



ILLINOIS
NATURAL
HISTORY
SURVEY



Brent Manning, Director
Illinois Department of Natural
Resources

Paul Vehlow
Federal Aid Coordinator

John E. Buhnerkempe
Chief, Division of Wildlife
Resources

Federal Aid Project
Report SR-02-01
Job Number 103.1
Sport Fish & Wildlife
Restoration Program

Results of studies of Illinois hunters, landowners, and participants in Access Illinois



Craig A. Miller, Ph.D.
Program Leader and Principal Investigator
Human Dimensions Research Program
Illinois Natural History Survey

Report prepared by
Craig A. Miller, Ph.D.,
Linda K. Campbell,
Jessica A. Yeagle, and
R. Jason Williams



April 25, 2002

Hunter Access to Private Lands in Illinois

**Results of studies of Illinois hunters,
landowners, and participants in
Access Illinois Outdoors**

April 25, 2002

**Human Dimensions Research Program
Illinois Natural History Survey**

Craig A. Miller, Ph.D., Program Leader
Linda K. Campbell
Jessica A. Yeagle
R. Jason Williams

Suggested Citation: Miller, C.A., L.A.Campbell, J.A. Yeagle, and R.J. Williams. 2002. Hunter Access to private lands in Illinois: Results of studies of Illinois hunters, landowners, and participants in Access Illinois Outdoors. Human Dimensions Program Report SR-02-01. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
Hunter Access to Private Lands in Illinois	
Executive Summary	1
Illinois Hunters.....	1
Landowners.....	2
Access Illinois Outdoors Participants.....	2
Access Illinois Outdoors Landowners.....	3
Background.....	4
Purpose.....	4
Methods.....	5
Illinois Hunter Survey	
Results and Discussion	6
<u>Profile of Illinois Hunters</u>	6
Table 1. Description of place of residence of Illinois hunters.....	6
Table 2. Total household income.....	7
Table 3. Years hunted in Illinois.....	7
<u>Hunter Effort</u>	7
Table 4. Days hunted in Illinois for all game species.....	8
Table 5. Game species hunted in Illinois.....	8
Table 6. Game species harvested in Illinois.....	9
Table 7. Game species IL hunters stopped hunting in past 5 years..	10
Table 8. Game species IL hunters preferred to hunt more often....	11
Table 9. Hunting effort of IL hunters during past 5 years.....	11
Table 10. Reasons for increased hunting effort.....	12
Table 11. Species hunted more than 5 years prior to study.....	12
Table 12. Reasons for decreased hunting effort.....	13
Table 13. Species hunted less than 5 years prior to study.....	13
Table 14. Factors contributing to decline of hunting.....	14
<u>Land Access</u>	15
Table 15. Property hunted most often by Illinois hunters.....	16
Table 16. Years Illinois hunters have hunted their current lands....	16
Table 17. Hunter reaction if access to current lands is lost.....	16
Table 18. Effect of lost access on hunting effort.....	17
Table 19. Loss of hunting access by Illinois hunters.....	17
Table 20. Reported refusals for permission to hunt.....	17
Table 21. Hunter ratings of the amount of private land available...	18
Table 22. Hunter ratings of the amount of public land available....	18
<u>Hunter Attitudes Toward Fee Hunting on Private Land</u>	18
Table 23. Illinois hunters who have paid to hunt private land.....	21
Table 24. Illinois hunters who plan to hunt private land.....	21
Table 25. Willingness to pay to hunt private land.....	21

	Page
Table 26. Amount Illinois hunters were willing to pay to hunt.....	22
Table 27. Reasons given for those not willing to pay to hunt.....	22
Table 28. Game species Illinois hunters prefer to hunt for a fee.....	23
Table 29. Hunter perceptions of effect of access on hunting effort..	23
Table 30. Hunters' willingness-to-pay for access to land shared....	23
Table 31. Amount willing to pay for access to land shared.....	24
Table 32. Change in hunter effort given access with others.....	24
Table 33. Hunters' willingness-to-pay for access with friends.....	25
Table 34. Amount willing to pay for access with friends.....	25
Table 35. Change in hunter effort given access with friends.....	25
Table 36. Hunters' willingness-to-pay for exclusive access.....	25
Table 37. Amount willing to pay for exclusive access.....	26
Table 38. Change in hunter effort given exclusive access.....	26
<u>Hunter Support for IDNR Private Land Access Program.....</u>	<u>26</u>
Table 39. Hunter support for IDNR access program.....	27
Table 40. Predicted change in hunter effort under program.....	27
Table 41. Preferred incentives of hunters for program.....	27
Appendix A. Access lost in last 5 years, by county.....	28

Illinois Landowner Survey

Results and Discussion

Response.....	29
<u>Current Status of Hunter Access to Private Land in Illinois.....</u>	<u>29</u>
Table 1. Landowners allowing hunters access.....	30
Table 1a. Regional representation of private property.....	31
Table 2. Trouble with people hunting without permission.....	31
Table 3. Landowners allowing trapping on their property.....	31
Table 4. Landowners reasons for not allowing hunter access.....	32
Table 5. Landowners' awareness of reduced liability.....	32
Table 6. Relationship of hunters granted access to landowners.....	32
Table 7. Species hunters were permitted to hunt.....	33
Table 8. Change in number of hunters with access.....	33
Table 8a. Regional change in hunters with access.....	33
Table 9. Perceived benefits to landowners allowing access.....	34
Table 10. Percentage of landowners who hunt.....	34
Table 11. Landowners who hunted on their property.....	34
Table 12. Percentage of landowners who have family who hunt...	35
<u>Fee Access for Hunting Private Property.....</u>	<u>35</u>
Table 13. Landowners who charge hunters for access.....	35
Table 13a. Regional breakdown of landowners charging access....	35
Table 14. Services provided to hunters by landowners.....	36

	Page
<u>Landowner Willingness to Participate in Hunter Access Programs</u>	36
Table 15. Landowners willing to participate in access program.....	37
Table 16. Landowners willing to participate by region.....	37
Table 17. Landowners willing to participate by land class.....	37
Table 18. Landowners willing to participate who did not allow hunting at time of study, by land class.....	38
Table 19. Ratings of incentives by all landowners.....	39
Table 20. Ratings of incentives by landowners willing to participate in program.....	39
Table 21. Ratings of 3 most important incentives for landowners willing to participate in an access program, by region....	40
Table 22. Reasons given for not participating in program.....	41
Table 23. Attitudes of IL landowners concerning access.....	41
Discussion.....	42

Access Illinois Outdoors Participant Survey

Methods.....	44
Results and Discussion.....	44
Profile of Access Illinois Outdoors Participants.....	44
<u>Hunter Effort</u>	44
Table 1. Species hunted by participants in AIO.....	45

<u>Access Illinois Outdoors Enrollment</u>	45
Table 2. Year enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors.....	46
Table 3. Landowner contacts in the first year of enrollment.....	46
Table 4. Continuing arrangements begun through AIO.....	47
Table 5. Reasons for enrolling in AIO.....	47

<u>Satisfaction with AIO</u>	48
Table 6. Participant satisfaction ratings of AIO.....	48
Table 6a. Illinois participant satisfaction ratings of AIO.....	48
Table 7. Ratings for arrangement with landowner.....	49
Table 7a. Illinois ratings for arrangement with landowners.....	49
Table 8. Participant overall satisfaction with AIO.....	50
Table 8a. Illinois participant overall satisfaction with AIO.....	50
Table 9. Harvest success by AIO participants.....	51

<u>Access Arrangements with Landowners</u>	51
Table 10. Participant description of access agreement.....	51
Table 11. Number of hunters in arrangement with landowner.....	52
Table 12. Number of acres involved in arrangement.....	52
Table 13. Length of contract for paid use of private land.....	53
Table 14. Approximate total cost of arrangement.....	53
Table 15. Participant description of arrangement.....	54
Table 16. Participant description of property.....	54

	Page
Table 17. Participant description of hunt(s) in Illinois.....	54
Table 18. Trespass problems experienced while hunting as participant in AIO.....	55
<u>Perceived Worth of Experience</u>	55
Table 19. Rating of entire cost of visit to Illinois compared with experience.....	55
<u>Conclusions</u>	56
Appendix B. State of residence.....	57
Appendix C. Other reasons for enrolling in AIO.....	57

Access Illinois Landowner Survey

Results.....	58
Table 1. Landowners currently enrolled in AIO.....	59
Table 1a. Reasons for discontinuing enrollment in AIO.....	59
Table 2. Amount of land owned by landowners enrolled in AIO...	59
Table 3. Percent of landowners who hunt their own land.....	60
Table 4. Landowners allowing hunter access prior to AIO.....	60
Table 5. Description of hunters allowed access prior to AIO.....	60
Table 6. Number of hunters given access through AIO.....	61
Table 7. Trespass problems before and after participating in AIO..	61
Table 8. Landowner perceptions of hunters in AIO.....	61
Table 9. Landowner reasons for participating in AIO.....	62
Table 10. Incentives landowners recommend.....	62
Table 11. Landowner quality ratings for AIO.....	62
<u>Conclusions</u>	63
Appendix I. Illinois Hunter Survey Questionnaire.....	65
Appendix II. Illinois Landowner Survey Questionnaire.....	76
Appendix III. AIO Participant Survey Questionnaire.....	84
Appendix IV. AIO Landowner Evaluation Survey Questionnaire...	92

Hunter Access to Private Lands in Illinois

Executive Summary

Access to lands for hunting is a serious problem in Illinois. To determine need and support for a private land access program, four mail surveys were conducted from August 2000 through April 2001. Resident hunters, landowners, participants in Access Illinois Outdoors (AIO), and landowners enrolled in AIO were each surveyed for attitudes toward private land access, perspectives on a statewide private land access program, and hunting quality in Illinois.

Illinois Hunters

Results of the Illinois resident hunter study indicate hunters are at risk for losing access to private land and consider access to places to hunt to be the single greatest issue facing Illinois hunters. A large proportion (43%) of resident hunters reported their hunting efforts had decreased in the five years prior to the survey, and most hunters (56%) identified lack of places to hunt as the greatest factor contributing to declining participation in hunting among Illinois residents. Most hunters (59%) depend on private land owned by someone else for their hunting lands, with 48% of all hunters reporting that from 1994 through 1999 they had lost access to private lands they hunted. Of hunters who had lost access to private land for hunting, 62% stated they had been refused permission to hunt other private land in the year prior to the study (1999). Less than half of hunters (42%) reported they would be willing to pay to hunt private land in Illinois. When given certain circumstances under which an access program would operate, most hunters (63%) were supportive of paying for an access program that allowed them and a few friends to hunt private land and least supportive (23%) of paying for a program that allowed them and other hunters they did not know access to the same land. Most hunters (78%) felt the Illinois Department of Natural Resources should pursue a program to assist hunters in gaining access to private land in Illinois. Hunters most often suggested “reduced liability” as the incentive offered to landowners for providing access.

Landowners

A total of 68% of landowners reported they allowed hunting on their property. Landowners most often allowed family and friends to hunt on their lands, and 32% stated they allowed “people who ask permission.” Liability was the most frequent reason given for not allowing hunters on their property. Majorities of landowners reported the number of hunters on their property was the same as in the past, however 37% of landowners in DNR Administrative Region III responded that fewer hunters hunted their land than in the past. Twenty-one percent of landowners in Region IV stated they had more hunters at the time of the survey than previously. Four percent of landowners charged fees for hunter access, and access fees were charged by 9% of landowners in Region IV. A total of 38% of landowners indicated willingness to participate in an access program, with willingness highest among landowners in Region III. Reduced liability was rated as the most desired incentive by both landowners willing to participate in the program and among all landowners. Of landowners who indicated a willingness to participate in an access program, 85% allowed hunting at the time of the survey.

Access Illinois Outdoors Participants

A total of 62% of participants in Access Illinois Outdoors (AIO) reported they were no longer enrolled in the program. Illinois hunters comprised 33% of AIO participants. When asked why they enrolled in AIO 26% of all hunters stated their reason for joining was because they could not find land on which to hunt, whereas 44 % of Illinois hunters stated this was their reason for joining AIO. Overall satisfaction with AIO was rated as “Good” to “Excellent” by 63% of participants, with 37% of participants rating the program “Poor” to “Fair.” Among Illinois hunters, the ratings were 48% “Good” to “Excellent” and 53% rated the program “Poor” to “Fair” (23% of Illinois hunters gave the program a “Poor” rating). Participants overall satisfaction with the program was reported as “Extremely satisfied” by 17% of all participants, and 11% for Illinois hunters. A total of 17% expressed they were “Extremely dissatisfied” with the program, whereas 30% of Illinois participants stated they were “Extremely dissatisfied” with AIO. The average length of hunting contract was more than one day, but less than one week and the average fee was approximately \$750.00.

Access Illinois Outdoors Landowners

Of landowners enrolled in AIO, 86% reported they allowed hunting on their land prior to enrollment in the program. Family members and friends comprised the majority of hunters on these lands prior to the landowners' enrollment in AIO. The average number of hunters allowed access through AIO was 2-5 hunters per landowner. Most landowners stated their reason for participating in AIO was for extra income. Reduced liability was identified by AIO landowners as the most important incentive for allowing hunters access to property statewide. A total of 81% of landowners enrolled in AIO rated the program as "Good" to "Excellent."

Background

Illinois ranks 47th of states in public lands (Riggs 1990), yet experiences high demand for recreation. The high proportion of private land ownership coupled with extensive agriculture use provides few opportunities for hunters, who are dependent on private land access in all regions of the state. In order to meet the needs of hunters for private lands on which to hunt, the Illinois Department of Natural Resources created Access Illinois Outdoors (AIO) in 1995. Access Illinois Outdoors was developed as a pilot project to pair hunters requesting access to private land with landowners in the five county region of west-central Illinois (Adams, Brown, Calhoun, Hancock, and Pike). Due to declining sales of hunting licenses, considerations have been given to developing a new access program throughout Illinois to provide greater hunting opportunities for Illinois residents.

Purpose

The intent of this study was to: a) evaluate the present recreational access program Access Illinois Outdoors, operational in 5 western counties, and b) investigate attitudes and needs of landowners and the hunting public toward access to private lands for recreation throughout Illinois. Information gathered from this study will enable IDNR to develop a recreation access program that can be implemented statewide. To determine the success of the current program and assess public needs and demand, data was gathered from participants and landowners in Access Illinois Outdoors (AIO), landowners not enrolled in AIO, and the hunting public. A further purpose of this project was to identify factors related to satisfaction and motivations of Access Illinois Outdoors participants, landowner benefits, and recreation access programs acceptable statewide by both the hunting public and landowners. Information gathered through this study will enable IDNR management staff to better understand the needs of the hunting public for access to lands for recreation and of landowners for returns and compensation.

Methods

This study was conducted in 2 phases: 1) evaluation of participants and enrolled landowners in Access Illinois Outdoors, and 2) assessment of hunter needs and landowner incentives/benefits. Phase I involved mail surveys of participants and landowners in AIO. Phase II involved mail surveys of both hunters and landowners randomly selected throughout Illinois.

The list of participants and enrolled landowners were used as the entire sample for the mail surveys of AIO participants and landowners, respectively. The sample for the survey of hunters at large was derived from receipts from 1999 habitat stamp sales. Individuals were selected randomly to obtain a sample of 2,000 hunters statewide. For the statewide survey of landowners, individuals were selected from county property tax rolls via a stratified random sample based on size of land owned.

Mail surveys were each conducted using the same methodology. Each survey subject received a survey questionnaire accompanied by a cover letter explaining the study and a postage-paid return-mail envelope. Postcard reminders were sent approximately 2 weeks later to nonrespondents. The postcard reminder was followed approximately 2 weeks later by a second mailing of the questionnaire to nonrespondents, followed 2 weeks later by a second postcard reminder.

This project was funded by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources. Research was administered by the Human Dimensions Research Program of the Illinois Natural History Survey. The mail survey instruments were developed by Program researchers in cooperation with and by approval of IDNR management staff, printed by the University of Illinois printing services, and mailed first-class through the University's mail service. Return mail was handled through the Human Dimensions Research Program's business reply permit with the U.S. Postal Service in Urbana, Illinois.

Illinois Hunter Survey

Results and Discussion

The survey of 2,872 resident Illinois hunters yielded 1,939 (67.5%) responses, of which 1,919 (66.8% of total) were usable.

Profile of Illinois Hunters

Illinois hunters averaged 43 years of age at the time of this study, and hunted in Illinois an average of 26 years. Most hunters (41%) live in rural areas, followed by 28% who live in small towns (Table 1). Median range for total household income for Illinois hunters was \$30,000 to \$44,999 (Table 2). The distribution of hunters by years hunting in Illinois show most hunters (56%) have hunted in Illinois more than 20 years (Table 3). Few hunters (13%) have hunted in Illinois less than 5 years.

Table 1. Description of place of residence of Illinois hunters, 2000. (n = 1,887)

Area	Number of Respondents	Percent Response
Rural area	766	41%
Small town	516	28%
Small city (5,000 to 49,999)	349	19%
Medium city (50,000 to 500,000)	122	6%
Suburb of medium of large city	93	5%
Large city (over 500,000)	20	1%

Table 2. Total household income. (n = 1,673)

Income	Percent Response
Less than \$15,000	6%
\$15,000 to \$29,999	18%
\$30,000 to \$44,999	22%
\$45,000 to \$59,999	21%
\$60,000 to \$74,999	14%
\$75,000 to \$89,999	7%
\$90,000 to \$104, 999	6%
\$105,000 to \$119,999	2%
Over \$119,999	4%

Table 3. Years hunted in Illinois. (n=1908)

	Percent Response
1 year	2%
2-5 years	11%
6-10 years	12%
11-20 years	18%
More than 20 years	56%

Hunter Effort

Illinois hunters averaged 18 days afield during the 1999-2000 seasons. The largest group of hunters (35%) consisted of those who hunted 1 to 10 days (Table 4). Most hunters (n=1,230; 64.1%) hunted deer with a firearm during 1999-2000. Small game hunting was the second in participation as 1,186 hunters (61.8%) reported hunting small game (Table 5). Small game species were harvested by 982 (51.2%) hunters, and 710 (37%) hunters reported harvesting a deer during firearm season (Table 6).

Table 4. Days hunted in Illinois for all game species (1999-2000 seasons). (n = 1,887)

	Percent Response
1-10 days	35%
11-20 days	20%
21-30 days	15%
31-40 days	9%
41-50 days	6%
More than 50 days	15%

Table 5. Game species hunted in Illinois (1999-2000 season).

	Number of Respondents
Deer (firearm)	1230
Small Game (pheasant, rabbit, etc.)	1186
Deer (archery)	812
Doves	561
Ducks	342
Geese	331
Turkey (spring 1999)	308
Furbearers	225
Deer (muzzleloader)	130
Turkey (fall 1999)	123

Table 6. Game species harvested in Illinois (1999-2000 seasons).

	Number of Respondents
Small Game	982
Deer (firearm)	710
Doves	494
Deer (archery)	287
Ducks	246
Geese	192
Furbearers	179
Turkey (spring)	104
Deer (muzzleloader)	33
Turkey (fall)	24

Illinois hunters decreased their participation in small game hunting during the past 5 years (Table 7). These same hunters expressed a desire to do more small game hunting if given the opportunity (Table 8). Slightly more than one-quarter (26%) of hunters reported their hunting efforts have increased during the past 5 years (1994-1999). More hunters (43%) responded that their efforts have decreased during the past 5 years than increased or stayed the same (Table 9). Hunters whose efforts have increased reported increased free time, hunting partners, and available land as the most frequent reasons for the increase (Table 10). These hunters indicated they hunted deer during archery and firearm season more during 1999 than the 5 years prior to the study (Table 11).

Of the 43% of hunters whose efforts have decreased during the past 5 years, lack of land was cited most often as the reason for the decrease, followed by lack of time and not enough game (Table 12). These hunters hunted less small game, doves, and archery deer during 1999 than 5 years previous (Table 13). All hunters (regardless of whether their hunting effort increased, stayed the same, or decreased) were asked for their opinion on factors contributing to decline of hunting participation in Illinois (Table 14). The majority of hunters (56%) identified “Not enough land” as the most important reason for

declines in hunting. This reason was cited by 61% of hunters who reported their efforts increased over the 5 years prior to the study. “Declining game species” was the second factor identified, cited by 15% of all hunters.

Table 7. Game species Illinois hunters stopped hunting in past 5 years.

	Number of Respondents
Small Game	432
Doves	326
Ducks	277
Geese	260
Furbearers	221
Deer (firearm)	163
Turkey (spring)	133
Deer (archery)	130
Turkey (fall)	101
Deer (muzzleloader)	90

Table 8. Game species Illinois hunters preferred to hunt more often.

	Number of Respondents
Small Game	978
Deer (archery)	810
Deer (firearm)	785
Turkey (spring)	679
Ducks	552
Turkey (fall)	507
Geese	471
Doves	464
Deer (muzzleloader)	242
Furbearers	192

Table 9. Hunting effort of Illinois Hunters during past 5 years (1994-1999). (n = 1883)

	Percent Response
Increased	26%
Stayed the same	32%
Decreased	43%

Table 10. Reasons for increased hunting effort (1994-1999).

	Number of Respondents
Increased free time	226
Hunting partners	209
Availability of land	183
Involved in new type of hunting	138
Greater financial resources	136
Better equipment	101
More game	63
Better seasons/regulations	46
Better health/fitness	20

Table 11. Species hunted more than 5 years prior to study.

	Number of Respondents
Deer (archery)	232
Deer (firearm)	162
Small game	158
Ducks	101
Geese	91
Turkey (spring)	81
Doves	59
Turkey (fall)	33
Furbearers	28
Deer (muzzleloader)	28

Table 12. Reasons for decreased hunting effort (1994-1999).

	Number of Respondents
No land to hunt on	453
Lack of time	405
Not enough game	321
Too many regulations	149
Seasons too short	123
Health problems	102
Lack of financial resources	86
No one to hunt with	76
Lack of interest	45
Too much equipment needed	20

Table 13. Species hunted less than 5 years prior to study.

	Number of Respondents
Small Game	598
Doves	283
Deer (archery)	217
Deer (firearm)	217
Ducks	216
Geese	193
Furbearers	140
Turkey (spring)	95
Turkey (fall)	63
Deer (muzzleloader)	39

Table 14. Factors contributing to decline of hunting reported by Illinois hunters.

	Increased Effort (%)	Same Effort (%)	Decreased Effort (%)	Total (%)
Not enough land	61	54	55	56
Declining game species	10	12	19	15
Gun control	9	17	10	12
Not enough time	9	6	8	8
Too many hunters on public land	8	9	5	7
Competing recreation uses of public land	3	2	3	3

Land Access

Most Illinois hunters (59%) hunted primarily on private land not owned by themselves during the 1999-2000 seasons. Slightly more hunted their own private land (22%) than hunted public lands (19%) (Table 15). Hunters hunted their current areas an average of 11 years for state lands and an average of 19 years on their own private property (Table 16).

A majority of hunters (70%) stated that if they lost access to the lands they currently hunt they would seek out other private land, whereas 15% reported they would be forced to give up hunting (Table 17). A majority of hunters (57%) responded that losing access to their current hunting lands would result in decreased hunting effort (Table 18). Slightly less than half of hunters (48%) reported they have lost access to land on which they hunted during the 5 years prior to this study (1994-1999) (Table 19) (See Appendix A for complete list of Illinois counties). Forty percent of hunters reported they were denied permission to hunt private land during the year prior to the study (1999). The average number of times hunters were denied access to private land was 4 times per hunter during 1999 (Table 20). A comparison of both hunters who reported losing access to private land and those to whom access to other private land was denied showed the percentages for each are similar: 48% to 40% and are significantly correlated ($R = 0.4314$). Almost two-thirds of hunters who lost access to land were refused permission to hunt on other private land. Comparing these results with those in Table 17 shows that 70% of all hunters would look for other lands on which to hunt if they lost access to the land to which they currently have access. This may be problematic, however, if the same proportion are refused access to private land as that reported by respondents in this study. These results could portend lost opportunities for hunters; as they are displaced from private lands it may be difficult to replace access lost with new lands on which to hunt.

Hunters hunting their own private land rated the amount of private land available for hunting in Illinois as “Fair” (mean = 4.3, mode = 5.0). All other hunters, those hunting mostly on others’ private land or public lands, rated private land availability as “Poor” (mode = 3.0) (Table 21). Hunters, regardless of lands hunted, rated the amount of public land available for hunting in Illinois as “Fair”, with slightly higher ratings for

hunters who hunt primarily on federal land (Table 22). Ratings of “Poor” to “Fair” in service industries are indicative of low customer satisfaction.

Table 15. Property hunted most often by Illinois hunters during 1999-00 seasons.

	Percent
Private property not owned by me	59
My own private property	22
State lands (state parks, conservation areas, etc.)	14
Federal lands (national wildlife refuges, Shawnee National Forest, etc.)	5

Table 16. Years Illinois hunters have hunted their current hunting lands.

“How long have you hunted on these types of property?”	Mean Years
My own private property	19
Federal lands (national wildlife refuges, Shawnee National Forest, etc.)	15
Private property not owned by me	14
State lands (state parks, conservation areas, etc.)	11

Table 17. Hunter reaction if access to current hunting lands is lost.

“If you lost access to the land you hunt most often would you...?”	Percent
Find other private land	70
Find other public land	15
Have to give up hunting	15

Table 18. Effect of lost access to current hunting lands on hunting effort.

“How would the loss of your current hunting spot affect your total hunting effort?”	Percent Respondents
My effort would increase	8
My effort would stay the same	35
My effort would decrease	57

Table 19. Loss of hunting access by Illinois hunters 1994-1999.

“In the past five years have you lost access to land you used to hunt?”	Percent Response
Yes	48%
No	52%

Table 20. Reported refusals for permission to hunt by Illinois Hunters.

“In the past year have you been refused when requesting to hunt private land?”	Percent Response
Yes	40
No	60
How many times?	Mean = 4
Percent of hunters who have lost access to private land in past 5 years and who have been refused permission to hunt private lands:	
Yes	62

Table 21. Hunter ratings of the amount of private land available for hunting in Illinois.

Very poor	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Type of Land Hunted				Mean			Mode	
Hunt own private land				4.3			5.0	
Hunt others' private land				4.0			3.0	
Hunt state land				3.1			3.0	
Hunt federal land				3.5			3.0	
Total				3.9			3.0	

Table 22. Hunter ratings of the amount of public land available for hunting in Illinois.

Very poor	Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9
Type of Land Hunted				Mean			Mode	
Hunt own private land				4.6			5.0	
Hunt others' private land				4.3			5.0	
Hunt state land				4.8			5.0	
Hunt federal land				5.1			5.0	
Total				4.5			5.0	

Hunter Attitudes Towards Fee Hunting on Private Land

Twelve percent of Illinois hunters reported they paid to hunt private land in Illinois at some point during their hunting career (Table 23). Most hunters (90%) planned to hunt private land during the 2000-2001 hunting season (Table 24). The large percentage of hunters who indicated they planned to hunt on private land shows a high demand by hunters for access to private land in Illinois, given that only 22% of hunters (from Table 15) stated they hunted their own private land. Understandably, hunters who

hunted on their own land were less likely to support paying to hunt private land (30% in favor). Less than half of hunters (43%) who hunted primarily on private land owned by another were willing to pay to hunt on private land (Table 25). Hunters indicated they were willing to pay an average of \$10 per day, \$20 per week, and \$100 per season to access private lands for hunting (Table 26). Of the hunters who objected to paying to hunt private land (58%), leading reasons include paying too much for licenses and permits, objections to paying to hunt, and objections to paying to hunt private land (Table 27).

Firearm deer hunting was the type of hunting most favored by hunters willing to pay to hunt private land (Table 28). It is perhaps important to note that small game hunting was the second-most favored type of hunting. Taking into consideration the trend toward decreased small game hunting (Table 13) and the desire to hunt more small game (Table 8), these results indicate a need for more small game hunting opportunities for Illinois hunters.

Most respondents (59%) reported that access to private land for hunting would result in an increase in their hunting efforts (Table 29). Responses were significantly correlated ($R = 0.1678$) with present hunting effort, indicating hunters whose hunting efforts decreased during 1994-1999 would increase their efforts if they had access to private land on which to hunt.

Hunters were then asked a series of questions directed at their willingness to pay for access to private land. Given three different scenarios, hunters were asked for their support if a) the private land was open to them and other hunters they did not know, b) themselves and friends of theirs only, or c) to them alone. Each series of items asked respondents if they would be willing to pay for access under the specific conditions, what amount they would be willing to pay, what length of time (day, week, or season) they would pay for access, and how they thought such access would affect their hunting effort.

In the first scenario hunters were asked if they would be willing to pay for access to private land if it was open to them and several other hunters they did not know. A minority of hunters (23%) responded they were willing to pay for access under such conditions (Table 30). Of those who supported paying under the conditions stated, average payment was: per day \$25 (mode = \$10), per week \$101 (mode = \$20), and per

season \$213 (mode = \$100) (Table 31). Modal responses are provided to illustrate what most hunters were willing to pay and balance the effect high and low amounts had on determining average payments. Most hunters (58%) reported such access would increase their hunting effort (Table 32). The responses were significantly correlated with their present hunting effort ($R = 0.1684$), and with willingness to pay for access to private land in general ($R = 0.7273$).

The second condition under which hunters evaluated paying for access to private lands asked if they supported paying for access to hunt on private land for themselves and a few of their friends. Most hunters (63%) were willing to pay for access under this condition (Table 33). Hunters were willing to pay an average fee of \$28 per day (mode = \$10), an average fee of \$86 per week (mode = \$50), and an average fee of \$235 per season (mode = \$100) (Table 34). A majority of hunters (58%) felt their hunting effort would increase under this condition (Table 35). Responses were significantly correlated with support for paying for access in general ($R = 0.8206$), and for access with other hunters ($R = 0.7977$).

Under the third condition hunters were asked if they would be willing to pay for access to private land if they had the land to themselves. A majority of hunters (57%) responded that they would be willing to pay for access under such conditions (Table 36). Average payments for exclusive access was \$33 per day (mode = \$10), \$107 per week (mode = \$50), and \$284 for the season (mode = \$100) (Table 37). Most hunters (62%) expected their hunting effort to increase under such an arrangement (Table 38).

In summary, less than half (42%) of hunters were in favor of paying for access to private land. Hunters were most supportive of access that would include themselves and a few of their friends, and the majority were willing to pay \$10 per day, \$50 per week, or \$100 for the season. Hunters were least supportive of paying to hunt private land that included access for hunters they did not know. Providing access to private land, even for a fee, would likely increase hunting effort for those participating. Those hunters who did not support paying to hunt private land were opposed based on their perception that they currently pay enough in fees and permits, and that paying to hunt ran against their values.

Table 23. Illinois hunters who have paid to hunt private land in Illinois. (n = 1,905)

“Have you ever paid a property owner to hunt private land in Illinois?”	Percent Response
Yes	12
No	88

Table 24. Illinois hunters who plan to hunt private land during 2000-2001 season. (n = 1,890)

“Do you plan to hunt private land in 2000-01?”	Percent Response
Yes	90
No	10

Table 25. Willingness to pay to hunt private land by Illinois Hunters. (n = 1,893)

“Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land?”	Percent Response
Yes	42%
No	58%
<u>Hunt state land</u>	
Yes	42%
No	58%
<u>Hunt federal land</u>	
Yes	41%
No	59%
<u>Hunt own private land</u>	
Yes	30%
No	70%
<u>Hunt land owned by others</u>	
Yes	43%
No	57%

Table 26. Amount Illinois hunters were willing to pay to hunt private land for their favorite type of hunting.

<u>“What amount would you pay to hunt private land for your favorite type of hunting?”</u>			
	Per Day	Per Week	Per Season
% Hunters	37%	5%	58%
Minimum	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.00
Maximum	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$3,000
Mean	\$31	\$109	\$272
Mode	\$10	\$20	\$100

Table 27. Reasons given for those not willing to pay a fee to hunt private land.

	Number of Respondents
I already pay enough in license fees	285
I object to paying to hunt	276
I don't believe in paying to hunt private land	249
I hunt on my own land	207
Hunting is getting too expensive	134
DNR should buy more land so I can hunt without paying an access fee	74

Table 28. Game species Illinois hunters would prefer to hunt for a fee on private land.

“If you are willing to pay a fee to hunt private land, what species would you want to hunt?”	Number of Respondents
Deer (firearm)	446
Small Game	400
Deer (archery)	374
Ducks	228
Turkey (spring)	223
Geese	210
Doves	192
Turkey (fall)	162
Deer (muzzleloader)	85
Furbearers	37

Table 29. Hunter perceptions of effect of access to private land on hunting effort.
(n = 759)

“If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt...”	Percent Response
More than now	59
Same amount as now	37
Less than now	4

Table 30. Hunters’ willingness-to-pay for access to land shared with other hunters.

“Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land if you shared the land with several other hunters you did not know?”	Percent Response
Yes	23
No	77

Table 31. Amount willing to pay for access to land with other hunters.

“What amount would you pay to hunt private land, for your favorite type of hunting, with several other hunters you did not know?”

	Per Day	Per Week	Per Season
Minimum	\$2.00	\$5.00	\$1.00
Maximum	\$100	\$1,000	\$2,000
Mean	\$25	\$101	\$213
Mode	\$10	\$20	\$100

Table 32. Change in hunter effort given access to land with other hunters.

“If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt....”

	Percent Response (n = 384)
More than now	58
Same amount as now	38
Less than now	4

Table 33. Hunters' willingness-to-pay for access to land shared with friends.

“Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land if you shared it with a few of your friends only?”	Percent Response (n = 1828)
Yes	63
No	37

Table 34. Amount willing to pay for access to land with friends.

“What amount would you pay to hunt private land, for your favorite type of hunting, if you shared it with a few of your friends only?”

	Per Day	Per Week	Per Season
Minimum	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$5.00
Maximum	\$400	\$1,000	\$4,000
Mean	\$28	\$86	\$235
Mode	\$10	\$50	\$100

Table 35. Change in hunter effort given access to land with friends.

“If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt...”	Percent Response (n = 1016)
More than now	58%
Same amount as now	39%
Less than now	3%

Table 36. Hunters' willingness-to-pay for exclusive access to land.

“Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land if you had it to yourself?”	Percent Response (n = 1764)
Yes	57%
No	43%

Table 37. Amount willing to pay for exclusive access to land.
 “What amount would you pay to hunt private land if you had it to yourself?”

	Per Day	Per Week	Per Season
Minimum	\$1.00	\$5.00	\$1.00
Maximum	\$200	\$1,000	\$3,000
Mean	\$33	\$107	\$284
Mode	\$10	\$50	\$100

Table 38. Change in hunter effort given exclusive access to land.

“If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt...”	Percent Response (n = 901)
More than now	62
Same amount as now	36
Less than now	2

Hunter Support for IDNR Private Land Access Program

Hunters were asked if they supported the Illinois Department of Natural Resources pursuing a program to assist hunters in gaining access to hunt on private land. Most hunters (78%) stated they would support such a program. Support was highest among hunters who hunt mostly on state land (90%), followed by hunters who hunt federal land (85%), hunters who hunt others’ private land (80%), and hunters who hunt their own land (62%) (Table 39). A majority of hunters (58%) believed their hunting effort would increase if such a program was developed (Table 40). Hunters were in favor of reduced liability, tax breaks, and plant materials as incentives for landowners participating in such a program. Slightly more than one-third of hunters (35%) supported cash payments to landowners (Table 41).

Table 39. Hunter support for IDNR access program.

“Do you feel the IDNR should pursue a program to assist hunters in gaining access to private land for hunting?”	Percent Response (n = 1,808)
Yes	78
No	22
<u>Responses by type of land hunted most often</u>	
	<u>% Yes</u>
State lands	90
Federal lands	85
Other’s private	80
Own private	62

Table 40. Predicted change in hunter effort under IDNR access program.

“If the Illinois Department of Natural Resources developed a program to provide hunters access to private lands, would your hunting effort...”	Percent Response (n = 1,852)
Increase	58
Stay the same	39
Decrease	2

Table 41. Preferred incentives of hunters for IDNR access program.

“If the Illinois Department of Natural Resources developed a program to provide hunters access to private lands, what would you suggest landowners receive in return?”	Number of Respondents
Reduced liability	1367
Tax breaks	1299
Plant materials (seedling, seed for habitat, etc.)	1252
Cash payment	678
Scheduling hunters	593
Technical support	570

Appendix A. Access lost in last 5 years (1995 – 2000), by county.

County	Number of Respondents	County	Number of Respondents	County	Number of Respondents
Fulton	22	Adams	9	Washington	6
Jackson	22	Coles	9	Wayne	6
Tazewell	22	Livingston	9	DeKalb	5
Randolph	20	Champaign	8	Henderson	5
Will	20	Christian	8	Mercer	5
Perry	19	Effingham	8	Morgan	5
Franklin	18	Iroquois	8	Pope	5
JoDaviess	18	Jefferson	8	Warren	5
Madison	18	Knox	8	Cass	4
LaSalle	17	Lawrence	8	Clinton	4
St. Clair	17	Montgomery	8	Hamilton	4
Macoupin	16	Sangamon	8	Lee	4
Clay	15	Williamson	8	Moultrie	4
McLean	15	Woodford	8	Pulaski	4
Rock Island	15	Brown	7	Edgar	3
Henry	14	Grundy	7	Gallatin	3
Peoria	14	Jasper	7	Hardin	3
Pike	14	Johnson	7	Kankakee	3
Crawford	13	Saline	7	McDonough	3
Greene	13	Stephenson	7	Stark	3
Logan	13	Whiteside	7	Alexander	2
Marion	13	Bond	6	DeWitt	2
Ogle	12	Boone	6	Douglas	2
Schuyler	12	Bureau	6	Edwards	2
Shelby	12	Calhoun	6	Fayette	2
Vermilion	12	DuPage	6	Wabash	2
Carroll	11	Kendall	6	White	2
Kane	11	Lake	6	Massac	1
Monroe	11	Macon	6	Menard	1
Winnebago	11	Marshall	6	Putnam	1
Clark	10	McHenry	6	Scott	1
Cumberland	10	Piatt	6	Cook	0
Hancock	10	Richland	6	Ford	0
Mason	10	Union	6	Jersey	0

Illinois Landowner Survey

Results and Discussion

Response

An initial random sample of 3,000 landowners throughout Illinois was selected from tax and census records for this study. Landowners were stratified into 3 land ownership categories of 1,000 landowners each: 1) less than 100 acres, 2) 100 - 500 acres, 3) more than 500 acres. After removing names that were listed with undeliverable addresses the sample size was reduced to 2,747 participants. Of these, 1,703 (62%) questionnaires were received and 1,562 (57%) were completed and usable. Surveys and follow-up reminders were mailed beginning in April through July 2001.

Current Status of Hunter Access to Private Land in Illinois

As of 2000, 68% of private property owners in Illinois allowed hunters access to their land (Table 1). Of the landowners who did not allow access, approximately half (15%) allowed access in the past but no longer permitted hunting. Percentage of landowners who allowed hunters access to their land was highest in Regions 5 (72%) and 4 (71%), lowest in Regions 2 (60%) and 3 (66%) (Table 1a). The average amount of time that landowners had permitted hunting was 23 years. Statewide, 55% of landowners have experienced problems with hunters on their land without permission (Table 2). Most landowners (70%) do not allow trapping on their property, mostly due to concerns about injury to domestic animals and liability (Table 3). Landowners who did not allow hunting on their land reported liability most often as their reason for not allowing access (Table 4). Most landowners (69%) were unaware that Illinois law provided reduced liability when hunters are provided free access to their land (Table 5). Responses to the question from Table 4, plus the frequency of liability as a reason for not allowing hunting shows that landowners in Illinois are either unaware or do not understand the protection Illinois law affords them when they provide hunters access to their property for free.

Friends, family, and neighbors made up the majority of hunters on private property, however 32% of hunters who had access were "People asking permission" (Table 6). An average of 5 hunters per landowner were allowed to hunt on his or her

property. Most landowners (79%) gave permission to hunt deer more than any other game species, whereas waterfowl ranked lowest for species hunted on private lands (Table 7). This ranking could be due to the game species most hunters sought on private land, not necessarily what species landowners were willing to have hunted.

Of the landowners who allowed hunters access to their property, 63% reported they had approximately the same number of hunters with permission during 2000 than when they first began to allow hunters to hunt on their property (Table 8). Greater percentages of landowners in Regions 4 (21%) and 5 (17%) reported they had more hunters on their land than in the past, whereas the smallest percentage of landowners who reported more hunters than in the past were in Regions 2 (11%) and 3 (9%) (Table 8a). The highest percentages of landowners who reported less hunters than in the past were from Regions 3 (37%) and 2 (23%). Landowners reported that the primary benefits to allowing hunters access to their land were to maintain relationships with family or friends, and to control wildlife populations (Table 9).

Slightly more than one-third (39%) of landowners surveyed were hunters, and approximately one quarter (26%) hunted in the past but did not at the time of the study (Table 10). Most landowners (59%) who allowed hunters access also hunted on their property, and 30% used to hunt on their property but no longer did so (Table 11). Most landowners, regardless of whether or not they permitted hunters access to their land, had family members who hunted (Table 12). Landowners who were familiar with hunting, either as a hunter, former hunter, or who had family members who hunted, were more likely to allow hunters access to their property.

Table 1. Landowners allowing hunters access to their property. (n = 1,448)

	n	%
Yes	987	68
No, but did in the past	217	15
No	244	17

Table 1a. Regional representation of private property open to hunters.

	Region 1 % (n=528)	Region 2 % (n=102)	Region 3 % (n=324)	Region 4 % (n=344)	Region 5 % (n=150)
Yes	68	60	66	71	72
No, but did in the past	15	16	16	14	14
No	17	25	17	15	14

Table 2. Trouble with people hunting without permission. (n = 1,389)

“Have you had problems with people hunting without permission?”	%
Yes	55
No	45

Table 3. Landowners allowing trapping on their property. (n = 1,402)

Allow trapping	%	
Yes	30	
No	70	
If “No,” why not? (n = 977)		
	<u>n</u>	<u>%</u>
Injury to domestic animals	253	26
Liability	231	24
Don’t like trapping	234	24
No one asks	120	12
Safety concerns	112	12
Inconsiderate trappers	84	9
Damage to property	66	7
Limited game	57	6
Poor habitat	39	4
Other	32	4

Table 4. Reasons given by landowners for not allowing hunters access. (n=461)

Reasons	n
Liability	251
Inconsiderate	121
Safety concerns	120
Damages to property and equipment	92
Injury to livestock	82
Got tired of people asking	73
Don't like hunting or hunters	50
Land not suitable	43
Other	33

Table 5. Landowners' awareness of reduced liability when *not* charging access. (n=1,431)

	n	%
Aware	440	31
Not Aware	991	69

Table 6. Relationship of hunters granted access to landowners. (n=987)

	n	%
Friends	735	75
Family	503	51
Neighbors	328	33
People asking permission	314	32
Employees	51	5

Table 7. Species hunters were permitted to hunt on private property. (n=987)

Species:	n	%
Deer	781	79
Deer(bucks)	735	75
Deer(doe)	646	66
Rabbits/Squirrels	500	51
Pheasants	360	37
Raccoons	343	35
Predators	277	28
Quail	249	25
Turkey	241	24
Doves	201	20
Waterfowl	131	13
Other	5	-

Table 8. Change in number of hunters with access compared when landowner first allowed hunting. (n=940)

	%
More than in past	15
Same as in past	63
Less than in past	22

Table 8a. Regional change in hunters with access compared to number when landowner first allowed hunting.

	Region 1 % (n = 343)	Region 2 % (n = 56)	Region 3 % (n = 207)	Region 4 % (n = 229)	Region 5 % (n = 105)
More than in past	14	11	9	21	17
Same as in past	67	66	54	64	68
Less than in past	19	23	37	15	16

Table 9. Perceived benefits to landowners for allowing hunter access. (n = 987)

Benefit	n	%
Maintain relations with friends/family	589	60
Control wildlife	482	49
Remove nuisance wildlife	304	31
Discourage trespassers	120	12
Provide me with game	45	5
Source of income	22	2
Source of goods and services	16	2
Other	25	3

Table 10. Percentage of landowners who hunt. (n = 1,439)

Do you hunt?	%
Yes	39
No	35
I used to	26

Table 11. Landowners who hunted on their property. (n = 889)

Do you hunt on your property?	%
Yes	59
No	12
I used to, but not anymore	30

Table 12. Percentage of landowners who have family members who hunt. (n = 1,406)

Do other members of your family hunt?	Percent Response (%)
Yes	58
No	42
<u>If “Yes,” which family members hunt?(n=809)</u>	
Son/daughter	65
Brother/sister	33
Grandchildren	20
Father/mother	11
In-laws	10
Spouse	8
Grandparent	2
Other	11

Fee Access for Hunting Private Property

A small percentage of landowners (4%) charged hunters fees for access to their land (Table 13). The percentage of landowners who charged hunters fees for access to their property was highest in Region 4 (9%) and lowest in Region 3 (<0.5%) (Table 13a). Most landowners did not provide any services to hunters using their property. Of landowners who provided services, blinds were those reported most frequently provided by landowners (Table 14).

Table 13. Landowners who charge hunters for access.

“Do you charge hunters to hunt your property?” (Responses are from landowners who allow hunting, n = 954)	Percent Response (%)
Yes	4
No	96

Table 13a. Regional breakdown of landowners who charge hunters for access.

	Region 1 % (n=347)	Region 2 % (n=55)	Region 3 % (n=207)	Region 4 % (n=238)	Region 5 % (n=107)
Yes	2	6	<0.5	9	1
No	98	94	99.5	91	99

Table 14. Services provided to hunters by landowners. (n = 987)

Benefits:	n	%
Blind	64	7
Lodging	26	3
Meals	18	2
Guide services	15	2
Transportation	15	2
Other	4	<1

Landowner Willingness to Participate in Hunter Access Program

Statewide, 38% of landowners surveyed were willing to participate in a hunter access program (Table 15). Of these, 85% already allowed hunters access to their land. Therefore, 15% of landowners who indicated they would be willing to participate in an access program did not allow hunting on their land at the time the survey was conducted. The number of landowners willing to participate in the access program who did not allow hunting at the time of this study (and thus represent new land opened to hunting) constituted 5.7% of all landowners surveyed. Comparing landowners who were willing to participate in an access program with the hunters already allowed access (Table 6), we would expect similar relationships with hunters gaining access: approximately one-third of hunters gaining access would be “People who ask permission,” and the remainder would be family, friends, and neighbors. Given that 16% of landowners would be new to allowing access, it remains to be determined who (in terms of relations presented in Table 6) these landowners would allow to hunt on their land.

There is a slight difference in willingness to participate among landowners by region (Table 16). Region 3 was highest in landowners willing to participate in an access program. Region 3 ranked next to lowest in the percentage of landowners (66%) who allowed hunters access to their land (see Table 1a). Therefore, an access program may be of particular benefit to opening private lands to hunting in Region 3.

When land ownership category is considered, the majority of landowners willing to participate owned 101 to 500 acres, whereas 31% of landowners willing to participate were in the 1 to 100 acre category (Table 17). The lowest percentage of landowners (14%) willing to participate were in the highest ownership category (> 500 acres). An examination of landowners who did not allow hunting at the time of the study shows that more landowners in the 1 to 100 acre (44%) and 101 to 500 acre (43%) categories were willing to participate, whereas 13% of landowners who owned the larger properties (> 500 acres) were willing to participate (Table 18).

Table 15. Landowners willing to participate in access program. (n = 471)

Would you participate in such a program?	n	%
Yes ¹	471	38
No	758	62

¹An additional 44 landowners responded to this question by indicating they “may be” interested in such a program, including 13 respondents who answered “No” to participating in the program, but indicated some interest in the “why not” section.)

Table 16. Landowners willing to participate in access program, by region. (n = 471)

Willing to participate	Region 1 % n=460	Region 2 % n=89	Region 3 % n=280	Region 4 % n=276	Region 5 % n=124
Yes	37	35	42	36	41
No	63	65	58	64	59

Table 17. Landowners willing to participate in access program, by land ownership class. (n = 471)

Land ownership	n	%
1-100 acres	146	31
101 – 500 acres	260	55
> 500 acres	65	14

Table 18. Landowners willing to participate in access program and who did not allow hunting¹, by land ownership class. (n = 72)

Land ownership	n	%
1-100 acres	32	44
101 – 500 acres	31	43
> 500 acres	9	13

¹ Did not allow hunting at time of study, winter 2001.

Landowners reported several incentives they felt were important to include in an access program (Table 19). Highest among these was reduced liability, reported as “Very Important” by 53% of respondents. That this incentive was rated highest is further indication most landowners were either unaware of or did not understand current Illinois law protecting landowners from liability if they allow hunters access without charging fees (see Table 5). Tax breaks were listed as important by 45% of landowners, followed by cash payments. When only landowners willing to participate in the program were considered, ratings of incentives did not change in rankings, but more landowners rated the incentives as “Very Important” (Table 20).

Importance of incentives differed by landowners in the five regions who expressed a willingness to participate in an access program (Table 21). Reduced liability was rated as “Very Important” by more than two-thirds of landowners in Regions 1 through 4, and by 50% of landowners in Region 5. Tax breaks were rated as “Very Important” for 52% of landowners in Region 1 (lowest percentage) through 64% among landowners in Region 5 (highest percentage). More than half of landowners in two regions rated cash payments as “Very Important”: 55% in Region 4 and 54% in Region 3.

Table 19. Ratings of proposed hunter access incentives by all landowners.

Incentive	Not Important % (1)	Somewhat Important % (2)	Very Important % (3)	Mean
Reduced liability	27	20	53	2.26
Tax breaks	25	30	45	2.19
Cash payment	32	31	37	2.05
Free plant materials	33	36	31	1.98
Free technical advice	50	33	17	1.67
Scheduling hunters	65	22	13	1.48

Table 20. Ratings of proposed hunter access incentives by landowners willing to participate in program.

Incentive	Not Important % 1	Somewhat Important % 2	Very Important % 3	Mean
Reduced liability	14	21	65	2.51
Tax breaks	12	30	58	2.46
Cash payment	15	35	50	2.34
Free plant materials	17	39	44	2.26
Free technical advice	36	42	23	1.87
Scheduling hunters	52	32	16	1.64

Table 21. Ratings of 3 most important incentives for landowners willing to participate in an access program, by region.

		1	2	3	4	5
Region		%	%	%	%	%
<u>Incentive</u>	<u>Importance</u>					
Reduced Liability	Not	17	10	7	12	25
	Somewhat	17	20	22	23	25
	Very	66	70	72	65	50
Tax Breaks	Not	17	3	8	9	11
	Somewhat	31	33	31	32	24
	Very	52	63	61	59	64
Cash Payments	Not	22	13	11	9	18
	Somewhat	33	41	35	36	36
	Very	45	47	54	55	46

Landowners unwilling to participate in an access program expressed a variety of reasons for their unwillingness (Table 22). Most frequent among the reasons stated were “Not interested/Don’t want the bother” (19%), “Land not suitable for hunting (18%), and “Land reserved for family/friends” (18%).

Landowners willing to participate in an access program reported their attitudes toward hunter access and related issues (Table 23). Landowners were divided in their attitudes toward the Illinois Department of Natural Resources leasing land for hunter access. Most landowners (52%) felt that hunters should pay landowners for access to private property. A majority of landowners (56%) believed the Illinois Department of Natural Resources should provide landowners incentives for providing hunter access. A high percentage of landowners agreed that leasing land is an added source of income for landowners, 52% felt leases limited hunter access, and 58% agreed that paying to hunt provided hunters more places to hunt. Most landowners (74%) agreed that hunters reduce crop damage by wildlife. The perception that landowners risk liability if they provided access was shared by 77% of landowners.

Table 22. Reasons given by landowners for not participating in access program.(n = 433)

	n	%
Not interested/ Don't want the bother	78	19
Land not suitable for hunting	77	18
Land reserved for family/friends	76	18
Want control over hunters	60	14
Hunting is too dangerous	25	6
Against government intrusion	23	5
Liability	16	4
Inconsiderate hunters	16	4
Privacy	14	3
Program not needed	13	3
Maybe/More information needed	13	3
Don't like hunting	6	1

Table 23. Attitudes of Illinois landowners willing to participate in hunter access program concerning access and related issues.(n = 471)

Statement	Agree (%)	Unsure (%)	Disagree (%)
DNR should lease land for hunters.	33	35	33
Hunters should pay landowners for access.	52	34	15
DNR should provide incentives for hunter access.	56	27	17
Leasing land is an added source of income.	72	22	7
Hunting leases limit access.	52	33	16
Paying for access provides more places to hunt.	58	31	10
Hunters reduce crop damage.	74	18	8
Landowners risk liability.	77	13	9

Discussion

More than two-thirds of Illinois landowners surveyed allowed hunting on their property. Almost half of those who did not allow hunting at the time of this study had previously permitted hunters access to their land. Reasons for discontinuing access were similar to those given from landowners who never allowed hunting; liability, inconsiderate actions on the part of hunters, and safety concerns topped the list. Hunters who were able to hunt on private property were mainly family and friends of the landowners. Individuals asking permission constituted approximately one-third of hunters on private property in Illinois. The greatest interest was in deer hunting for hunters on private property, with small game, furbearers, and turkeys comprising less than fifty-percent of species hunted on private lands.

Less than half (38%) of landowners expressed interest in participating in an access program. Of those interested, 84% already provide access to hunters, primarily family and friends. The results of this study suggest that approximately 16% of landowners interested in participating in an access program would be landowners with property not now open to hunting. The majority of potential new properties that would be opened to hunting were less than 500 acres in size. Landowners in DNR Administrative Regions 3 and 5 were more favorable toward an access program than those in other regions, although less than 50% of landowners in all regions were willing to participate. Willingness of landowners to participate in Region 3 is of special note, as this region ranks next to last of the five regions in the ratio of acres of public land per hunter (0.9 acres/hunter). Region 3 also has the second highest percentage of hunters using public land (28%) of the five regions, yet ranks next to last of the five regions in the number of public areas available for hunting (C.A. Miller, unpublished data, Illinois Hunter Survey).

The most favored incentives landowners would desire from an access program were reduced liability, tax breaks, and cash payments. A study conducted by the Place to Hunt Committee (a cooperative effort between the Illinois Departments of Conservation and Agriculture established in the mid-1980's) found concerns over liability to be the primary reasons landowners did not permit hunting on their land (Gunkel 1988). The

committee worked to strengthen the Recreational Use of Land and Water Areas Act. The results of this study strongly suggest landowners are unaware of the protection this act provides landowners and perceive liability complaints to be a threat to their operations.

Illegal trespass was another concern landowners expressed in the Place to Hunt Committee study. Trespass was a concern of 77% of landowners surveyed in the 1987 study. Trespass problems were reported by 55% of landowners in the current study. This change may indicate success of efforts to educate hunters of the law requiring landowner permission prior to hunting private property.

The Place to Hunt Committee also found leasing to be practically non-existent in Illinois during 1987. The concept of leasing has changed since the Place to Hunt Committee study, as 4% of landowners statewide in the current study (2001) reported charging fees for hunting and 9% of landowners in DNR Administrative Region 4 charged hunters fees for access. The 1999-2000 Illinois Hunter Survey found 11% of Illinois hunters had paid fees at some time during their hunting careers to hunt private land in Illinois, and 6% of hunters reported paying fees to hunt private land during 1998-1999 seasons (Miller, et al. 1999).

In conclusion, the results of this study did not find widespread support for an access program among Illinois landowners, and less so among landowners who did not already allow hunting on their property. The issue of liability is one that needs to be addressed, both in terms of landowners' basic information of the law's protections, and clearly defining the provisions of the law for both hunters and landowners alike. Care must be made to guard against lands open under an access program converting to leases, as has happened in Michigan and elsewhere (M. Sargent, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, personal communication). Until the problem of land access (both public and private) is addressed, Illinois will continue to experience declining sales of hunting licenses.

Access Illinois Outdoors Participant Survey

Methods

This study was conducted to determine satisfaction with land access among participants in the Access Illinois Program. A self-administered mail survey of participants in Access Illinois Outdoors (AIO) was conducted during July through September, 2000. Survey questionnaires were mailed to 1,265 participants, with 103 returned as undeliverable. Participants who did not respond to the initial mailing received a postcard reminder 10 days following the initial mailing. A second questionnaire was sent to nonrespondents, followed 10 days later with a second postcard reminder. A third mailing of the questionnaire and postcard reminder was conducted during September.

Results and Discussion

Questionnaires were received from 704 participants for a response rate of 61%. Of the questionnaires received, 685 (59%) were complete and usable.

Profile of Access Illinois Outdoors Participants

AIO participants were mostly male (99%) and averaged 43 years of age. Median total household income was \$45,000 for all participants. One-third (33%) of participants were Illinois residents, 17% were from Pennsylvania, and the remaining 50% came from 33 other states (Appendix B).

Hunter Effort

More AIO participants (84%) hunted than any other activity. The participants who did not indicate they hunted enrolled during 2000 and likely did not have the opportunity to hunt before the study was conducted. Bowhunting for deer was most popular (271 hunters), followed by firearm deer hunting (173 hunters), and spring turkey (53 hunters) (Table 1).

Table 1. Species hunted by participants in AIO.

Species Hunted	Number of Respondents
Deer (archery)	271
Deer (firearm)	173
Turkey (spring)	53
Turkey (fall)	26
Deer (muzzleloader)	18
Pheasants	16
Rabbits	11
Quail	7
Geese	7
Doves	6
Ducks	5
Raccoons	2
Other ^a	4

^aOthers include squirrel and coyote.

Access Illinois Outdoors Enrollment

Enrollment in AIO increased each year since 1994 (Table 2). As this study was conducted during summer 2000 enrollment for that year was lower than prior years, but likely increased as the year progressed. Participants reported an average (mode) of 1 landowner contact during their first year of enrollment (Table 3). It is important to note that 15% of participants stated they were not contacted by any landowners during their first year of enrollment. A majority of individuals (62%) are no longer continuing their arrangement with the landowner they began with AIO (Table 4).

Table 2. Year enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors.

Year	Percent Response
1994	1
1995	4
1996	7
1997	19
1998	22
1999	34
2000	13

Table 3. Landowner contacts in the first year of enrollment in Access Illinois Outdoors.

Number of Landowners	Percent Response
0	15
1	32
2	25
3	15
4	6
5	3
6	3
7	<1
8	<1
9	<1
12	<1
15	<1

Table 4. Continuing arrangements with landowner begun through Access Illinois Outdoors.

	Percent Response
Continuing	38
Not continuing	62

Reasons for enrolling in AIO differed between all hunters and Illinois hunters (Table 5). The reason for enrolling given most often (28%) by all hunters was “I prefer to hunt private land over public land.” The same percentage (28%) of Illinois hunters also gave that same reason as their motivation for enrolling in AIO. The most frequent response (45%) for Illinois residents was “Could not find land of my own to hunt.” Desire to hunt trophy animals differed between the two groups: 25% of all hunters compared to 6% of Illinois hunters. A higher proportion of Illinois hunters (17%) reported “Better selection of land available” than all hunters (12%).

Table 5. Reasons for enrolling in Access Illinois Outdoors¹.

Reason for Enrolling	Percent Responses	
	All Hunters	Illinois Hunters
I prefer to hunt private land over public land	28	28
Could not find land on my own	26	45
To hunt land with trophy animals	25	6
Better selection of land available	12	17
To save time	9	4
To hire an outfitter	>1	0

¹See Appendix C for list of other reasons provided in open-ended response.

Satisfaction with AIO

Hunters were asked to rate their satisfaction with selected aspects of the AIO program. More hunters (44%) rated as “Poor” the number of landowners that contacted them, compared to any other category (Table 6). This low rating shows a significant dissatisfaction with this aspect of the AIO program. Hunters were most satisfied with the “Hospitality of landowner” (48% rated this as “Excellent”) and “Quality of habitat” (rated “Excellent” by 30% of respondents). Illinois residents who participated in AIO expressed lower satisfaction than hunters as a whole (Table 6a). Satisfaction among Illinois hunters was extremely low for number of landowner contacts and price of access.

Table 6. Participant satisfaction ratings for selected aspects of Access Illinois Outdoors.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Number of landowners that contacted you	44%	29%	22%	5%
Amount of land available to you	23%	32%	36%	10%
Length of time before you were contacted by landowner	25%	25%	35%	15%
Price of lease or cost of access	29%	32%	29%	10%
Hospitality of landowner	6%	10%	35%	48%
Quality of habitat	11%	19%	40%	30%
Overall quality of hunting experience	17%	20%	36%	27%

Table 6a. Illinois resident participant satisfaction ratings for selected aspects of Access Illinois Outdoors.

	Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
Number of landowners that contacted you	53%	26%	18%	4%
Amount of land available to you	28%	33%	30%	10%
Length of time before you were contacted by landowner	32%	29%	28%	11%
Price of lease or cost of access	49%	31%	15%	6%
Hospitality of landowner	9%	16%	37%	38%
Quality of habitat	12%	24%	38%	26%
Overall quality of hunting experience	23%	30%	28%	20%

Most hunters (54%) expressed some level of satisfaction with their arrangements with landowners, whereas 27% expressed some level of dissatisfaction and 19% were undecided (Table 7). A rating of 27% dissatisfied is high by customer satisfaction standards. Illinois residents who were enrolled in AIO were less satisfied than hunters as a whole with the arrangements made with landowners, as 43% reported some level of dissatisfaction (Table 7a). The results for hunters as a whole and Illinois residents suggest slightly more than half of AIO hunters were satisfied with the arrangements made with landowners and followed the same trend relative to overall satisfaction with AIO. Hunters had mixed feelings of satisfaction with AIO (Table 8). Overall satisfaction with AIO showed slightly more than half (51%) of hunters reported they were satisfied with AIO, whereas 28% reported some degree of dissatisfaction. Level of satisfaction with AIO was lower for Illinois hunters, with 45% reporting some degree of dissatisfaction and 36% reporting some level of satisfaction (Table 8a). The two measure of satisfaction (overall and with landowner arrangements) for all hunters were strongly correlated ($R^2 = 0.79$).

Table 7. Participant satisfaction ratings for arrangement with landowner(s).

Extremely Dissatisfied		Undecided						Extremely Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
14%	3%	5%	5%	13%	6%	8%	16%	10%	20%
Mean = 6.3					Mode = 10				

Table 7a. Illinois AIO participant satisfaction ratings for arrangement with landowner(s).

Extremely Dissatisfied		Undecided						Extremely Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
22%	5%	8%	8%	12%	8%	8%	10%	9%	11%
Mean = 5.2					Mode = 10				

Table 8. Participant overall satisfaction with Access Illinois Outdoors.

Extremely Dissatisfied		Undecided						Extremely Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
17%	4%	5%	2%	16%	5%	10%	15%	9%	17%
Mean = 6.0					Mode = 10				

Table 8a. Illinois AIO participant overall satisfaction with Access Illinois Outdoors.

Extremely Dissatisfied		Undecided						Extremely Satisfied	
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10
30%	6%	6%	3%	14%	5%	8%	10%	7%	11%
Mean = 4.8					Mode = 10				

Harvest success among AIO participants was highest for firearm deer hunters (63%) (Table 9). Although success was high among duck (80%), goose (57%), and pheasant (56%) hunters, few individuals hunted these species while participating in AIO. Successfully harvesting deer or other game was not significantly related to hunters overall satisfaction with AIO or arrangements made with landowners.

Table 9. Harvest success by AIO participants.

Species Harvested	Number of Hunters	Percent Success
Deer (archery)	271	45
Deer (firearm)	173	63
Turkey (spring)	21	40
Turkey (fall)	11	42
Pheasants	9	56
Rabbits	6	55
Geese	4	57
Ducks	4	80
Deer (muzzleloader)	4	22
Quail	2	29
Doves	2	33

Access Arrangements with Landowners

The majority (97%) of hunters described the arrangements with landowners as “Private land for a fee” (Table 10). Mean number of hunters per lease was 3, and 59% of hunters entered into agreements that allowed 3 hunters or less (Table 11). Leases averaged 386 acres, with most (56%) from 1 to 200 acres (Table 12).

Table 10. Participant description of access agreement.

	Percent Response
Private land (for a fee)	97
Private land (no cost)	2
Private land in exchange for goods/services	1

Table 11. Number of hunters in arrangement with the landowner.
(mean = 3.0 hunters)

Number of Hunters	Percent Response
1	25
2	24
3	20
4	15
5	5
6	3
7	3
8	1
9	1
10	1
12	1
20	1

Table 12. Acres involved in arrangement with the landowner.
(mean = 386 acres)

Acres	Percent Response
1-100	25
101-200	31
201-300	12
301-400	8
401-500	6
501-600	4
601-700	1
701-800	1
801-900	1
901-1000	4
Over 1000	7

The majority of hunters (76%) had lease contracts of one week or less, with 4% of that number having a one-day contract (Table 13). It is important to note that Illinois hunters constituted 78% of the one-day and 61% of the entire season lease holders, whereas nonresident hunters were the majority of all other lease holders. Average (mean) cost of leases was \$750, with leases ranging from less than \$100 to more than \$3,000 (Table 14). Most hunters (55%) shared the lease with only members of their own party (Table 15). Fewer than one-fifth (18%) of hunters had exclusive rights to the land, and no one traded hunting privileges for their own land with the AIO participating landowner. Most hunters (69%) categorized the land they hunted as an “Active farm” (Table 16).

Table 13. Length of contract for paid use of private land.

Length of Contract	Percent Response All Hunters	Percent Response Illinois Hunters
One day	4	11
More than one day, but less than a week	41	47
One week	31	6
More than one week, but less than entire season	10	6
Entire season	14	30

Table 14. Approximate total cost of arrangement with landowner. (mean = \$750)

Cost	Percent Response
Less than \$100	5
\$100 - \$500	48
\$501 - \$1,000	28
\$1001 - \$2,000	13
\$2,001 - \$3,000	4
Over \$3,000	2

Table 15. Participant description of arrangement with landowner.

Arrangement	Percent Response
I had exclusive rights to the land	18
I shared rights with others in my party	55
I shared rights with others in different parties	27
I traded use for the Illinois landowner's property with use privileges on mine	0

Table 16. Participant description of landowner's property.

	Percent Response
Active farm	69
Rural land, but not actively farmed	26
Other ^a	5

^aOthers include land that is mostly wooded, CRP land, and one half-idle or CRP and one half crops.

Hunters hunted with a party unguided more often (42%) than other types of hunts (Table 17). Few hunters (3%) hunted with an outfitter or guide. Approximately one-fifth (21%) of hunters participating in AIO hunted with family or friends living in Illinois. Most hunters (81%) did not experience problems with trespass while hunting (Table 18). Of those who did, 64% had problems with adjoining property owners.

Table 17. Participant description of hunt(s) in Illinois.

Type of Hunt	Percent Response
Hunted with outfitter/guide	3
Hunted with friends and/or family living in Illinois	21
Hunted alone on my own unguided	34
Hunted with a party of nonresidents unguided	42

Table 18. Trespass problems experienced while hunting as a participant in AIO.

	Percent Response
Yes	19
No	81
If “Yes,” was your experience with an adjoining landowner’s property?	
Yes	64
No	36

Perceived Worth of Experience

Access Illinois Outdoors participants were asked to rate their experience relative to the cost of their visit. A majority of hunters (53%) felt the cost was worth the experience or a bargain (Table 19). Slightly less than one-third (31%) felt the experience fell short of the cost. In contrast, 57% of Illinois hunters felt the experience was either “Slightly costly compared to my experience” or “Too expensive compared to the experience.”

Table 19. Rating of entire cost of visit to Illinois compared with experience.

	% Response All Hunters	% Response Illinois Hunters
The cost was worth the experience	34	13
A good bargain for the money	19	13
The cost was about even with the experience	17	18
Slightly costly compared to my experience	17	26
Too expensive compared to the experience	14	31

Conclusions

Most hunters enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors were nonresident hunters visiting Illinois for an opportunity to hunt trophy game on private land. They were somewhat satisfied with the AIO program, but not to a great extent. Number of landowner contacts, price of lease, and time before contact were leading factors for dissatisfaction among all hunters in the program. Many of these hunters were visiting Illinois for a one-time hunting opportunity.

Resident Illinois hunters constituted close to one-third of hunters in AIO. Many Illinois hunters stated their motivation for participation was because they couldn't find access to land on their own. Overall satisfaction with the program and with key program components was markedly lower for Illinois hunters. The individual aspects of the AIO program that elicited the lowest satisfaction ratings for Illinois residents were the same as all hunters (number of landowner contacts, price of lease, and time before contact), but received lower ratings from Illinois residents. This low satisfaction among Illinois hunters in AIO is an important consideration if Access Illinois Outdoors is to be used as a model for a statewide hunter access program.

Appendix B. In what state do you reside?

State	Number of Respondents	State	Number of Respondents
Illinois	228	New Jersey	6
Pennsylvania	115	Texas	6
Michigan	36	Kentucky	5
Missouri	32	Maryland	5
North Carolina	26	Ohio	4
Wisconsin	26	Minnesota	3
New York	22	Oklahoma	3
Georgia	19	South Carolina	3
Louisiana	19	Arizona	2
Virginia	19	Colorado	2
Florida	18	Connecticut	2
Tennessee	16	Maine	2
Mississippi	14	New Hampshire	2
West Virginia	12	Idaho	1
Indiana	10	Montana	1
Vermont	9	South Dakota	1
Arkansas	8	Utah	1
Alabama	7		

Appendix C. Other reasons for enrolling in Access Illinois Outdoors?

Reason	Number of Respondents
To find private land near home that was not crowded	10
Less expensive than an outfitter	6
Landowners required it to hunt on their land	4
Compare availability of land with quality of land	2
To hunt private land out of state	2
A friend suggested it	2
Lost previously hunted land to outfitter or development	1
To utilize a state program	1
New to Illinois	1

Access Illinois Landowner Survey

The purpose of this study was to determine satisfaction of landowners participating in Access Illinois Outdoors, and perceived benefits landowners derived from participating in the program.

Results

All landowners participating in Access Illinois Outdoors as of June 2000 were used as the sample for this study. Of the 285 landowners listed as participants in AIO, 191 (69%) returned completed questionnaires.

Most landowners (92%) were currently enrolled at the time of this study (Table 1). Of the reasons given by landowners no longer participating in AIO, leasing to outfitters was cited most often (Table 1a). Some confusion as to the processes involved in AIO must exist, as 3 landowners who were no longer enrolled stated they weren't contacted by hunters, whereas it is the landowner who initiates contact with hunters. Most landowners (74%) enrolled in AIO owned less than 500 acres (Table 2).

A majority of landowners (60%) reported they hunted on their own land (Table 3). Several landowners stated that hunting on their own land was reason to discontinue enrollment in AIO. A large majority of landowners (86%) allowed hunters access prior to enrolling in AIO (Table 4). Hunters who had access prior to AIO were mostly family members, friends, and people who asked permission (Table 5).

An average of 2-5 hunters had access privileges per landowner (Table 6). Trespass problems appear to have declined once a landowner enrolled in AIO. A majority of landowners (71%) reported problems with hunters trespassing on their land without permission prior to enrolling in AIO, whereas 43% of landowners reported problems with hunters trespassing following enrollment (Table 7). A slight majority of landowners (53%) felt that hunters enrolled in AIO were better mannered than those who hunted their property prior to enrollment (Table 8).

Most landowners (n = 124) reported extra income as the reason they participated in AIO, followed by knowing who was on their property, and control over access (Table 9). When asked what incentives they would like to see in a statewide hunter access

program, landowners responded that reduced liability was the incentive they preferred (Table 10). The majority of landowners (81%) enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors rated the program as “Good” to “Excellent” (Table 11).

Table 1. Landowners currently enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors. (n=179)

	n	Percent Response
Yes	165	92
No	14	8

Table 1a. Reasons for discontinuing enrollment in AIO. (n = 14)

	n	Percent Response
Lease to outfitter	4	31
Wasn't contacted by hunters	3	23
Wanted hunting for self and family	2	15
Already have hunters, don't need AIO	2	15
No longer allow hunting	2	15

Table 2. Amount of land owned by landowners enrolled in AIO.

	Percent Response
Less than 500 acres	74
500 – 1,000 acres	17
1,001 – 1,500 acres	5
1,501 – 2,000 acres	1
2,001 – 2,500 acres	1
2,501 – 3,000 acres	1
More than 3,000 acres	1

Table 3. Percent of landowners who hunt their own land.

	Percent Response
Yes	60
No	40

Table 4. Landowners allowing hunter access prior to AIO.

	Percent Response
Yes	86
No	14

Table 5. Description of hunters allowed access prior to AIO.

	Number of Respondents
Family members	117
Friends	108
People who asked permission	69
Neighbors	64
Employees	18

Table 6. Number of hunters given access through AIO.

Number of Hunters	Percent Response
1	5
2-5	51
6-10	21
More than 10	24

Table 7. Trespass problems before and after participating in AIO.

“Did you have problems with hunters trespassing on your land without permission?”	Before AIO	After AIO
Yes	71%	43%
No	29%	57%

Table 8. Landowner perceptions of hunters in AIO versus hunters in past.

“How do the manners of hunters who hunt your land in AIO differ from hunters you allowed in the past?”	Percent Response
Much better	20
Somewhat better	33
Same	45
Somewhat worse	1
Much worse	1

Table 9. Landowner reasons for participating in AIO

	Number of Respondents
Extra income	124
Knowing who is on my property	108
Control over who comes on my land	106
Control over the deer or other game harvested	61
No longer bothered by hunters requesting to hunt my land	60

Table 10. Incentives landowners recommend for statewide access program.

	Number of Respondents
Reduced liability	141
Tax breaks	93
Cash payment	85
Plant materials	79
Technical support	71
Scheduling hunters	52

Table 11. Landowner quality ratings for AIO.

	Percent Response
Poor	2
Fair	17
Good	50
Excellent	31

Conclusions

When reviewing the results of this study, particularly ratings for AIO and desired incentives, it is important to consider that landowners in Access Illinois Outdoors received payments from hunters for access to their lands. Receiving payment would provide a different point of reference for incentives and could be assumed to influence satisfaction with the program. Most landowners reported that extra income was the reason they were enrolled in AIO. Liability appears to be an issue with landowners in AIO, both in terms of trespass violations and incentives landowners see as important to include in a statewide access program.

A large majority of landowners enrolled in AIO took lands that were accessible to hunters before the program and put these lands into leases. Hunters using these lands prior to AIO were primarily family and friends. Removing lands from access to favor leasing is an important point to consider when looking at AIO as a model for a statewide access program, as the results presented here indicate such action would lead to displacement of resident hunters.

Literature cited

Gunkel, N. 1988. Place to hunt committee: A cooperative Illinois program. p. 350-360 *in* Transactions of the 53rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference. R. McCabe, editor. The Wildlife Management Institute, Washington, D.C.

Miller, C.A., L.K. Campbell, and K. Caldwell. 1999. 1998 Illinois Hunter Harvest Survey Report. Job Completion Report, Federal Aid in Wildlife Restoration W-112-R-8. Human Dimensions Program Report. Illinois Natural History Survey, Champaign, IL.

Riggs, J.C. (1990). Estimated state and federal lands for recreation. Report to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Dept.

Illinois Hunter Survey

ALL RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Postage-paid return envelope provided

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

The Department of Natural resources is requesting disclosure of information that is necessary to accomplish the statutory purpose as outlined under the Illinois Compiled Statutes, The Wildlife Code, Chapter 520. Disclosure of information is voluntary

Please take 15 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire. Your responses will tell us more about hunters and hunting in Illinois .

Section 1. Hunting Effort and Experience. Please tell us about your hunting activities during the 1999-2000 seasons and your experiences related to hunting.

1. Approximately how many days did you hunt in Illinois during the 1999-2000 season for all game species?

1 – 10 days 11 – 20 days 21 – 30 days
 31 – 40 days 41 – 50 days more than 50 days

2. Which of the following species did you hunt **last year** in Illinois (1999-2000)? Please check all that apply.

Geese Ducks Small Game (pheasant, rabbit, etc.)
 Doves Turkey (spring 1999) Turkey (fall 1999)
 Furbearers Deer (archery) Deer (firearm)
 Deer (muzzleloader) Other (Please identify): _____

3. Which of the following species did you successfully harvest **last year** in Illinois (1999-2000)? Please check all that apply.

Small Game Geese Ducks
 Doves Turkey (spring) Turkey (fall)
 Furbearers Deer (archery) Deer (firearm)
 Deer (muzzleloader) Other (Please identify): _____

4. How many years have you hunted in Illinois?

1 year 2-5 years 6-10 years
 11-20 years more than 20 years

5. Have you hunted a commercial hunting preserve in Illinois?

Yes
 No

If "Yes", was it in the past year?

Yes
 No

6. **In the past five years**, have you **stopped hunting** any of the following species you used to hunt? Please check all those you no longer hunt.

Small Game Geese Ducks
 Doves Turkey (spring) Turkey (fall)
 Furbearers Deer (archery) Deer (firearm)
 Deer (muzzleloader) Other (Please identify): _____

11. In your opinion, what do you feel is the **single greatest problem** that contributes to the decline in hunting?
(Choose 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. Which of the following describes the people you usually hunt with now? Choose all that apply.

- family members friends from work
 friends from hunting/shooting clubs I usually hunt alone
 friends from conservation organizations (for example DU, Pheasants Forever, etc.)
 other (please identify): _____

13. If you had only one day to hunt, which of the following would you hunt?

- Small Game Geese Ducks
 Doves Turkey (spring) Turkey (fall)
 Furbearers Deer (archery) Deer (firearm)
 Deer (muzzleloader) Other (Please identify): _____

Please state if you agree or disagree with the following statements by circling the number that matches your answer.

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Unsure	Agree	Strongly Agree
14. I plan my vacation time around hunting seasons.	1	2	3	4	5
15. My closest friends are hunters.	1	2	3	4	5
16. I would rather go hunting than do any other recreation activity.	1	2	3	4	5
17. I spend a lot of time before the season scouting the area I will hunt.	1	2	3	4	5
18. Hunting defines my lifestyle.	1	2	3	4	5
19. If I cannot find someone to hunt with me I hunt alone.	1	2	3	4	5
20. I spend a lot of time in the off-season planning for the hunt.	1	2	3	4	5
21. Hunting is one of the most important activities in my life.	1	2	3	4	5

22. In the past five years, have you purchased any of the following specifically for hunting? Check all that apply.

- | | |
|--------------------------------------|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4x4 vehicle | <input type="checkbox"/> ATV |
| <input type="checkbox"/> camper | <input type="checkbox"/> firearm or bow |
| <input type="checkbox"/> land | <input type="checkbox"/> boat/canoe |
| <input type="checkbox"/> decoys | <input type="checkbox"/> clothing |
| <input type="checkbox"/> hunting dog | <input type="checkbox"/> other (please identify): _____ |

23. Have you visited a sports or outdoor show in the past 12 months?

- Yes How many? shows
 No

24. Do you belong to a local sportsmen's club ("sportsmen's club" refers to a local club whose charter emphasizes hunting, shooting, and sports ethics).

- Yes No

24a. If you answered "Yes" to question 24, how often have you used your club facilities in the past 12 months?

- | | |
|--|--------------------------------------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> at least once per month | <input type="checkbox"/> 1 – 3 times |
| <input type="checkbox"/> 4 – 6 times | <input type="checkbox"/> Never |

25. Do you watch hunting shows on television?

- Yes
 No

25a. If you answered "Yes" to question 25, how often have you watched hunting shows in the past 12 months?

- every week
 once a month
 less than once a month, but more than 5 times in the past year
 less than 3 times in the past year
 Never

26. Do you subscribe to hunting magazines?

- Yes How many?
 No

Section 2. Hunting Experience. Please answer the following questions about your past hunting experiences.

1. Who took you hunting your first time? Please check all that apply.

father mother grandparent
 uncle/aunt brother/sister friend of family
 friend of mine other

2. How old were you the first time you went hunting? _____ years old

3. Which of the following best describes the area **where you were raised**?

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)

4. Did other members of your family hunt? Yes (please answer **4a**) No

4a. What other members in your family hunted? Please check all that apply.

father mother grandparent
 uncle/aunt brother/sister cousin

5. In your first year of hunting, what game species did you hunt?

Small Game Geese Ducks
 Doves Turkey (spring) Turkey (fall)
 Furbearers Deer (archery) Deer (firearm)
 Deer (muzzleloader) Other (Please identify): _____

Section 3. Hunting Access. Please answer the following questions for all species hunted in Illinois.

1. On which of the following types of property did you hunt most often in 1999-00? Please check one.

State lands (state parks, conservation areas, etc.)
 Federal lands (national wildlife refuges, Shawnee National Forest, etc.)
 My own private property
 Private property not owned by me

2. If you lost access to the land you checked in question 1, would you (check one)

Find other private land
 Find other public land
 Have to give up hunting

2a. How would the loss of your current hunting spot (from question 1) affect your total hunting effort?

_____ My effort would increase

_____ My effort would stay the same

_____ My effort would decrease

3. How long have you hunted at the place mentioned in question 1? _____ years

4. In the **past five (5) years** have you lost access to land you used to hunt?

_____ Yes What county? _____

_____ No

5. In the **past year** have you been refused when requesting to hunt private land?

_____ Yes How many times? _____

_____ No

6. What is the **maximum travel time** you would travel for a **typical single day's hunt**?

_____ 15 minutes _____ 30 minutes _____ 1 hour

_____ 1 ½ hour _____ 2 hours _____ more than 2 hours

7. Did you make any overnight trips to hunt in Illinois during the 1999-2000 season?

_____ Yes How many? _____

_____ No

8. Have you ever paid a property owner to hunt private land in Illinois?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. Do you plan to hunt private land in 2000-01?

_____ Yes _____ No

10. Please give your opinion of the amount of **private** land available for hunting in Illinois by circling the number that matches your opinion.

Very Poor		Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

11. Please give your opinion of the amount of **public** land available for hunting in Illinois by circling the number that matches your opinion.

Very Poor		Poor		Fair		Good		Excellent
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9

Section 4. Value of Private Land Access. The questions in this section will help us determine the value hunters place on access to private land for hunting. Your answers will not determine any prices or leases, but help us understand what such access would be worth to you.

1. Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land? _____ Yes _____ No (**go to question 4**)

1a. What is the maximum amount you would pay to hunt private land for your favorite type of hunting?

\$ _____ per (check one) _____ day _____ week _____ season

If you provided a dollar amount in question 1, please answer the following question.

2. If you answered "Yes" to question 1, what species would you want to hunt?

_____ Small Game _____ Geese _____ Ducks
_____ Doves _____ Turkey (spring) _____ Turkey (fall)
_____ Furbearers _____ Deer (archery) _____ Deer (firearm)
_____ Deer (muzzleloader) _____ Other (Please identify): _____

3. If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt

_____ More than now _____ Same amount as now _____ Less than now

4. If you answered "No" to question 1, please choose the statement below that best describes your reason. Please choose **one** reason.

_____ I object to paying to hunt
_____ I already pay enough in license fees
_____ DNR should buy more land so I can hunt without paying an access fee
_____ Hunting is getting too expensive
_____ I don't believe in paying to hunt private land
_____ I hunt on my own land
_____ Other (please specify): _____

5. Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land if you shared the land with several other hunters you did not know?

_____ Yes _____ No

5a. What is the maximum amount you would pay to hunt private land, for your favorite type of hunting, with several other hunters you did not know?

\$ _____ per (check one) _____ day _____ week _____ season

If you provided a dollar amount in question 5a, please answer the following question.

6. If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt

_____ More than now _____ Same amount as now _____ Less than now

7. Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land if you shared it with a few of your friends only?

Yes No

7a. What is the maximum amount you would pay to hunt private land, for your favorite type of hunting, if you shared it with a few of your friends only?

\$ per (check one) day week season

If you provided a dollar amount in question 7a, please answer the following question.

8. If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt

More than now Same amount as now Less than now

9. Would you be willing to pay a fee to hunt private land if you had it to yourself?

Yes No

9a. What is the maximum amount you would pay to hunt private land if you had it to yourself?

\$ per (check one) day week season

If you provided a dollar amount in question 9a, please answer the following question.

10. If you had access to private land for the amount indicated above, would you hunt

More than now Same amount as now Less than now

11. Have you ever hunted as a nonresident in other states (states in which you did not reside)?

Yes No

11a. If yes, did you hunt with a guide or outfitter in that state or states?

Yes

No

12. If the Illinois Department of Natural Resources developed a program to provide hunters access to private lands, would your hunting effort

Increase Stay the same Decrease

13. If the Illinois Department of Natural Resources developed a program to provide hunters access to private lands, what would you suggest landowners receive in return? Please check all of the following you would suggest for such a program.

Tax breaks

Cash payment

Technical support

Plant materials (seedlings, seed for habitat, etc.)

Scheduling hunters

Reduced liability

Other (Please identify): _____

14. Do you feel the IDNR should pursue a program to assist hunters in gaining access to private land for hunting?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Section 4. Reasons for Hunting. Please state the importance of the following items related to hunting in Illinois by circling the number that matches your response.

	Not Important	Slightly Important	Very Important
Hunting for trophy game	1	2	3
Sharing stories of the hunt with friends	1	2	3
Hunting new areas	1	2	3
Having wild game to eat	1	2	3
Challenging my hunting skills	1	2	3
<hr/>			
Getting away from my daily routine	1	2	3
Spending time in the outdoors	1	2	3
Harvesting game	1	2	3
Getting shots at game	1	2	3
Sharing the hunt with friends	1	2	3
Hunting a spot I've hunted for years	1	2	3
<hr/>			
Pitting my skills against a trophy buck	1	2	3
Hunting private land with little competition	1	2	3
Harvesting a trophy buck	1	2	3
Limiting out	1	2	3
Hunting land near my home	1	2	3
Hunting at a camp with friends	1	2	3

Section 5. Background Information. The following questions are important to help us understand more about the people involved in hunting in Illinois. Please tell us something about yourself by checking the responses that apply. All responses will be kept confidential.

1. How many years have you hunted in Illinois? _____ Years

2. What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female

3. What is your marital status?

_____ Single (never married)

_____ Married

_____ Divorced/Separated/ Widowed

4. Do you have children living at home?

_____ Yes

_____ No

4a. Do they hunt?

_____ Yes

_____ No

5. What is your county of residence? _____

6. Which of the following best describes the area 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)

7. 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 to \$104,999

_____ \$45,000 to \$59,999

_____ \$105,000 to \$119,999

_____ over \$119,999

8. Please give your age. _____ years

COMMENTS

In your opinion, what do you feel is the **biggest** problem facing hunters in Illinois?

In your opinion, what are the **most important reasons** why hunting is declining in Illinois?

In your opinion, what should the Illinois Department of Natural resources do to preserve the sport of hunting in Illinois?

RETURN ENVELOPE IS PROVIDED – POSTAGE-PAID

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!

Your input will help us understand more about hunters and hunting in Illinois.

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, 524 S. Second St., Springfield, IL 62701-1787, (217) 782-7616 or the officer of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.

Illinois Landowner Survey

ALL RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Postage-paid return envelope provided

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

The Department of Natural Resources is requesting disclosure of information that is necessary to accomplish the statutory purpose as outlined under the Illinois Compiled Statutes, The Wildlife Code, Chapter 520.

Disclosure of information is voluntary.

Section 1. Agricultural Operations. Please help us find out more about agricultural operations by completing the questions listed below.

1. Do you farm your land? _____ Yes (please go to question 1b) _____ No
- 1a. If "No," does someone else farm your land? _____ Yes _____ No
- 1b. What type of farming do you or your tenant do on your land?
- _____ row crops _____ forage crops _____ livestock _____ poultry
_____ dairy _____ orchards _____ nursery _____ other
2. How many acres do you own? _____ acres
- 2a. How many acres are in agriculture production? _____ acres
3. Is farming your primary source of income? _____ Yes _____ No
4. Do you have land placed in set-aside programs (for example CRP, CREP, etc.)?
_____ Yes (please go to questions 4a and 4b) _____ No
- 4a. If "Yes," please give the name of the program _____
- 4b. If "Yes," please give the number of acres in the program _____
5. Do you perform any management practices on your property for the specific benefit of wildlife?
_____ Yes (go to question 5a) _____ No
- 5a. If "Yes," check all the following management practices that apply.
- _____ feeding of wildlife _____ conservation tillage _____ wetland management
_____ forest management _____ planting of trees, shrubs, or grasses
_____ other (Please identify): _____
6. Have you experienced crop damage from wildlife in the past 12 months?
_____ Yes (go to question 6a) _____ No
- 6a. If "Yes," what type of damage did you experience?
- _____ eating young plants _____ eating mature grains or fruits
_____ damaging newly planted fields _____ damaging trees
_____ other (please identify): _____
- 6b. What species were responsible for damages to your crops?
- _____ deer _____ turkeys _____ geese
_____ other (please identify): _____

Section 2. Hunting on Private Land. Please answer the following questions about hunting and hunters on your land.

1. Do hunters request permission to hunt on your property?

_____ Yes _____ No

1a. If "Yes," how do they contact you?

_____ telephone _____ by knocking on the door

_____ mail _____ through acquaintances

_____ other (please identify): _____

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 allow hunters on your property?

_____ Yes (go to question 3a)

_____ No, but I have in the past.(go to question 3b)

_____ No (go to question 3c)

3a. If "Yes," how long have you been allowing hunters on your property? _____ years

3b. If "No," approximately what year did you stop letting hunters on your land? _____

3c. If "No," which of the following reasons best describe why you don't give hunters permission to hunt on your land? Please check all that apply.

_____ hunters were inconsiderate of my land _____ I got tired of people asking to hunt

_____ concerns for my, or my family's safety _____ liability

_____ damage to property/equipment _____ injury to livestock

_____ I don't like hunting/hunters

_____ other (please identify): _____

4. If you allow hunting, what do you consider to be the benefits of hunters on your property?

_____ control wildlife _____ maintain relations with neighbor/friend/family

_____ remove nuisance wildlife _____ source of income

_____ provide me with wild game _____ source of goods and services

_____ discourage trespassers

_____ other (please identify): _____

5. How many hunters have permission to hunt on your property? _____ hunters

6. How does the number of hunters who hunt on your property now compare to when you first started letting them hunt?

more same less

7. Which of the following best describes those who hunt on your property? Please check all that apply.

Family members Friends or acquaintances Neighbors
 Employees People who ask permission

8. Do you charge hunters to hunt your property ("charge" could mean exchange of goods or services as well as cash payments)?

Yes No

9. Do you provide any of the following benefits to hunters on your land?

tree stand/blind guide services meals
 motorized transportation lodging
 other(please identify): _____

10. Which of the following species do you allow hunters to hunt? Please check all that apply.

Pheasants Quail Rabbits/Squirrels
 Waterfowl Doves Turkey
 Predators Raccoons Deer (doe)
 Deer (bucks) Other (Please identify): _____

11. Have you had problems with people hunting on your land without permission?

Yes No

12. Do you currently allow trapping on your property?

Yes No (go to question 12a)

12a. Which of the following reasons best describes why you don't allow trapping on your land? Please check all that apply.

trappers were inconsiderate of my land liability
 safety concerns for my family injury to livestock or pets
 damage to property/equipment I don't like trapping
 other (please identify): _____

13. The Illinois Department of Natural Resources is considering a program to create opportunities for hunters to hunt on private land in Illinois. Please rate the importance of each of the following incentives that might be included in such a program by circling the number that matches your response.

	<u>Not</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Somewhat</u> <u>Important</u>	<u>Very</u> <u>Important</u>
_____ Tax breaks	1	2	3
_____ Cash payment	1	2	3
_____ Free technical advise	1	2	3
_____ Free planting materials (seedlings, seeds, etc.)	1	2	3
_____ Scheduling of hunters by DNR	1	2	3
_____ Reduced liability when charging access	1	2	3
_____ Other (Please identify): _____	1	2	3

14. Would you be willing to participate in such a program if the incentives you think important are included?

_____ Yes _____ No If not, why? _____

Section 3. Hunting Experience. Please complete the following questions about hunting.

1. Do you hunt? _____ Yes _____ No (please go to question 6) _____ I used to, but not anymore

2. Do you hunt on your property? _____ Yes _____ No _____ I used to, but not anymore

3. Who took you hunting your first time? Please check all that apply.

_____ father _____ mother _____ grandparent
 _____ uncle/aunt _____ brother/sister _____ friend of family
 _____ friend of mine _____ other (please identify): _____

4. How old were you the first time you went hunting? _____ years old

5. In your first year of hunting, what game species did you hunt?

_____ Small Game _____ Waterfowl _____ Doves
 _____ Turkey _____ Raccoons _____ Deer (archery)
 _____ Deer (firearm) _____ other (Please identify): _____

6. Do other members of your family hunt? _____ Yes (please answer 6a) _____ No

6a. What other members of your family hunt? Please check all that apply.

_____ father/mother _____ son/daughter _____ grandparent _____ spouse
 _____ brother/sister _____ grandchildren _____ other (identify) _____

Section 4. Attitudes Toward Land Management in Illinois. Please indicate whether you agree or disagree with the following statements about land access by circling the appropriate number provided.

	Strongly Agree	Agree	Unsure	Disagree	Strongly Disagree
The Department of Natural Resources should lease private land for public hunting.	1	2	3	4	5
Hunters should pay landowners to access lands for hunting.	1	2	3	4	5
I own my property because it is good source of income.	1	2	3	4	5
The Department of Natural Resources should provide incentives (technical assistance, seed, etc.) for landowners to allow hunters free access to their property.	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
Leasing land for hunting is an added source of income for landowners.	1	2	3	4	5
Hunting leases that limit access to private land will make it difficult for hunters to find a place to hunt.	1	2	3	4	5
Making a living off of my land is the most important reason I own my land.	1	2	3	4	5
Wildlife on private property should belong to the landowner who supports it.	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
Hunters help reduce crop damage from wildlife.	1	2	3	4	5
Landowners risk liability if they let hunters on their land.	1	2	3	4	5
By paying access fees to private landowners hunters will have more places to hunt.	1	2	3	4	5
The state of Illinois is responsible for wildlife property damage.	1	2	3	4	5
<hr/>					
Property owners should have more control over wildlife on their land.	1	2	3	4	5
State and federal law puts too many restrictions on how I can use my land.	1	2	3	4	5
I enjoy seeing wildlife on my land.	1	2	3	4	5
I look forward to passing my property onto my heirs.	1	2	3	4	5

Section 5. General Information. The following questions are important to help us understand more about private landowners in Illinois. Please help us by checking the responses that apply to you. All responses are confidential.

1. What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female

2. What is your marital status?
 _____ Single (never married)
 _____ Married
 _____ Divorced/Separated/ Widowed

3. 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

4. Please give your age. _____ years

5. How did you obtain the majority of your property? _____ Purchased _____ Inherited _____ Other

6. How long has most of your property been in your family? _____ years

7. How long have you lived in Illinois? _____ years

8. Which of the following best describes the area **where you were raised**?
 _____ 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)

COMMENTS

Please comment on hunters and hunting on private lands in Illinois.

COMMENTS

Please provide any comments you have about your property and why it is important to you.

Please provide any comments you may have about wildlife and crop damage in Illinois.

What do you see as the reasons why some landowners might not allow hunters access to their land?

RETURN ENVELOPE IS PROVIDED – POSTAGE-PAID

THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!

Your input will help us understand more about hunters and hunting in Illinois.

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, 524 S. Second St., Springfield, IL 62701-1787, (217) 782-7616 or the officer of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.

Access Illinois Outdoors Participant Survey

ALL RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL
THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Postage-paid return envelope provided

Illinois Natural History Survey

The Illinois Natural History Survey is requesting disclosure of information that is necessary to accomplish the statutory purpose as outlined under the Illinois Compiled Statutes, The Wildlife Code, Chapter 520. Disclosure of information is voluntary.

Please take 15 minutes of your time to complete this questionnaire. Your response enables us to evaluate Access Illinois Outdoors and provide optimal recreation opportunities in Illinois.

Section 1. Experience with Access Illinois Outdoors. Please answer the following questions regarding your experience with Access Illinois Outdoors.

1. In what year did you enroll in Access Illinois Outdoors? _____
2. How many landowners contacted you in the first year you enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors?
 _____ Landowners
3. Are you continuing the arrangement with the landowner that you began as a participant in Access Illinois Outdoors?
 _____ Yes
 _____ No
4. Which of the following **best** describes why you enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors? **Please choose one.**
 _____ could not find land on my own
 _____ to save time
 _____ better selection of land available
 _____ to hire an outfitter
 _____ to hunt land with trophy animals
 _____ I prefer to hunt private land over public land
 _____ other (please identify): _____
5. Please rate the following using the scale provided. Circle the number for the appropriate response.

	<u>Poor</u>	<u>Fair</u>	<u>Good</u>	<u>Excellent</u>
Number of landowners that contacted you	1	2	3	4
Amount of land available to you	1	2	3	4
Length of time before you were contacted by landowner	1	2	3	4
Price of lease or cost of access	1	2	3	4
Hospitality of landowner	1	2	3	4
Quality of habitat	1	2	3	4
Overall quality of hunting experience	1	2	3	4

6. On a scale of 1 to 10, with 1 = "Extremely Dissatisfied" and 10 = "Extremely Satisfied" please circle the number that indicates your level of satisfaction with the following:

Overall satisfaction with arrangement between you and the landowner(s) (please circle)

Extremely Dissatisfied				Undecided						Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

Overall satisfaction with Access Illinois Outdoors

Extremely Dissatisfied				Undecided						Extremely Satisfied
1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	

7. As a participant in Access Illinois Outdoors, in which of the following recreational activities listed below did you take part? Please check all that apply.

hunting fishing mushroom or berry picking
 hiking other (please identify): _____

8. Did you verify the information provided by the landowner prior to your visit?

Yes No

8a. If "Yes", how did you verify the information? Please check all that apply.

visit photos video
 references IDNR other (Please identify): _____

8b. If you visited, who accompanied you on your visit?

hunting partner(s) family
 friend other than partner no one, I came alone
 other (please identify): _____

9. Which of the following **best** describes the land to which you had access?

Private land (no cost) Private land in exchange for goods/services
 Private land (for a fee) Other (please identify): _____

If you exchanged cash or goods/services in order to hunt private land, please complete questions 9a – 9d.

9a. How many others (including yourself) shared your arrangement with the landowner? _____ others

9b. How many acres were involved in your arrangement with the landowner? _____ acres

9c. If you paid to use private land, how long was your contract? (please check one)

_____ one day _____ more than one day, but less than a week
_____ one week _____ more than one week, but less than entire season
_____ entire season

9d. What was the approximate total cost of your arrangement with the landowner? (please check one)

_____ less than \$100
_____ \$100 - \$500
_____ \$501 - \$1,000
_____ \$1,001 - \$2,000
_____ \$2,001 - \$3,000
_____ over \$3,000

10. Which of the following **best** describes your arrangement with the landowner? **Please choose one.**

_____ I had exclusive rights to the land
_____ I shared rights with others in my party
_____ I shared rights with others in different parties
_____ I traded use for the Illinois landowner's property with use privileges on mine
_____ Other (Please describe): _____

11. Did the landowner provide any of the following?

_____ tree stand _____ blind
_____ guide services _____ 4-wheel drive vehicle
_____ All-Terrain Vehicle _____ meals
_____ lodging _____ other (please identify): _____

12. How would you describe the landowner's property to which you had access?

_____ active farm _____ rural land, but not actively farmed
_____ other (please describe): _____

13. How did you find out about Access Illinois Outdoors?

- | | |
|---|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> National Outdoors Show (SHOT show, etc.) | <input type="checkbox"/> State Outdoors Show |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Regional Outdoors Show | <input type="checkbox"/> National or State-wide Magazine |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Friends from Illinois | <input type="checkbox"/> Hunting/Outdoor Television Show |
| <input type="checkbox"/> IL Dept. of Commerce & Community Affairs | <input type="checkbox"/> IL Department of Natural Resources |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please identify) : _____ | |

Section 2: Hunting If you hunted in Illinois as a participant in Access Illinois Outdoors, please complete this section. If you did not hunt, please go to Section 3.

1. Which of the following **best describes** your hunt(s) in Illinois? (Please choose one)

- | | |
|--|---|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hunted with outfitter/guide | <input type="checkbox"/> Hunted with friends and/or family living in Illinois |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Hunted alone on my own unguided | <input type="checkbox"/> Hunted with a party of nonresidents unguided |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (please identify): _____ | |

2. Which of the following species did you hunt? Please check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pheasants | <input type="checkbox"/> Quail | <input type="checkbox"/> Rabbits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geese | <input type="checkbox"/> Ducks | <input type="checkbox"/> Doves |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Turkey (spring) | <input type="checkbox"/> Turkey (fall) | <input type="checkbox"/> Raccoons |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deer (archery) | <input type="checkbox"/> Deer (firearm) | <input type="checkbox"/> Deer (muzzleloader) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please identify): _____ | | |

3. Were you successful in harvesting any of the following species? Please check all that apply.

- | | | |
|---|---|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> Pheasants | <input type="checkbox"/> Quail | <input type="checkbox"/> Rabbits |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Geese | <input type="checkbox"/> Ducks | <input type="checkbox"/> Doves |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Turkey (spring) | <input type="checkbox"/> Turkey (fall) | <input type="checkbox"/> Raccoons |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Deer (archery) | <input type="checkbox"/> Deer (firearm) | <input type="checkbox"/> Deer (muzzleloader) |
| <input type="checkbox"/> Other (Please identify): _____ | | |

4. Did you experience any trespass problems while hunting as a participant in Access Illinois Outdoors?

- Yes No

4a. If "Yes", was your experience with an adjoining landowner's property?

- Yes No

5. Have you ever hunted as a nonresident in other states (states in which you did not reside)?

_____ Yes

_____ No

If yes, did you hunt with a guide in that state or states?

_____ Yes

_____ No

Please state the importance of the following items **related to your hunt in Illinois** by circling the number that matches your response.

	<u>Not Important</u>	<u>Slightly Important</u>	<u>Very Important</u>
Hunting for trophy game	1	2	3
Sharing stories of the hunt with friends at home	1	2	3
Hunting new areas	1	2	3
Having wild game to eat	1	2	3
Hunting for game not found in my home state	1	2	3
Challenging myself with new hunts	1	2	3
<hr/>			
Getting away from my daily routine	1	2	3
Spending time in the outdoors	1	2	3
Harvesting a deer	1	2	3
Applying my hunting skills in a new place	1	2	3
Getting shots at deer	1	2	3
Sharing the hunt with friends	1	2	3
<hr/>			
Pitting my skills against a trophy buck	1	2	3
Hunting with a guide	1	2	3
Hunting private land with little competition	1	2	3
Meeting hunters from other states	1	2	3
Harvesting a trophy buck	1	2	3

Section 3: Expenses Please complete the following questions concerning your expenses while visiting Illinois through Access Illinois Outdoors.

1. What type of lodging did you have while participating in Access Illinois Outdoors? Please check one.

- Did not stay over night
- Stayed with friends or family
- Camped in commercial campgrounds
- Camped in state or federal campgrounds
- Stayed in hotel or motel
- Stayed in private lodge (for example, owned by outfitter or club)
- Other (Please identify): _____

2. If you are not a resident of Illinois, which of the following did you purchase while visiting Illinois as a participant in Access Illinois Outdoors? Please check all that apply.

- Meals
- Groceries
- Gasoline
- Ammunition
- Hunting equipment
- Camping equipment
- Other (please identify): _____
- Deer/Game processing (butcher, meat locker, etc.)
- taxidermist
- clothing
- souvenirs
- Fishing equipment

3. How did you travel to Illinois for your visit?

- vehicle
- airline
- other (please identify): _____

4. How would you rate the entire cost of your visit to Illinois compared to your experience? Please check one response.

- a good bargain for the money
- the cost was worth the experience
- the cost was about even with the experience
- slightly costly compared to my experience
- too expensive compared to the experience

The following questions are important to help us understand more about the people involved in hunting in Illinois. Please tell us something about yourself by checking the responses that apply. All responses are anonymous and will be kept confidential.

1. What is your gender? _____ Male _____ Female

2. In what state do you reside? _____

3. What is your approximate total (gross) household income?

_____ less than 15,000

_____ \$15,000 to \$29,999

_____ \$30,000 to \$44,999

_____ \$45,000 to \$59,999

_____ \$60,000 to \$74,999

_____ over \$75,000

4. Please give your age. _____ years

5. Would you recommend Access Illinois Outdoors to others?

_____ Yes _____ No If not, why? Please explain: _____

COMMENTS

**RETURN ENVELOPE IS PROVIDED – POSTAGE-PAID
THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!**

The Illinois Natural History Survey 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, Illinois Natural History Survey, 607 E. Peabody Dr., Champaign, IL 61820, or the officer of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.

Access Illinois Outdoors Landowner Evaluation Survey

ALL RESPONSES ARE CONFIDENTIAL

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

Postage-paid return envelope provided

Illinois Natural History Survey

Access Illinois Outdoors is seeking information from landowners enrolled in their program through a cooperative agreement with the Illinois Natural History Survey. As a landowner enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors, your opinions are very important in evaluating the current program. Please take 10 minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire and return it to us in the envelope provided. Thank you.

1. Are you currently enrolled as a landowner in Access Illinois Outdoors?

_____ Yes

_____ No If "No", why did you discontinue your enrollment? _____

2. Please rate the quality of Access Illinois Outdoors from your perspective as a landowner.

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1	2	3	4

3. Before you enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors did you allow others to hunt on your property?

_____ Yes _____ No

3a. If "Yes" which of the following did you allow to hunt on your property? (Please choose all that apply)

_____ Family members _____ Friends _____ Employees
_____ Neighbors _____ People who asked permission

3b. How do the manners of the hunters who hunt your land through Access Illinois Outdoors differ from hunters you allowed in the past?

Much Better	Somewhat Better	Same	Somewhat Worse	Much Worse
1	2	3	4	5

4. Do you hunt on your property? _____ Yes _____ No

5. How many hunters do you allow to hunt on your property?

_____ 1 _____ 2-5 _____ 6-10 _____ more than 10

6. Please indicate the benefits you receive from enrolling in Access Illinois Outdoors.

(Check all that apply)

_____ Extra income

_____ Knowing who is on my property

_____ Control over who comes on my land

_____ Control over the deer or other game harvested

_____ No longer bothered by hunters requesting to hunt my land

_____ Other (please identify): _____

7. Before you enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors did you have problems with hunters trespassing on your land without permission?

_____ Yes _____ No

8. After enrolling in Access Illinois Outdoors have you had problems with hunters trespassing on your land without permission?

_____ Yes _____ No

9. How would you describe the courtesy of the hunters who hunt your land under Access Illinois Outdoors?

Poor	Fair	Good	Excellent
1	2	3	4

10. A program similar to Access Illinois Outdoors is being considered for the entire state of Illinois. As a landowner, which of the following incentives would you suggest be included in such a program? Please check all that apply.

- _____ Tax breaks
- _____ Cash payment
- _____ Technical support
- _____ Plant materials (seedlings, seed for habitat, etc.)
- _____ Scheduling hunters
- _____ Reduced liability
- _____ Other (Please identify): _____

11. Do you farm your land?

_____ Yes _____ No

11a. If "No", does someone else farm your land? _____ Yes _____ No

12. What type of farming do you do on your land? (If your land is not farmed, please skip this question).

_____ row crops	_____ forage crops	_____ livestock	_____ poultry
_____ dairy	_____ orchards	_____ nursery	

13. How much land do you now or did you have enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors?

_____ less than 500 acres	_____ 500 – 1,000 acres	_____ 1,001 – 1,500 acres
_____ 1,501 – 2,000 acres	_____ 2,001 – 2,500 acres	_____ 2,501 – 3,000 acres
_____ more than 3,000 acres		

14. How did you find out about Access Illinois Outdoors?

- Illinois Department of Natural Resources
- Two Rivers Conservation and Development Council
- University of Illinois Extension
- Friends or neighbors enrolled in Access Illinois Outdoors
- Illinois Farm Bureau
- Other (please identify): _____

15. Would you recommend Access Illinois Outdoors to others?

- Yes If "Yes", why? Please explain: _____
- No If "No", why not? Please explain: _____

COMMENTS

**RETURN ENVELOPE IS PROVIDED – POSTAGE-PAID
THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!**

The Illinois Natural History Survey 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 Natural History Survey 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, Illinois Natural History Survey, 607 Peabody Dr., Champaign, IL 61820, or the officer of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, D.C. 20240.