Landowners who were unlikely to participate in IRAP commonly did not want hunters or recreationists that they do not know on their property (61%), their land was for them and their family to recreate (53%), and/or their land was currently leased for farming purposes (37%) (Figure 126). Other reasons participation in IRAP was unlikely included “I do not agree with state agencies leasing land for public use” (23%) and “There is enough public land available for hunters/recreationists in Illinois” (12%).

Figure 125. IRAP activities in which respondents were interested (n=8).
Eighty percent of landowners indicated that they had concerns about enrolling their land into IRAP (Figure 127). Seventy-nine percent of respondents were concerned about the behavior of hunters and recreationists, 79% were concerned about personal liability, 67% were concerned about use or possible damage, and 64% were concerned about overall safety (Figure 128). About 78% indicated that they were either extremely unlikely or unlikely to enroll, and 1.3% indicated that they were likely to enroll multiple properties in IRAP (Figure 129).
Figure 127. Percentage of respondents who had concerns about enrolling in IRAP ($n=336$).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Concern</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Behavior of hunters/recreationists</td>
<td>79.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal liability</td>
<td>78.7%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use/possible damage</td>
<td>67.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety</td>
<td>64.4%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat work performed</td>
<td>30.0%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>7.9%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(Percentages >100 because respondents selected all that applied.)
Discussion

Landowners throughout the state who responded to our survey helped us better understand the attitudes of non-participating landowners toward IRAP. About 40% of landowners agreed that it was difficult to find places to hunt or recreate in Illinois; although a majority of respondents agreed that landowners have become less willing to grant permission to access their land, only 30% agreed that some type of hunting or recreation program was needed to improve private land access.

Not all respondents were aware that landowners who provided free access to their property have their liability reduced under Illinois law; slightly more than 20% were not aware. This percentage is a decrease compared to landowners responding to a 2001 survey regarding hunter access in Illinois; more than 70% of landowners responding to that survey were unaware of the reduced liability (Miller, et al. 2002). Over three-fourths of landowners have previously denied access to hunters asking to hunt their property, with the most common reason being that

![Figure 129. Likelihood of enrolling multiple properties in IRAP (n=320).](image-url)
they kept the land for themselves, family, and friends. Another concern by many respondents was liability. Sixty-seven percent of landowners were currently allowing hunting on their property, and very rarely contacted a Conservation Officer about problems involving hunters on their property. About 80% of respondents indicated that they were satisfied or extremely satisfied with hunters on their property.

Seventeen percent of landowners surveyed were previously aware of IRAP before receiving the survey questionnaire. About a quarter of respondents were not at all supportive of the program; 36% of respondents agreed that IRAP created new recreation opportunities on private land and 33% agreed that IRAP was beneficial to the state. A small minority (4%) of landowners were likely to recommend IRAP to a friend and 2% were likely to enroll their land into IRAP. The most common reasons landowners were unlikely to participate in IRAP were: they did not want hunters or recreationists that they do not know on their property, their land was for them and their family to recreate, and/or their land was currently leased for farming purposes. They were generally concerned about the behavior of hunters and recreationists on their property as well as personal liability, potential damage, and overall safety.
Conclusions

Demographics

Respondents from the IRAP recreationists and IRAP landowner samples had higher response rates than both statewide samples (Figure 130). This could be due to the survey addressing a salient issue for those already enrolled in the program. Males were the dominant gender among all respondents, and those who participate in IRAP were generally younger than statewide recreationists and landowners (Figures 131 & 132). Comparing IRAP landowners and statewide landowners, a much higher percentage of statewide landowners received a larger percentage of their total household income from their private property than those enrolled in IRAP (Figure 133).

![Figure 130. Response rate comparison.](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IRAP Recreationist</th>
<th>Statewide Recreationist</th>
<th>IRAP Landowner</th>
<th>Statewide Landowner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Response Rate</td>
<td>58%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>43%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Figure 131. Gender comparison.

Figure 132. Average age comparison.
Figure 133. Comparison of percentages of household income that comes from owned private property.

**Land Access**

IRAP recreationists recreated on public land more often than private land, whereas statewide recreationists recreated on public and private land equally (Figure 134). Both groups of recreationists generally preferred to access private land over public land, and those from the IRAP recreationist sample were more unsuccessful in their attempts to gain private land access than statewide recreationists (Table 26). This may be part of the reason that they decided to participate in IRAP. Recreationists were more likely to think that it was difficult to gain access to private property than landowners, and that some type of program was needed to improve access to private land (Table 26). These findings suggest that, if IRAP is expanded, such efforts would be optimized by focusing on regions of the state with low proportions of public lands.
Figure 134. Comparison of types of land recreated on most often.

### Table 26. Comparison of land access preferences.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IRAP Recreationist</th>
<th>Statewide Recreationist</th>
<th>IRAP Landowner</th>
<th>Statewide Landowner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Prefer to access private land for recreation.</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td>69%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Have been unsuccessful gaining private land access.</td>
<td>55%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Think it is difficult to gain access to private property.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td></td>
<td>50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agree that some type of program is needed to improve private land access.</td>
<td>85%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td></td>
<td>29%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Respondents to the statewide recreationists survey who were already aware of IRAP before the survey (16%) were more likely to have found out about IRAP through the IDNR website, whereas those from the statewide landowner sample who were previously aware of IRAP (17%) were more likely to hear about IRAP through friends (Figure 135). Substantial differences existed between recreationists and landowners in their beliefs about the benefits of IRAP (Table 27).

Figure 135. IRAP awareness comparison.
Table 27. Comparison of beliefs regarding IRAP benefits.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IRAP Recreationist</th>
<th>Statewide Recreationist</th>
<th>IRAP Landowner</th>
<th>Statewide Landowner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial to Illinois.</td>
<td>97%</td>
<td>63%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial to me personally.</td>
<td>82%</td>
<td>27%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is needed to improve access to private lands.</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>52%</td>
<td>—</td>
<td>26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Respondents who participated in IRAP agreed more than statewide groups that IRAP has provided additional hunting opportunities (Figure 136). As for future IRAP participation, those already involved in IRAP were much more likely to continue participation than those not involved (Table 28). IRAP participants were also much more likely to give a higher satisfaction rating than the two statewide samples (Figure 137).

Figure 136. Comparison of those who agree that IRAP has provided additional hunting opportunities.
Table 28. Comparison of future IRAP participation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>IRAP Recreationist</th>
<th>Statewide Recreationist</th>
<th>IRAP Landowner</th>
<th>Statewide Landowner</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Likely to participate in IRAP in the future.</td>
<td>87%</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>90%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither likely nor unlikely to participate in IRAP in the future.</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>25%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unlikely to participate in IRAP in the future.</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>79%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Would recommend IRAP to a friend.</td>
<td>86%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td>91%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 137. Comparison of IRAP satisfaction/support.
Discussion

Overall, those who were enrolled in IRAP were satisfied with the program and would like to continue their participation. In terms of recruiting new participants, findings support the IDNR website as the best way to spread word to recreationists statewide whereas word of mouth has been the best method for landowners statewide. Recreationists statewide seemed willing to try IRAP because they felt that it would benefit them, but contracting landowners to participate may be problematic in some regions of the state.

Those who were not involved in IRAP generally did not believe that IRAP provided additional hunting opportunities; 98% of participants stated they would hunt in Illinois if IRAP was not available, however 40% reported they would hunt less than they currently hunted. As less than 4% of hunters in IRAP had less than 5 years of hunting experience in Illinois it may be that the program did not produce new hunters. It is important to note that hunters in this category were primarily youth hunters and this level of recruitment matches that for the state as a whole.

The benefit of the program manifests itself in the ability to allow private land access that was previously not easily available to hunters. This may be useful in retaining current hunters that are displeased with crowding on public lands. Access to private land alone does not seem to be enticing enough to recruit new hunters, but instead draws in those who are looking for more areas to hunt. Therefore the program does not seem to be recruiting adult hunters.

However, the program was very successful in creating youth turkey hunting opportunities. If the program is to be used as a recruitment tool it is likely these types of opportunities should be explored. Given the amount of effort and financial investment required to start hunting as an adult focusing on youth mentor programs may yield more recruitment. Exploring the creation of a small game mentorship program could be one approach, if IRAP
lands are to be more successful in recruiting hunters. Expanding the IRAP properties enrolled would be beneficial, as hunters expressed that lack of properties close to where they lived was the prime reason for unlikely participation in the future, although 87% planned to continue participation. Expanding not only the number of properties but the distribution to underserved areas of the state could provide further benefits. A majority (88%) of participants reported that they would participate in additional IRAP activities, if offered. This response suggests expanding the types of activities offered would provide further support for the program. IRAP was serving an important role in providing opportunities for youth turkey hunters, as one-fourth stated they would not be able to hunt during the season without IRAP.
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The Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) Participant Evaluation

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Division of Wildlife Resources
and
Illinois Natural History Survey

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is interested in participant hunter/recreationist evaluations of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). Please take 15 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will tell us more about participant opinions of IRAP and important issues concerning the IRAP program in Illinois.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
All of your responses will be kept confidential.
Please return this survey in the postage-paid return envelope provided.
Section 1. Outdoor recreation in Illinois. The following questions are important to help understand more about you and your opinions of outdoor recreation activities in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. I am completing this survey for: (Please select one)
   - Myself, as an IRAP adult participant
   - My child, who is an IRAP participant
   - Myself, as an IRAP youth participant

2. Which of the following outdoor recreational activities do you do? (Please select all that apply)
   - Hunting
   - Hiking
   - Birding
   - Fishing
   - Boating

3. Please rate your level of importance for each of the following activities by circling the number that best matches your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not all Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>I do not participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. On which type of land do you hunt/recreate most often?
   - My own private property
   - Public property (State, Federal, and other public lands)
   - IRAP land
   - Private property not owned by me
   - Private outfitter property
   - Private property owned by my family

5. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to find places to hunt/recreate in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to gain access to private properties for hunting/recreation activities in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have become less willing to grant permission to hunt/recreate on private land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has become easy to establish and maintain private landowner contacts in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some type of hunter/recreation program is needed to improve access to private land in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 2. The Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). IRAP was initiated in 2011 by Illinois DNR to provide access to private land for a variety of outdoor recreational activities. You are receiving this questionnaire because you have previously or are currently enrolled as an IRAP participant.

1. How did you become aware of IRAP? (Please select all that apply)
   - Illinois DNR website
   - National Wild Turkey Federation
   - Facebook
   - An IRAP landowner
   - An IRAP participant
   - Friend
   - Other (Please identify): ___________________________

2. Please select the year(s) that you participated in the following IRAP activities. (Please select all that apply)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>2011</th>
<th>2012</th>
<th>2013</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>Never Participated</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Youth Turkey Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Deer Hunting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naturalist (Bird watching, etc.)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport Fishing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-motorized Boat Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to access private land over public land for outdoor recreation in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have time to meet with private landowners to obtain access to private land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been unsuccessful in my attempts to gain private land access in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public land for hunting/recreation in Illinois is too crowded.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I applied to participate in IRAP because I wanted to try hunting for the first time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I applied to participate in IRAP to find private access for outdoor activities in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I applied to participate in IRAP to hunt/recreate new places in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3. Your IRAP experience. The following questions are important to learn more about your opinions of IRAP and your experience with the program. All responses are kept confidential.

1. How many times have you applied to participate in an IRAP activity? _____Times

2. How many times have you been drawn to participate in IRAP? _____Times
3. Have you ever applied to access IRAP properties and not been selected? _____Yes _____No

3a. If “Yes”, did you reapply to participate in IRAP? _____Yes _____No

4. On average, how far did you travel to participate in IRAP activities?

_____ <1 mile _____ 1-25 miles _____ 26-50 miles _____ 51-75 miles _____ 76-100 miles _____ >100 miles

5. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP is needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands in Illinois.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP is beneficial for Illinois.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP is beneficial to me personally.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP causes more hunters/recreationists to lease places for themselves.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP decreases the number of hunters that are leaving the sport.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP creates new opportunities to hunt/recreate on private lands in Illinois.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters/recreationists in Illinois.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>When landowners enroll in IRAP, hunters lose access to sites.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Please indicate your level of satisfaction with the following statements about IRAP by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Application process for IRAP activities</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Lottery selection process for IRAP activities</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Availability of IRAP properties in your area</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Timing of activities for IRAP properties</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of wildlife habitat on IRAP properties</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Quality of private lands selected for IRAP sites</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Abundance of wildlife on IRAP properties</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. How would you rate your overall satisfaction with IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Which of the following activities **would you NOT participate in if it weren’t for IRAP?**

_____ Spring Youth Turkey Hunting  _____ Archery Deer Hunting
_____ Naturalist  _____ Sport Fishing
_____ Non-motorized Boat Access to Public Waterways

---

**Section 4. IRAP and hunting in Illinois.** The following questions are important to learn more about your IRAP hunting experience and plans for future hunting activities in Illinois. **If you did not hunt IRAP properties, please go to question 18.**

1. Would you consider yourself a hunter?  _____ Yes  _____ No (If “No”, please go to question 18)

2. How many years have you hunted?  ____ Years

3. How many years have you hunted in Illinois?  ____ Years

4. Who do you hunt with? (Please select all that apply)

_____ I hunt by myself  _____ Spouse  _____ Parent(s)  _____ Children
_____ Non-immediate family  _____ Friend(s)  _____ Guide/Outfitter  _____ IRAP Hunter(s)

5. How many IRAP sites have you hunted in Illinois?  ____ Sites

6. Which of the following statements best describes your use of IRAP? (Please select only one)

_____ I have visited one IRAP site for one hunting activity.
_____ I have visited one IRAP site for different hunting activities.
_____ I have visited different IRAP sites for the same hunting activity.
_____ I have visited different IRAP sites for different hunting activities.

7. Did you harvest game whereas hunting IRAP?  _____ Yes  _____ No

8. How satisfied were you with the **number of shot opportunities** you had whereas hunting on IRAP properties?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. Have you ever participated in IRAP youth turkey hunting?  _____ Yes  _____ No (If “No”, please go to question 11)

9a. If “Yes”, would you still apply for state-wide turkey hunting during seasons 3 and 4 **if IRAP were not available?**

_____ Yes, if I get drawn for a permit  _____ No
10. How interested would you be in having IRAP youth turkey season occur later to avoid bad weather and/or Easter weekend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Level</th>
<th>Not at all Interested</th>
<th>Slightly Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Extremely Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. Please indicate which IRAP hunting permits you applied for to hunt during the 2015-16 hunting seasons.

**How satisfied were you with the IRAP application process?**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP Permit</th>
<th>Applied</th>
<th>Received</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Spring Youth Turkey Hunting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Archery Deer Hunting</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How interested would you be in having youth waterfowl hunting as an IRAP activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interest Level</th>
<th>Not at all Interested</th>
<th>Slightly Interested</th>
<th>Somewhat Interested</th>
<th>Very Interested</th>
<th>Extremely Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. **If IRAP was not available,** would you still hunt in Illinois?

   _____Yes       _____No (If “No”, please go to question 16)

14. **If IRAP was not available,** what type of land would you hunt? (Please select all that apply)

   _____My own private property       _____Public property (State, Federal, and other public lands)
   _____Private property owned by family       _____Private outfitter property
   _____Private property owned by friends       _____Private property **not** owned by myself, family, or friends

15. **If IRAP was not available,** how often would you hunt?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Much Less Often</th>
<th>Less Often</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>More Often</th>
<th>Much More Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. Please state how likely you will do the following by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would seek permission to hunt private property not enrolled in IRAP?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would participate in additional IRAP activities?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely is it that you would recommend IRAP to a friend?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. Please give your level of interest with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely Uninterested</th>
<th>Uninterested</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Extremely Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a mentor program established for IRAP hunters in need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a mentor whereas hunting on IRAP properties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a mentor for IRAP hunters in need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How likely is it that you would participate in IRAP in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18a. **If your future participation in IRAP is unlikely**, what reason(s) have influenced your decision? (Please select **all** that apply)

- Lack of free time
- Lack of hunting partners
- Health problems
- Unable to be drawn for IRAP
- More places to hunt
- Too expensive
- Not enough IRAP activities
- Poor economy
- Lack of interest
- Too many regulations
- Regulations are too complicated
- Not enough wildlife
- Not enough IRAP properties close to home
- Other (Please explain): ___________________________

**Section 5. Background information.** The following questions are important to help understand more about IRAP recreation participants and your outdoor recreational activities in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Please give your age. _____Years
2. What is your gender? _____Male    _____Female
3. How long have you lived in Illinois? _____Years
4. Do you have access to the Internet in your home? _____Yes    _____No
5. Which of the following best describes where you live now?
   - Rural area
   - Small city (5,000 to 49,999)
   - Small town
   - Medium city (50,000 to 500,000)
   - Suburb of medium or large city
   - Large city (over 500,000)
6. What is your approximate total (gross) household income?

_____ less than $15,000  _____ $60,000 to $74,999
_____ $15,000 to $29,999  _____ $75,000 to $89,999
_____ $30,000 to $44,999  _____ $90,000 plus
_____ $45,000 to $59,999

Comments:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!

Please return this survey in the postage-paid envelope provided.

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources receives federal assistance and therefore must comply with federal anti-discrimination laws. In compliance with the Illinois Human Rights Act, the Illinois Constitution, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act as amended, and the U.S. Constitution, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, age, or disability. If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility, please contact the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, Department of Natural Resources, One Natural Resources Way, Springfield, IL 62701-1787, (217) 782-7616 or the Officer of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.
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February 1, 2016

Dear IRAP participant,

You are one of a select group of Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) participants asked to provide information about your opinions and experiences with the program. The information you and other selected hunters and recreationists furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for evaluating IRAP and learning about potential improvements.

This survey is limited to hunters and recreationists who have applied to participate in the IRAP program. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire even if you are not currently participating in IRAP. A stamped envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

1816 South Oak Street,
Champaign, Illinois 61820 USA
March 15, 2016

Dear IRAP participant,

Your name was selected as one of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) participants and we recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your opinions and experiences with the program. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you.

**If you have not returned your completed questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. We have enclosed another copy for your use.** The information you and other selected IRAP participants provide will help wildlife managers make decisions to evaluate and improve IRAP. **Your responses are voluntary and completely confidential.**

**Even if you are no longer participating in IRAP, we ask that you please take a few minutes to complete the portions of the questionnaire that pertain to you.** A postage paid envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment. **NO Illinois Tax Dollars** are used for this study.
Appendix A.4: IRAP Participant Cover Letter #3

ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY
Prairie Research Institute
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

April, 2016

Dear IRAP participant,

Your name was selected as one of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) participants and we recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your opinions and experiences with the program. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you.

If you have not returned your completed questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. We have enclosed another copy for your use. The information you and other selected IRAP participants provide will help wildlife managers make decisions to evaluate and improve IRAP. Your responses are voluntary and completely confidential.

Even if you are no longer participating in IRAP, we ask that you please take a few minutes to complete the portions of the questionnaire that pertain to you. A postage paid envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment.

NO Illinois Tax Dollars are used for this study.

1816 South Oak Street,
Champaign, Illinois 61820 USA
Appendix A.5: IRAP Participant Postcard

Dear IRAP Participant,

Recently you were mailed a questionnaire about your experiences with the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). We have not yet received your response. **If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. Your input is very important!**

Your name and address will be deleted from our mailing list when your questionnaire is received. Thank you for your time and cooperation.
The Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP)

Landowner Evaluation

Ilinois Department of Natural Resources
Division of Wildlife Resources
and
Ilinois Natural History Survey

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is interested in landowner evaluations of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). Please take 15 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will tell us more about landowner opinions of IRAP and important issues concerning the IRAP program in Illinois.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
All of your responses will be kept confidential.
Please return this survey in the postage-paid return envelope provided.
Disclosure of information is voluntary.
Section 1. Land use decisions. The following questions are important to help understand more about Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) landowners and land-use decisions made on private property in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Which **IRAP activities** have you allowed on your property since the programs’ inception in 2011?
   - [ ] Spring youth turkey hunting
   - [ ] 1st time adult turkey hunting
   - [ ] Archery deer hunting
   - [ ] Small game hunting
   - [ ] Naturalist
   - [ ] Sport fishing
   - [ ] Non-motorized boat access on public waterways

2. Why did you choose to enroll your land(s) into IRAP? (Please select all that apply)
   - [ ] To improve habitat for wildlife
   - [ ] To have a habitat management plan implemented on my land
   - [ ] Financial incentive provided by Illinois DNR
   - [ ] To have controlled hunting/recreation activities on my land
   - [ ] To receive conservation program (CRP, WREP, etc.) cost-share assistance
   - [ ] To provide hunting/recreation opportunities for others

3. Are you currently enrolled in IRAP? _____ Yes  _____ No (Please go to question 3a)

3a. If “No”, why are you no longer enrolled in IRAP? (Please select all that apply)
   - [ ] I leased the property for other purposes
   - [ ] I wanted to be in control of all activities performed on my land
   - [ ] I was dissatisfied with the IRAP program
   - [ ] I entered into a lease with other hunters
   - [ ] I sold the property
   - [ ] Other (Please identify): ________________________________

Section 2. Before your IRAP enrollment. The following questions are important to learn about your experience leading up to your enrollment in the IRAP program. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Did you have concerns about enrolling in IRAP? _____ Yes  _____ No (If “No”, please go to question 4)

2. Please indicate which of the following concerns you had about enrolling in IRAP. (Please select all that apply)
   - [ ] Concerns about the habitat work performed on my property
   - [ ] Concerns about the behavior of hunters/recreationists on my property
   - [ ] Concerns about the use and/or possible damage to my personal property
   - [ ] Concerns for the safety of my family, livestock, pets, and/or hunters/recreationists on my property
   - [ ] Concerns about personal liability in the event of an accident
   - [ ] Other (Please identify): ________________________________
3. Were all your concerns adequately addressed by the Illinois DNR representative with whom you enrolled in IRAP?
   _____Yes  _____No (Please go to question 3a)

3a. If “No”, which concerns were not addressed?
   _____Concerns about the habitat work performed on my property
   _____Concerns about the behavior of hunters/recreationists on my property
   _____Concerns about the use and/or possible damage to my personal property
   _____Concerns for the safety of my family, livestock, pets, and/or hunters/recreationists on my property
   _____Concerns about personal liability in the event of an accident
   _____Other (Please identify): ________________________________

4. Have you ever denied access to hunters asking for permission to hunt your property?
   _____Yes (If “Yes”, please go to questions 8a and 8b) _____No (If “No”, please go to Section 3)

4a. How often would you say that you deny hunting access to your property?

   Never  Infrequently  Frequently  Always
   1     2  3     4     5     6     7

5. Did you allow hunters to access your property before enrolling in IRAP?
   _____Yes  _____No (If “No”, please go to Section 3)

5a. Who was allowed to hunt the property before your enrollment in IRAP? (Please select all that apply)
   _____Friends and neighbors
   _____Hunters who requested permission
   _____Me and/or immediate family
   _____The property was open to anyone who wanted to hunt and they did not have to ask for permission
   _____I leased hunting rights to the property

5b. About how many persons per year were hunting the property before your enrollment in IRAP?
   _____1-5  _____6-10  _____11-15  _____>15  _____I don’t know

6. What type of game did persons hunt or trap on the property before IRAP? (Please select all that apply)
   _____Dove  _____Waterfowl (ducks, geese)  _____Small game (rabbit, squirrel)
   _____Predators (coyote, fox, raccoon)  _____Deer  _____Turkey
   _____Upland birds (pheasant, quail)  _____I don’t know
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7. How often did you need to contact an Illinois DNR Conservation Officer or other law enforcement to address problems with hunters using the property before enrolling in IRAP?

- Frequently  - Infrequently  - Never  - I don’t know

8. How would you rate your satisfaction with the hunters who hunted your property prior to enrolling in IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 3. Your IRAP experience.** The following questions are important to learn about your experience whereas being enrolled in IRAP. If you are no longer enrolled, we would still like to receive your feedback about IRAP.

1. Please select your level of satisfaction for the following statements by circling the number that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service you received from the Illinois DNR representative administering IRAP.</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Procedures required for participation in the IRAP program.</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Amount of communication between yourself and IDNR representatives for IRAP.</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service and professionalism of persons who performed habitat work on your IRAP property.</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Behavior of hunters/recreationists who have visited your IRAP property.</th>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. How would you rate your **overall experience** with IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Poor</th>
<th>Fair</th>
<th>Good</th>
<th>Excellent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. How would you rate the **value of habitat improvements** made on your property whereas enrolled in IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not Valuable</th>
<th>Low</th>
<th>Moderate</th>
<th>High</th>
<th>Very High</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Did your neighbors complain to you about **IRAP hunter/recreationist behavior** on the enrolled property during or after the hunting/recreation seasons?

- Yes  - No
5. How satisfied were you with the timing of IRAP activities during your enrollment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do you have recommendations for IRAP?

_____ Yes      _____ No (If “No”, please go to question 7)

6a. If “Yes”, what type of recommendations do you have? (Please select all that apply)

_____ Parking    _____ Participant behavior    _____ Additional Activities

_____ Safety    _____ Vehicle use    _____ Property Access

_____ Other (Please identify): ________________________________

7. Did you know of any incidents that were handled by an Illinois DNR Conservation Officer regarding your IRAP property?

_____ Yes      _____ No (If “No”, please go to question 8)

7a. If “Yes”, please indicate what type of incidents occurred. (Please select all that apply)

_____ Trespassing  _____ Poaching  _____ Property Damage

_____ Conflict between users  _____ Vehicle use  _____ Littering

_____ Safety violations  _____ Other (Please identify): ________________________________

8. After this property was enrolled in IRAP, how often did you feel you needed to contact an Illinois DNR Conservation Officer or other law enforcement to address problems with IRAP members using the property?

_____ Frequently  _____ Infrequently  _____ Never  _____ I don’t know

9. How would you rate your satisfaction with the IRAP hunters who hunted your property whereas enrolled in IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Were you contacted this year by an Illinois DNR representative to “check in” on how you thought things were going?

_____ Yes      _____ No

11. How important would a regular “check in” by an Illinois DNR representative be to you?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unimportant</th>
<th>Unimportant</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Important</th>
<th>Extremely Important</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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12. How would you rate your level of satisfaction with IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Unsatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

13. Please circle the response that best matches your likeliness of performing the following actions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely is it that you would recommend to a friend that they enroll their property in IRAP?</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely is it that you would re-enroll in IRAP?</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How likely is it that you would enroll additional acres?</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 4. IRAP Hunting. The following questions are important to learn about your experiences during your enrollment in IRAP hunting activities. **If you did not allow hunting on your land whereas enrolled in IRAP, please go to Section 5.**

1. Please express your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements about IRAP by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP has introduced new youth and adult hunters to the sport of hunting.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP has provided additional hunting opportunities for those without hunting access in Illinois.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP has decreased the number of hunters leaving the sport.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP has provided hunting opportunities to the same people who hunted my property.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP has displaced hunters who previously hunted my property.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters in Illinois.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. **After enrolling in IRAP**, how many people hunted the property?

   ____ 1-5   _____ 6-10   _____ 11-15   _____ 15+   ____ I don’t know

3. **Since your IRAP enrollment**, who has hunted the property? (Please select all that apply)

   ____ Myself/Family   _____ Friends and neighbors  _____ Hunters who asked permission  
   _____ Illinois resident hunters   _____ Non-resident hunters   ____ I don’t know  
   ____ The property was open to anyone who wanted to hunt and they did **not** have to ask for permission  
   _____ Hunting club members and/or people who leased hunting rights to the property
3a. **If you hunted the property**, how often were you able to hunt compared to years before your IRAP enrollment?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Much Less Often</th>
<th>Less Often</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>More Often</th>
<th>Much More Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. **Since IRAP**, for which type of game did persons hunt on the property? (Please select all that apply)

- [ ] Dove
- [ ] Waterfowl (ducks, geese)
- [ ] Small game (rabbit, squirrel)
- [ ] Predators (coyote, fox, raccoon)
- [ ] Deer
- [ ] Turkey
- [ ] Upland birds (pheasant, quail)
- [ ] I don’t know

**Section 5. Background information.** The following questions about yourself are important to help understand more about how private landowners in Illinois feel about conservation programs. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Please give your age. _____ Years
2. What is your gender? _____ Male  _____ Female
3. Do you live on the property you enrolled in IRAP? _____Yes  _____No
4. For the private property that you own, who has the primary responsibility for making decisions? (Please select one)
   - [ ] I am the sole decision-maker
   - [ ] I share decision-making with my spouse
   - [ ] I share decision-making with my relatives
   - [ ] I share decision-making with non-family business partners
5. What county is your IRAP property located in? ____________________ County
6. Approximately what percentage of your total net household income is from the private property that you own?
   - [ ] 0 to 10%
   - [ ] 11% to 25%
   - [ ] 26% to 50%
   - [ ] 51% to 75%
   - [ ] 76% to 100%

**Comments:**
February 1, 2016

Dear IRAP landowner,

You are one of a select group of Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) landowners asked to provide information about your opinions and experiences with IRAP during your enrollment. The information you and other selected landowners furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for evaluating IRAP and learning about potential improvements.

This survey is limited to private landowners who have enrolled their land into the IRAP program since 2011. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire even if you are not currently enrolled in IRAP. A stamped envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program
March 15, 2016

Dear IRAP landowner,

Your name was selected as one of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) landowner participants and we recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your opinions and experiences with the program. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you.

If you have not returned your completed questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. We have enclosed another copy for your use. The information you and other IRAP landowner participants provide will help wildlife managers make decisions to evaluate and improve IRAP. Your responses are voluntary and completely confidential.

Even if you are no longer participating in IRAP, we ask that you please take a few minutes to complete the portions of the questionnaire that pertain to you. A postage paid envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment.

NO Illinois Tax Dollars are used for this study.

1816 South Oak Street,
Champaign, Illinois 61820 USA
April, 2016

Dear IRAP landowner,

Your name was selected as one of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) landowner participants and we recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your opinions and experiences with the program. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you.

**If you have not returned your completed questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. We have enclosed another copy for your use.** The information you and other IRAP landowner participants provide will help wildlife managers make decisions to evaluate and improve IRAP. Your responses are voluntary and completely confidential.

**Even if you are no longer participating in IRAP, we ask that you please take a few minutes to complete the portions of the questionnaire that pertain to you.** A postage paid envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment. **NO Illinois Tax Dollars** are used for this study.
Dear Illinois Landowner,

Recently you were mailed a questionnaire about your experiences with the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). We have not yet received your response. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. Your input is very important!

Your name and address will be deleted from our mailing list when your questionnaire is received. Thank you for your time and cooperation.
The Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP)

Statewide Hunter/Recreationist Survey

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is interested in Illinois hunter/recreationist opinions of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). Please take 15 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will tell us more about hunter/recreationist opinions of IRAP and important issues concerning the IRAP program in Illinois.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
All of your responses will be kept confidential.
Please return this survey in the postage-paid return envelope provided.
Disclosure of information is voluntary.
Section 1. Outdoor recreation in Illinois. The following questions are important to help understand more about you and your opinions of outdoor recreation activities in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Which of the following outdoor recreational activities do you do? (Please select all that apply)

   _____ Hunting   _____ Hiking   _____ Birding   _____ Fishing   _____ Boating

2. Please rate your level of importance for each of the following activities by circling the number that best matches your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Not at all Important</th>
<th>Slightly Important</th>
<th>Moderately Important</th>
<th>Very Important</th>
<th>I do not participate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hunting</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiking</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Birding</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fishing</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boating</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. On which type of land do you hunt/recreate most often?

   _____ My own private property   _____ Public property (State, Federal, and other public lands)
   _____ IRAP land                 _____ Private property not owned by me
   _____ Private outfitter property _____ Private property owned by my family

4. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to find places to hunt/recreate in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to gain access to private properties for hunting/recreation activities in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have become less willing to grant permission to hunt/recreate on private land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has become easy to establish and maintain private landowner contacts in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some type of hunter/recreation program is needed to improve access to private land in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 2. The Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) leases private property throughout Illinois for semi-controlled public access for a variety of outdoor recreational opportunities. IRAP focuses on finding places and activities for youth and families to experience the outdoors. Since the program’s inception in 2011, over 13,000 acres have been enrolled, several thousand acres of habitat projects have been implemented and Illinois DNR is looking to expand the program across the state, especially in underserved areas.

1. Before this survey, were you aware of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP)?

   _____ Yes   _____ No (If “No,” please go to question 3)
1a. If “Yes,” how did you become aware of IRAP? (Please select all that apply)

- Illinois DNR website
- National Wild Turkey Federation
- Facebook
- An IRAP landowner
- An IRAP participant
- Friend
- Other (Please identify): ________________________

2. Have you ever applied to access IRAP properties and not been selected?  
   _____ Yes  _____ No

   2a. If “Yes,” did you reapply to participate in IRAP?  
      _____ Yes  _____ No

3. Have you ever attempted to hunt on private land in Illinois?  
   _____ Yes  _____ No (If “No,” Please go to question 5)

4. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I prefer to access private land over public land for outdoor recreation in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I do not have time to meet with private landowners to obtain access to private land.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have been unsuccessful in my attempts to gain private land access in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public land for hunting/recreation in Illinois is too crowded.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial to me personally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial for Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP causes more hunters/recreationists to lease places for themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP decreases the number of hunters that are leaving the sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP creates new opportunities to hunt/recreate on private lands in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters/recreationists in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When landowners enroll in IRAP, hunters lose access to sites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How would you rate your level of support for the existence of IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Moderately Supportive</th>
<th>Extremely Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3. IRAP and hunting in Illinois. The following questions are important to learn more about your intentions for participating in IRAP and plans for future hunting activities in Illinois.

1. Would you consider yourself a hunter? _____Yes _____No (If “No,” please go to question 18)

2. Please answer the following questions regarding your attitudes toward hunting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunting is one of the most important activities in my life.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I spend a lot of time in the off-season planning for hunting.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I plan vacation time around hunting seasons.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hunting determines much of my lifestyle.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I spend a lot of time before the season scouting the area I will hunt.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>I would rather hunt than do any other recreation.</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Slightly Disagree</th>
<th>Unsure</th>
<th>Slightly Agree</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did you hunt in Illinois during the 2015-16 hunting seasons? _____Yes _____No

4. How many years have you hunted? _____Years

5. How many years have you hunted in Illinois? _____Years

6. Who do you hunt with? (Please select all that apply)
   _____ I hunt by myself _____ Family _____ Friends _____ Mentor _____ IRAP Hunter(s)

7. Which type(s) of game do you hunt? (Please select all that apply)
   _____ Dove _____ Waterfowl (ducks, geese) _____ Small game (rabbit, squirrel)
   _____ Predators (coyote, fox, raccoon) _____ Deer _____ Turkey
   _____ Upland birds (pheasant, quail)

8. On average, how far do you travel to hunt in Illinois?
   _____ <1 mile _____ 1-25 miles _____ 26-50 miles _____ 51-75 miles _____ 76-100 miles _____ >100 miles
9. Which of the following game species do you hunt less now than you did 5 years ago? (Please select all that apply)

- None
- Small game
- Geese
- Ducks
- Turkey (Spring)
- Turkey (Fall)
- Furbearers
- Doves
- Deer (Shotgun)
- Deer (Muzzleloader)
- Deer (Archery)
- Other (Please identify): _______________________________

9a. If your hunting effort decreased, which of the following has it been due to? (Please select all that apply)

- Lack of time
- Lack of interest
- Lack of financial resources
- No one to hunt with
- Too many regulations
- Seasons too short
- No land to hunt on
- Not enough game
- Health problems
- Too much equipment needed
- Other (Please identify):

10. Which of the following game species do you hunt more now than you did 5 years ago? (Please select all that apply)

- None
- Small game
- Geese
- Ducks
- Turkey (Spring)
- Turkey (Fall)
- Furbearers
- Doves
- Deer (Shotgun)
- Deer (Muzzleloader)
- Deer (Archery)
- Other (Please identify): _______________________________

10a. If your hunting effort increased, which of the following has it been due to? (Please select all that apply)

- Increased free time
- More game
- Better health/fitness
- Greater financial resources
- More hunting partners
- New type of hunting
- Better seasons/regulations
- Availability of land to hunt
- Better equipment
- Increased interest
- Other (Please identify):

11. What do you feel is the single greatest problem that contributes to the decline in hunting? (Please select only one)

- Not enough land
- Declining game species
- Gun control
- Too many hunters on public land
- Not enough time
- Competing recreation uses of public land
- Other (Please identify):

12. Have you ever been denied access to private land in Illinois when asking permission to hunt?

- Yes
- No (If “No,” please go to question 13)

12a. How often would you say that you have been denied access for hunting private land in Illinois?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
12b. Which of the following reasons best describe why you believe you were denied permission to hunt private land in Illinois? (Please select all that apply)

- Previous bad experience with hunters
- Too many people were asking to hunt
- Safety concerns
- Liability concerns
- Livestock on the property
- Landowner(s) didn’t like hunting/hunters
- Other hunters had permission
- No one was allowed to hunt the property
- Other (Please identify): ________________________________

13. Have you ever paid a property owner to hunt private land in Illinois?  
   - Yes  
   - No

14. Have you ever taken a youth (less than 18 years old) turkey hunting during an Illinois Youth Turkey Hunt?  
   - Yes  
   - No (If “No,” please go to question 15)

14a. How much do you support holding Illinois youth turkey season later to avoid bad weather and/or Easter weekend?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Not Support</th>
<th>Slightly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Moderately Support</th>
<th>Extremely Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

14b. How much do you support allowing youth turkey hunters to hunt during all 5 regular spring turkey seasons until the youth hunter is able to harvest a turkey with their youth turkey permit?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Not Support</th>
<th>Slightly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Moderately Support</th>
<th>Extremely Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. Please indicate how likely you are to do the following by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to seek permission to hunt private property not enrolled in IRAP?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How likely are you to recommend participating in IRAP to a friend?</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How much do you support allowing a youth archery deer hunting as an IRAP activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Not Support</th>
<th>Slightly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Moderately Support</th>
<th>Extremely Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

17. How much do you support allowing a youth waterfowl hunting as an IRAP activity?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Do Not Support</th>
<th>Slightly Support</th>
<th>Somewhat Support</th>
<th>Moderately Support</th>
<th>Extremely Support</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
18. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I want to participate in IRAP because I want to try hunting for the first time.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to participate in IRAP to find private access for outdoor activities in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to participate in IRAP to hunt/recreate new places in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. How likely are you to participate in IRAP in the future?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Likelihood</th>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19a. **If your participation in IRAP is likely**, which IRAP activities are you interested in?

- _____Spring Youth Turkey Hunting
- _____Small Game Hunting
- _____Waterfowl Hunting
- _____1st Time Adult Turkey Hunting
- _____Archery Deer Hunting
- _____Naturalist
- _____Sport Fishing
- _____Non-motorized Boat Access to Public Waterways

19b. **If your participation in IRAP is likely**, how often do you plan on hunting in Illinois?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Much Less Often</th>
<th>Less Often</th>
<th>About the Same</th>
<th>More Often</th>
<th>Much More Often</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19c. **If your participation in IRAP is unlikely**, which reason(s) have influenced your decision?

(Please select all that apply)

- _____Lack of free time
- _____Lack of hunting partners
- _____Health problems
- _____Unable to be drawn for IRAP
- _____More places to hunt
- _____Too expensive
- _____Not enough IRAP activities
- _____Poor economy
- _____Lack of interest
- _____Too many regulations
- _____Regulations are too complicated
- _____Not enough wildlife
- _____Not enough IRAP properties
- _____Other (Please explain): ____________

20. Please give your **level of interest** with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely Uninterested</th>
<th>Uninterested</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Extremely Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a mentor program established for Illinois hunters in need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having a mentor whereas hunting on IRAP properties.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Becoming a mentor for IRAP hunters in need.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Section 4. Background information. The following questions are important to help understand more about IRAP recreation participants and your outdoor recreational activities in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Please give your age. _____ Years
2. What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female
3. How long have you lived in Illinois? _____ Years
4. Do you have children <18 living at home? _____ Yes _____ No (If “No,” please go to question 5)
   4a. If “Yes,” in which outdoor activities do your children participate? (Please select all that apply)
      _____ Hunting  _____ Fishing  _____ Camping  _____ Hiking  _____ Birding
      _____ Other (Please identify):_________________________________
5. Do you have access to the Internet in your home? _____ Yes _____ No
6. Which of the following best describes where you live now? (Please select one)
      _____ Rural area         _____ Small town (<5,000)  _____ Small city (5,000-49,999)
      _____ Suburb of medium/large city  _____ Medium city (50,000-500,000) _____ Large city (>500,000)
7. What is your approximate total (gross) household income?
      _____ <$15,000   _____ $15,000 to $29,999    _____ $30,000 to $44,999
      _____ $45,000 to $59,999   _____ $60,000 to $74,999    _____ $75,000 to $89,999    _____ >$90,000
      Comments:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!
Please return this survey in the postage-paid envelope provided.

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources receives federal assistance and therefore must comply with federal anti-discrimination laws. In compliance with the Illinois Human Rights Act, the Illinois Constitution, Title VI of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, Section 504 of the Rehabilitation Act as amended, and the U.S. Constitution, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources does not discriminate on the basis of race, color, sex, national origin, age, or disability. If you believe you have been discriminated against in any program, activity, or facility, please contact the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, Department of Natural Resources, One Natural Resources Way, Springfield, IL 62701-1787, (217) 782-7616 or the Officer of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.
April, 2016

Dear Illinois hunter/recreationist,

You are one of a select group of Illinois hunters/recreationists asked to provide information about your outdoor recreational activities and your opinions about the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). The information you and other selected hunters/recreationists furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for learning about outdoor recreation in Illinois and gauging hunter/recreationist interest in IRAP.

This survey is limited to resident hunters and recreationists in Illinois. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. A stamped envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment.

**NO Illinois Tax Dollars** are used for this study.
May, 2016

Dear Illinois hunter/recreationist,

You are one of a select group of Illinois hunters/recreationists who were asked to provide information about your outdoor recreational activities and your opinions about the Illinois Recreational Access Program. We are sending you an additional copy of the questionnaire, as we have not yet heard from you. If you recently returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return in the postage paid envelope provided.

The information you and other selected hunters/recreationists furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for learning about outdoor recreation in Illinois and gauging hunter/recreationist interest in IRAP. This survey is limited to resident hunters and recreationists in Illinois.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program
June, 2016

Dear Illinois hunter/recreationist,

You are one of a select group of Illinois hunters/recreationists who were asked to provide information about your outdoor recreational activities and your opinions about the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). If you recently returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return in the postage paid envelope provided.

The information you and other selected hunters/recreationists furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for learning about outdoor recreation in Illinois and gauging hunter/recreationist interest in IRAP. This survey is limited to resident hunters and recreationists in Illinois.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment.

**NO Illinois Tax Dollars** are used for this study.
Dear Illinois Hunter/Recreationist,

Recently you were mailed a questionnaire about your outdoor recreational activities and the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). We have not yet received your response. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. Your input is very important!

Your name and address will be deleted from our mailing list when your questionnaire is received. Thank you for your time and cooperation.
Appendix D.1: Illinois Statewide Landowner Survey Questionnaire

The Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP)

Statewide Landowner Survey

Illinois Department of Natural Resources
Division of Wildlife Resources
and
Illinois Natural History Survey

The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is interested in learning about land use in Illinois and private landowner opinions about the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). Please take 15 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will tell us more about landowner opinions of IRAP and future participation in the program. Please note that no one from the IDNR or IRAP program will call or solicit you about enrolling your property into the IRAP program. This survey is necessary for continuing and improving the IRAP program.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
All of your responses will be kept confidential.
Please return this survey in the postage-paid return envelope provided.
Disclosure of information is voluntary.
Section 1. About your private property. The following questions are important to learn more about private property and land-use in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. About how many acres of private land do you own in Illinois? _____Acres


3. Which land-cover type(s) best describe your private property in Illinois? (Please select all that apply)
   - Agricultural field(s) _____
   - Forest _____
   - Pasture _____
   - Ponds _____
   - Native grass _____
   - Wildlife food plot _____
   - Orchard _____
   - River access _____

4. Is farming your primary source of income? _____Yes _____No

5. Do you have livestock on your property? _____Yes _____No

6. Do you perform any conservation management practices on your property?
   - Yes _____
   - No (If “No,” please go to question 7)

6a. If “Yes,” please select all of the management practices that apply.
   - Grassed waterways _____
   - Stream buffers _____
   - Filter strips _____
   - Shallow water areas for wildlife _____
   - Shelterbelt establishment _____
   - Contour grass strips _____
   - Wildlife food plots _____
   - Native grass plantings _____
   - Cover crop _____
   - Wetland restoration _____
   - Tree plantings _____
   - Other: ______________________

7. In which of the following conservation programs listed below have you participated? Please give your answer by circling the number that best matches your response.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Conservation Program</th>
<th>Never participated</th>
<th>Participated in the past, but not now</th>
<th>Currently participate, but will not renew</th>
<th>Currently participate and will renew</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserve Program (CRP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Reserve Enhancement Program (CREP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural Conservation Easement Program (ACEP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Acres for Wildlife Enhancement (SAFE)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland Reserve Program (WRP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Conservation Stewardship Program (CSP)</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Conservation Programs</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

8. If you are enrolled in conservation programs, how many acres do you currently have enrolled in each program? (If you do not participate, please go to question 10)

   _____Acres Program (Please list): ________________________________
   _____Acres Program (Please list): ________________________________
   _____Acres Program (Please list): ________________________________
9. If you were not receiving payment for participating in the programs listed above or other similar programs, would you continue to engage in the conservation practices?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Definitely No</th>
<th>Probably No</th>
<th>Not Sure</th>
<th>Probably Yes</th>
<th>Definitely Yes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

10. Have you experienced crop damage from wildlife in the past 12 months?

_____Yes  _____No (If “No,” please go to Section 2)

10a. If “Yes,” what type of damage did you experience? (Please select all that apply)

_____Eating young plants  _____Eating mature grains or fruits
_____Damaging newly planted fields  _____Damaging trees
_____Injury to livestock  _____Other (Please identify): _______________________________

10b. What wildlife species were responsible for damages to your crops? (Please select all that apply)

_____Deer  _____Turkeys  _____Geese  _____I don’t know
_____Other (Please identify): _______________________________

**Section 2. Private land hunting in Illinois.** The following questions are important to learn more about hunting on private land in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>It is easy to find places to hunt/recreate in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It is difficult to gain access to private properties for hunting/recreation activities in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landowners have become less willing to grant permission to hunt/recreate on private land in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It has become less difficult to establish and maintain private landowner contacts in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Some type of hunter/recreation program is needed to improve access to private land in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Are you aware that landowners who provide hunters free access to their property have their liability reduced under Illinois law?

_____Yes  _____No

3. Do you currently carry an umbrella liability insurance coverage on your property for “others” who you allow to hunt/recreate on your property?

_____Yes  _____No  _____I do not allow others to recreate on my property
4. Have you ever denied access to hunters asking for permission to hunt your property?
   ____ Yes (If “Yes,” please go to questions 4a and 4b)  ____ No (If “No,” please go to question 5)

4a. Which of the following reasons best describe why you have denied hunters permission to hunt on your land? (Please select all that apply)
   ____ Hunters were inconsiderate of my land  ____ I got tired of people asking to hunt
   ____ Concerns for my family’s safety  ____ Liability
   ____ Damage to property/equipment  ____ Injury to livestock
   ____ I don’t like hunting/hunters  ____ I have other hunting arrangements
   ____ I keep it for myself/family/friends  ____ Other (Please identify): __________________________

4b. How often would you say that you deny hunting access to your property for hunting?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Infrequently</th>
<th>Frequently</th>
<th>Always</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Have you ever allowed hunting on your property? (Please select only one)
   ____ Yes, and I still do  ____ Yes, but not anymore  ____ No (If “No,” please go to Section 3)

6. Who was allowed to hunt the property? (Please select all that apply)
   ____ Me and/or immediate family
   ____ Friends and neighbors
   ____ Hunters who requested permission
   ____ The property was open to anyone who wanted to hunt and they did not have to ask for permission
   ____ I leased hunting rights to the property

7. What do you consider to be the benefits of having hunters on your property? (Please select all that apply)
   ____ Remove nuisance wildlife  ____ Source of income
   ____ Provide me with wild game  ____ Source of goods and services
   ____ Discourage trespassers  ____ Other (Please identify): __________________________

8. About how many persons per year were allowed to hunt your property? (Please select only one)
   ____ 1-5  ____ 6-10  ____ 11-15  ____ >15  ____ I don’t know

9. What type(s) of game was hunted on your property? (Please select all that apply)
   ____ Dove  ____ Waterfowl (ducks, geese)  ____ Small game (rabbit, squirrel)
   ____ Predators (coyote, fox, raccoon)  ____ Deer  ____ Turkey
   ____ Upland birds (pheasant, quail)  ____ I don’t know
10. How often have you needed to contact an Illinois DNR Conservation Officer or other law enforcement to address problems with hunters who had permission to use your property? (Please select only one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Infrequently (Once every few years)</th>
<th>Frequently (Once a year)</th>
<th>Always (Multiple time a year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11. How often have you needed to contact an Illinois DNR Conservation Officer or other law enforcement to address problems with hunters who did not have permission to use your property? (Please select only one)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Never</th>
<th>Once</th>
<th>Infrequently (Once every few years)</th>
<th>Frequently (Once a year)</th>
<th>Always (Multiple time a year)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. How would you rate your satisfaction with the hunters who have hunted your property?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Dissatisfied</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Satisfied</th>
<th>Extremely Satisfied</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Section 3. The Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP) leases private property throughout Illinois for semi-controlled public access, through a registration/reservation system, for a variety of outdoor recreational activities. Landowners are able to choose which IRAP activities they agree to let the public access whereas also retaining time for their personal outdoor activities on their property. With nearly 95% of Illinois privately owned, there are few public places available. IRAP focuses on finding places and activities for youth and families to experience the outdoors. Since the program’s inception in 2011, over 13,000 acres have been enrolled and Illinois DNR is looking to expand the program across the state and in underserved counties.

Eligible landowners who enroll into the program will have a management plan established/updated for their property addressing invasive species, opening of the canopy, natural oak/hickory forest regeneration, prairie grass plantings, etc. Landowners receive a stipend for each IRAP activity and season they allow public access and will be considered for cost share to implement wildlife management projects. All IRAP landowners are protected from liability for IRAP activities under the State of Illinois Recreational Use of Leased Land Act, 745 ILCS 57 and an additional ($2 million liability) insurance policy.

1. Before this survey, were you aware of the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP)?

_____Yes (If “Yes,” please go to question 1a)  _____No (If “No,” please go to question 2)

1a. How did you become aware of IRAP? (Please select all that apply)

_____Illinois DNR website  _____NWTF  _____Facebook  _____An IRAP landowner
_____An IRAP participant  _____A friend  _____Other source (Please identify): _______________________

2. How would you rate your level of support for the existence of IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Not at all Supportive</th>
<th>Somewhat Supportive</th>
<th>Moderately Supportive</th>
<th>Extremely Supportive</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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3. Please give your level of interest for each of the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Extremely Uninterested</th>
<th>Uninterested</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Interested</th>
<th>Extremely Interested</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Having a habitat management plan implemented on your property.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enrolling your property into a conservation management program(s).</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improving habitat conditions on your property to benefit wildlife.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Receiving financial incentives for conservation management practices performed on your property.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having controlled recreational activities on your property.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing outdoor recreational opportunities to the public on your property.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Providing hunting opportunities to new youth and adult hunters.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Having personal liability protection for activities performed on your property.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Please indicate your level of agreement or disagreement with the following statements by circling the response that best matches your opinion.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Strongly Disagree</th>
<th>Disagree</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Agree</th>
<th>Strongly Agree</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is needed to improve hunter/recreation access to private lands in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial for Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP causes more hunters/recreationists to lease places for themselves.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP is beneficial to me personally.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP decreases the number of hunters that are leaving the sport.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP creates new opportunities to hunt/recreate on private lands in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IRAP has had no impact on recruiting and retaining hunters/recreationists in Illinois.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>When landowners enroll in IRAP, hunters lose access to sites.</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. How likely are you to **recommend to a friend** that they enroll their land in IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. How likely are you to consider enrolling your property in IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6a. **If enrolling in IRAP is likely**, which IRAP activities would you be interested in allowing on your property? (Please select all that apply)

- Spring youth turkey hunting
- 1st time adult turkey hunting
- Archery deer hunting
- Small game hunting
- Waterfowl hunting
- Naturalist
- Sport fishing
- Non-motorized boat access on public waterways

6b. **If enrolling in IRAP is unlikely**, what reason(s) have influenced your decision? (Please select all that apply)

- My land is currently leased for hunting purposes
- My land is currently leased for agricultural/farming purposes
- I do not want hunters/recreationists that I do not know on my property
- I do not think IRAP works as described
- I do not agree with state agencies leasing land for public use
- Me and my family recreate on my land
- There is enough public land available for hunters/recreationists in Illinois
- Other (Please identify): _______________________________________

7. Would you have concerns about enrolling your land in IRAP?

- Yes  
- No (If “No,” please go to question 8)

7a. Which of the following concerns would you have about enrolling in IRAP? (Please select all that apply)

- Concerns about the habitat work performed on my property
- Concerns about the behavior of hunters/recreationists on my property
- Concerns about the use and/or possible damage to my personal property
- Concerns for the safety of my family, livestock, pets, and/or hunters/recreationists on my property
- Concerns about personal liability in the event of an accident
- Other (Please identify): _______________________________________

8. If you have **multiple properties**, how likely are you to enroll them in IRAP?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Extremely Unlikely</th>
<th>Unlikely</th>
<th>Neither</th>
<th>Likely</th>
<th>Extremely Likely</th>
<th>N/A</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Section 4. Background information. The following questions about yourself are important to help us understand more about private landowners in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. Please give your age. _____Years

2. What is your gender? _____Male _____Female

3. For private property you own, who has the primary responsibility for making decisions? (Please select all that apply)
   _____I am the sole decision-maker  _____I share decision-making with my spouse
   _____I share decision-making with my relatives _____I share decision-making with non-family business partners

4. What county(ies) is/are your private property located in?
   _______________________________,    _____________________________,    _____________________________

5. Approximately what percentage of your total net household income is generated from the private property that you own? (Please select only one)
   _____0 to 10%   _____11% to 25%   _____26% to 50%   _____51% to 75%   _____76% to 100%

   Comments:

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!
Please return this survey in the postage-paid envelope provided.
April, 2016

Dear Illinois landowner,

You are one of a select group of Illinois landowners asked to provide information about your private land, land use activities, and your opinions about the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). The information you and other selected landowners furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for learning about private land conservation management practices in Illinois and gauging landowner interest in IRAP.

This survey is limited to private landowners in Illinois. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. A stamped envelope is provided for returning the questionnaire to us.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment.
NO Illinois Tax Dollars are used for this study.
May, 2016

Dear Illinois landowner,

You are one of a select group of Illinois landowners who were asked to provide information about your private land, land use activities, and your opinions about the Illinois Recreational Access Program. We are sending you an additional copy of the questionnaire, as we have not yet heard from you. If you have recently returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return in the postage paid envelope provided.

The information you and other selected landowners furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for learning about private land conservation management practices in Illinois and gauging landowner interest in IRAP. This survey is limited to private landowners in Illinois.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment.

NO Illinois Tax Dollars are used for this study.
Dear Illinois landowner,

You are one of a select group of Illinois landowners who were asked to provide information about your private land, land use activities, and your opinions about the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). If you have recently returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If not, please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return in the postage paid envelope provided.

The information you and other selected landowners furnish our Illinois DNR program managers is vital for learning about private land conservation management practices in Illinois and gauging landowner interest in IRAP. This survey is limited to private landowners in Illinois.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.

Thank you for your time and assistance.

Sincerely,

Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program

Funded by your purchase of hunting & shooting equipment.

NO Illinois Tax Dollars are used for this study.

1816 South Oak Street,
Champaign, Illinois 61820 USA
Dear Illinois Landowner,

Recently you were mailed a questionnaire about your land use activities, management practices, and the Illinois Recreational Access Program (IRAP). We have not yet received your response. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. Your input is very important!

Your name and address will be deleted from our mailing list when your questionnaire is received. Thank you for your time and cooperation.