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## OBJECTIVE

To survey waterfowl (duck, goose, and coot) hunters annually to determine their activities, harvest, characteristics, attitudes, and opinions.


#### Abstract

A total of 3,123 (36\% response rate) Illinois waterfowl hunters returned usable questionnaires to the 2018-19 Illinois Waterfowl Hunter Survey. An estimated 40,047 adult waterfowl hunters spent 1 day or more afield during 2018-19, an increase of $7.6 \%$ from the 37,215 hunters in 2017-18. Waterfowl hunters spent 831,043 days afield, an increase of $13.5 \%$ from the 732,166 days devoted during the 2017-18 license year. Total waterfowl harvest decreased 2.1 \%, from 421,384 during 2017-18 to 412,402 during 2018-19. Duck harvest estimates for the regular duck season were as follows: 147,733 mallards (Anas platyrhynchos), 29,003 wood ducks (Aix sponsa), and 96,087 other ducks. A total of 23,326 teal (Anas spp.) were harvested during the September teal season. Goose hunters harvested 71,035 Canada geese (Branta canadensis) during the regular Canada goose season, a $9.9 \%$ decrease from the 78,850 Canada geese harvested during the 2017-18 regular goose season. Hunters harvested 13,165 Canada geese during the September Canada goose season, an 18.5\% decrease from the previous year. During the Youth Waterfowl Hunting Season, 4,822 adults took 5,775 youths waterfowl hunting, a $0.9 \%$ increase in adult participation and a $10.6 \%$ decrease in youth participation from the 2017-18 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Season. Hunter preferences for season and zones, and satisfaction with the waterfowl seasons are also discussed.


## METHODS

## Mailings

A random sample of 6,000 waterfowl hunters was drawn from the population of Illinois State Waterfowl Stamp purchasers from the 2018-19 license year. An additional 3,000 hunters were selected from areas of concern in the central and south zones. Hunters' responses from the additional sample were used for analysis of questions regarding those zones but were not used in harvest data analysis. No pre-season diary for recording
hunting activity and waterfowl harvest was sent during the fall of 2018. On 05 May 2019, hunters were mailed a 12-page questionnaire (Appendix A), cover letter (Appendix B), and a postage-paid return envelope. The effective sample was reduced from 8,861 questionnaires to 8,038 due to 962 being returned as undeliverable. A thank you/reminder postcard (Appendix C) was sent to hunters on 21 May 2019. Non-respondents were mailed a second questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix D) on 06 June 2019, followed by a second postcard mailing on 26 June 2019. A third and final questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix E) were mailed to non-respondents on 19 July 2019. Coded data were entered and analyzed using SPSS 26.0 (SPSS Inc. 2019). Confidence intervals are presented where appropriate.

## Statewide Estimates

Estimates of number of hunters, days afield, and waterfowl harvested were based on confirmed sales of 55,303 adult resident Illinois Migratory Waterfowl stamps (2017-18 series) and were computed following the procedures outlined below (Anderson et al. 1998), with slight modification. The correction factors for multiple stamp buyers $\left(A_{1}\right)$ and stamp exempt hunters $\left(A_{2}\right)$ were removed beginning with the estimates of 2016-17. The original formulas are presented for understanding how previous year's estimates were created.

The total number of active waterfowl hunters was estimated using the number of Illinois Migratory Waterfowl Stamps sold and adjusting for multiple-stamp buyers, non-hunting stamp buyers, and stamp-exempt hunters. The number of teal, duck, and goose hunters (Huntsp), days afield (Dayssp), birds crippled but not retrieved (Crip ${ }_{s p}$ ) and harvest (Harv$\left.{ }_{s p}\right)$ were calculated as follows:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { Hunt }_{s p}=\text { Hunt }_{r} \frac{L_{t} A_{1} A_{2}}{n}, \\
& \text { Days }_{s p}=\text { Days }_{r} \frac{L_{t} A_{1} A_{2}}{n}, \\
& \text { Crip }_{s p}=\text { Crip }_{r} \frac{L_{t} A_{1} A_{2}}{n}, \\
& \text { Harv }_{s p}=\text { Harv }_{r} \frac{L_{t} A_{1} A_{2} A_{3}}{n}
\end{aligned}
$$

Where:
$H u n t_{r}=$ number of respondents to the 2018-19 Illinois Waterfowl Hunter Survey who reported hunting for each species (adjustment for non-hunters is inherent),
$L_{t}=$ total number of Illinois migratory Waterfowl Stamps sold in 2018-19,
$A_{1}=$ fixed reduction factor for multiple-stamp buyers (0.957; Anderson 1986),
$A_{2}=$ fixed expansion factor for stamp-exempt hunters (1.086; Anderson et al. 1998),
$n$ = number of respondents to 2018-19 Illinois Waterfowl Hunter Survey who purchased a stamp,
Days $_{r}=$ total number of days spent hunting reported by respondents,
Crip $_{r}=$ total number of birds crippled but not retrieved reported by respondents,
Harv $v_{r}=$ total harvest of each species reported by respondents,
$A_{3}=$ fixed reduction factor for reporting bias ( 0.501 for teal, ducks, and coots; Anderson 1985; 0.478 for geese;
Anderson et al. 1996).
Confidence intervals for the estimated numbers of ducks, coots, and geese harvested were calculated by:

$$
95 \% \mathrm{CI}\left[\operatorname{Harv}_{s p}\right]= \pm 2 L_{t}\left(\frac{s}{\sqrt{n}}\right)\left(\frac{L_{t}-n}{L_{t}}\right)
$$

Where $s=$ standard deviation of total species harvest reported by respondents.

## SEASON LENGTHS AND BAG LIMITS

Illinois incorporated a fourth waterfowl zone in 2011-12 for the regular waterfowl seasons and 2012-13 for the September goose season. The four zones are the North, Central, South Central, and South zones (Appendix G). The early (September) teal (Anas spp.) season length was 16 days with a daily bag of 6 teal and a possession limit of 18. Early (September) Canada goose (Branta canadensis) season length and start date (1 September) were the same for all four zones. Possession limit was 15 geese in the North and Central zones and 6 in the South Central and South zones. Hunters could hunt for 15 days statewide and could harvest 5 geese a day in the North and Central zones and 2 birds per day in the South Central and South zones. Length and daily
bag limit of the regular duck season did not change (60-day season/6-bird daily bag limit) in 2018-19. Basic daily bag limits were 6 ducks with a 18 possession limit, 5 mergansers with a 15 possession limit, and 15 coots with a 45 possession limit; individual species limits are in Appendix H. Regular Canada goose season remained unchanged (90 day/2-bird Canada goose season) in the North and Central zones. Regular Canada goose season length in the South Central and South zone was 82 days and 70 days, respectively. Daily bag limit was 2 for Canada and White-fronted Geese (Anser albifrons) and 1 for Brant geese (Branta bernicla). These species had a possession limit of 3 times the daily bag.

## RESULTS

## Waterfowl Harvest and Days Afield

We received 3,123 questionnaires that were considered usable, for an overall response rate of $36 \%$. Of the 3,123 usable questionnaires, $2,103(67.4 \%)$ respondents were part of the original sample of 6,000 . This reduced sample will be used for harvest estimates to prevent bias due to oversampling Central and South Central Zone counties. Ninety-six percent of respondents indicated they had purchased an Illinois State Waterfowl Stamp for the 2018-19 season (Figure 1) and 1,470 (74.8\%) of license purchasers reported hunting 1 day or more for waterfowl (Figure 2).


Figure 1. Percentage of hunters who purchased an Illinois State Waterfowl Stamp for the 2018-19 seasons ( $n=2,030$ ).


Figure 2. Percentage of license purchasers who hunted waterfowl (ducks, geese, or coots) in Illinois during the 2018-19 waterfowl hunting season ( $n=1,965$ ).

The number of waterfowl hunters increased from 37,215 during the 2017-18 season to 40,047 during the 201819 season, a $7.6 \%$ increase in the number of hunters (Figure 3 and Table 1). Hunters reported spending 831,043 days afield, an increase of $13.5 \%$ from the 732,166 days devoted during the 2017-18 license year. Total waterfowl harvest decreased $2.1 \%$, from 421,384 during 2017-18 to 412,402 during the 2018-19 season (Table 1). Almost thirty-two percent of hunters hunted ducks only, $9.2 \%$ hunted geese only, and $58.9 \%$ hunted both ducks and geese (Figure 4 and Table 2).


Figure 3. Number of stamps sold, waterfowl hunters, and waterfowl harvested in Illinois, 2000-2018.


Figure 4. Percentage of hunters who hunted ducks, geese, or both during the 2018-19 Illinois waterfowl season.

## September Teal Season

The number of early (September) teal season hunters increased 23.1\% from 7,526 during 2017 to 9,263 during 2018 (Figure 5 and Table 3). Days afield increased 24.9\% from 28,306 during 2017 to 35,344 during 2018. More teal hunters and increased days afield coincided with an increased teal harvest of $23,326 \pm 8,817$ during the 2018 September teal season, a $54.9 \%$ increase from the 2017 harvest $(15,062)$. The Central zone accounted for over one-half of teal hunters (55.2\%), most of the teal harvested (56.4\%), and half of teal hunter days afield (51.7\%). The North Zone recorded the second-most days afield and hunters, but the second-most total teal were harvested in the South Central Zone (Table 4). Statewide, September season teal hunters averaged 3.81 days afield, and harvested an average of 0.66 teal per hunter per day and 2.52 teal per hunter for the season (Figure 6 and Table 5).


Figure 5. Number of teal harvested and hunter activity during the Illinois September teal season, from 20002018.


Figure 6. Rates of teal harvest and hunter activity during the Illinois September teal season from 2000-2018.

## Youth Waterfowl Hunting

The Youth Waterfowl Season dates changed in all 4 zones; number of days to hunt remained unchanged from 2017 to 2018. Youth age 17 and under were able to hunt ducks, geese, and coots for two days one week prior to opening of the regular duck season in the North, Central, and South Central zones, but 12 days earlier in the South zone. Eight percent of those who purchased an Illinois waterfowl stamp took a youth hunting during the Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days (Figure 7). Number of adults who participated in the 2018 youth hunt increased $0.9 \%$ from 4,780 to 4,822 participants, but number of youth participants decreased $10.6 \%$ from 6,459 during 2017 to 5,775 youths during 2018 (Table 6). Forty percent (40.4\%) of the hunting groups that participated in the 2018 youth waterfowl season had at least one youth who had never hunted ducks or geese before (Figure 8), and $16.1 \%$ of hunters indicated this was their first time accompanying a youth during the hunt (Figure 9). Harvest of ducks during the youth season decreased $10.0 \%$, from 8,283 during 2017 to 7,452 during 2018, and geese declined from 1,464 to 729 from 2017 to 2018.


Figure 7. Percentage of hunters* who took a youth (less than 17 years old) hunting during the 2018 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days ( $n=2,030$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they purchased hunting license the 2018-19 Waterfowl seasons.


Figure 8. Percentage of hunters* who took a youth (less than 17 years old) hunting for the first time ( $n=171$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they took a youth hunting during the 2018 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.


Figure 9. Percentage of hunters* for whom it was the first time to take a youth (less than 17 years) hunting. ( $n=174$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they took a youth hunting during the 2018 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.

Twenty percent of respondents (20.7\%) took a youth hunting during the regular duck or goose season; an additional $2.7 \%$ had a youth accompany them but did not hunt (Figure 10). Hunters were more likely to take youths hunting during the regular duck season than goose season (Figure 11).


Figure 10. Percentage of hunters* who took a youth ( $<17$ years of age) hunting during the 2018-19 regular duck or goose season in Illinois ( $n=1,138$ ).
*Cases selected for those who hunted for at least one day during the 2018-19 regular duck or goose season.


Figure 12. Zones hunters* hunted in most often during the 2018-19 duck season ( $n=1,248$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day during the 2018-19 duck seasons.


Figure 11. Seasons hunters* took a youth ( $<17$ years of age) hunting during 2018-19 $(n=247)$. *Cases selected for those who took youth hunting or had youth accompany them while hunting.


Figure 13. Percent of hunters* by zone that used Spinning wing decoys in duck season ( $n=1,231$ ). *Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day during the 2018-19 duck seasons.

## Regular Duck Season

Number of duck hunters increased by 3,811 (12.7\%) from 30,025 during the 2017-18 season to 33,836 in the 2018-19 season (Table 7). Duck hunters spent 464,327 days afield $(M=13.72)$ during the 2018-19 season, an increase of $17.8 \%$ from the 394,034 days reported during the 2017-18 season. Almost half ( $47.3 \%$ ) of respondents hunted the Central Zone most often, followed by the North, South Central, and South zones
(Figure 12). Hunters in the Central Zone were also more likely to use spinning wing decoys during duck season (Figure 13).

Total duck harvest during 2018-19 was 272,823 down $1.8 \%$ from the 277,689 reported for 2017-18 (Table 7). Mallards (Anas platyrhynchos) comprised $49.1 \%$ of the total regular season duck harvest, whereas wood ducks (Aix sponsa) and other ducks accounted for $10.6 \%$ and $40.3 \%$, respectively (Figure 14). Statewide mallard harvest in Illinois increased by 11,352 birds ( $8.3 \%$ ) from 136,381 during the 2017-18 season to 147,733 during the 2018-19 season (Figure 15 and Table 7). Wood duck harvest decreased 369 (1.3\%) from 29,372 during 2017-18 to 29,003 during 2018-19. The harvest of other ducks decreased $15,850(14.4 \%)$ from 111,937 during 2017-18 to 96,087 during 2018-19, and statewide coot (Fulica americana) harvest increased from 1,544 during 2017-18 to 2,088 coots during 2018-19.


Figure 14. Proportion of Mallards, Wood, \& Other Ducks harvested during the 2018-19 regular duck season. ${ }^{\text {a }}$
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Proportions are by mallard, wood duck, and other ducks due to how hunters are asked to report their harvest. This order (mallard, wood duck, and other ducks) is not necessarily the order of the most-often harvested ducks in Illinois.


Figure 15. Illinois regular season duck harvest, 2000-2018.

The 2018-19 duck harvest is presented by waterfowl zones in Table 8. Across the four waterfowl zones, the greatest number of hunters, days afield, and ducks harvested occurred in the Central zone. The South zone had the highest daily success rate (harvest/hunter/day) at 0.59 ducks per day, whereas the South Central zone had the highest season success rate (harvest/hunter/season) at 7.93 ducks per season. Statewide, duck hunter daily success decreased to 0.59 ducks/day and hunter season success decreased from 9.25 in 2017-18 to 8.06 during 2018-19 (Table 9). Of duck hunters who reported hunting $\geq 1$ day ( $n=1,242$ ), $33.8 \%$ hunted 5 days or less (Figure 16 and Table 10); 17.8\% of duck hunters reported not harvesting any ducks, whereas $16.8 \%$ harvested more than 30 ducks.


Figure 16. Distribution of days afield per hunter and ducks harvested per hunter for Illinois' during the 2018-19 regular duck season.

## Early September Goose Season

An estimated 9,916 hunters participated in the early (September) Canada goose season in Illinois during the 2018 season, an increase of $7.5 \%$ from the 9,225 who participated during 2017 (Figure 17 and Table 11). Statewide, early goose season hunters spent 35,361 days afield in 2018, 4.6 more than in $2017(33,817)$, and harvested approximately 13,165 Canada geese, a decrease from the $2017(16,155)$ harvest by $18.5 \%$. The Central zone accounted for the most hunters (54.0\%), harvest (52.6\%), and days afield (51\%) (Figure 20, Table 11).


Figure 17. Early September Canada goose harvest and hunter activity, 2000-2018.


Figure 18. Early September Canada goose harvest and hunter activity by zone in Illinois during 2018.

## Regular Canada Goose Season

Canada goose harvest during the 2018-19 regular goose season decreased 9.9\% from 2017-18 (Table 12, Figure 19). An estimated 25,363 hunters spent 296,021 days afield and harvested 71,035 Canada geese during 2018-19. Number of goose hunters in Illinois increased 5.5\% during 2018-19 compared to 2017-18, and number of days afield increased $7.3 \%$. Hunters also harvested 21,578 other geese, of which 12,254 were light geese (snow, blue or Ross' geese) (Chen caerulescens) and 9,324 were white-fronted geese (Anser albifrons), for a total combined harvest of 92,613 geese (Table 12, Figure 20).


Figure 19. Goose harvest during Illinois' regular goose season from 2000-2018.


Canada Geese

## Light Geese

White-fronted

Figure 20. 2018-19 Illinois' regular Canada goose season harvest.

Goose hunters reported a mean of 11.67 days afield and mean harvest of 2.80 Canada geese and 0.24 geese per hunter per day; $41.5 \%$ of goose hunters harvested $\geq 5$ geese (Figure 21 and Tables 13 and 14). The Central Zone led the state in the number of goose hunters (47.8\%), days afield (48.1\%), and Canada geese harvested (49.8\%); the most white-fronted (58.0\%) and light geese (40.2\%) were also harvested in the Central Zone (Table 14). Harvest of Canada geese is summarized by zone and year (2016-17 through 2018-19) in Table 15.


Figure 21. Distribution of days afield per hunter and geese harvested per hunter for Illinois' 2018-19 regular goose season.

## Crippling Losses

Crippling losses (birds downed but not retrieved) during the 2018-19 regular season were estimated at 36,996 ducks and 5,558 geese (Table 16). These estimates, considered to be indices because they contain information about the relative number and are not actual number or abundance estimates, equate to 13.6 ducks and 6.0 geese lost per 100 harvested.

White-fronted/Specklebelly Goose Harvest


Figure 22. Proportion of hunters* who reported harvest of white-fronted (specklebelly) geese during the 2018-19 waterfowl hunting seasons ( $n=931$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day during the 2018-19 goose seasons.


Figure 23. Comparison between the number of white-fronted geese hunters* seen in 2018-19 compared to the last 5 years ( $n=931$ ).
*Cases selected for those who hunted for at least one day during the 2018-19 regular goose season.

Twenty-one percent of those who hunted one day or more for geese during 2018-19 harvested whitefronted (specklebelly) geese (Figure 22). Forty-five percent of regular goose hunters saw more or much more white fronted geese as compared to five years ago (Figure 23). Fifty percent of regular goose hunters (49.8\%) did not target or shoot at them and $26.2 \%$ did not target them but shot if they had the opportunity. Twenty percent of goose hunters (20.4\%) used specklebelly calls and $21.9 \%$ used specklebelly decoys (Figure 24).


Figure 24. Proportion of hunters* who targeted white-fronted (specklebelly) geese during the Regular Goose Season ( $n=931$ ).
*Cases selected for those who hunted for at least one day during regular goose season.

## Public Land Use and Hunting Preferences

Almost half (45.8\%) of hunters had hunted on Illinois public lands during 2018-19. Among those who used public lands, public lands in the Central zone were most popular (Figure 26). Over half of the hunters on public lands had at least 1 hunt in a blind awarded through a lottery (Figure 27).


Figure 25. Percentage of hunters* who hunted on Illinois state public lands during 2018-19 $(n=1,453)$ *Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least 1 day during 2018-19.


Figure 26. Zone in which public land hunted was located ( $n=681$ ).


Figure 27. Percentage of waterfowl hunters whose public land use was in a blind awarded by lottery $(n=656)$.

Satisfaction with 2018-19 Duck and Goose Seasons
As a condition of implementing a four-zone structure, Illinois was required to collect information on hunter satisfaction in areas of the state impacted by waterfowl zone changes. The former South zone was divided into two zones with a goal of providing preferred season dates to most hunters in the South Central and South zones. South Central Zone duck hunters harvested the second highest average number of ducks per hunter per season $(M=7.93)$, an average of 0.06 fewer than Central zone hunters and 2.34 ducks per hunter per season more than hunters in the North zone, and 1.88 ducks per hunter per season more than hunters in the South zone. North zone duck hunters had the highest level of satisfaction for all but one aspect of the season. South Central zone hunters were the most satisfied with the "amount of time you spent duck hunting" and were the least satisfied zone with all other measures except "weather during duck season" (Table 17). South Central and South zone goose hunters harvested the fewest geese per hunter per season ( $M=1.14$ and $M=1.19$, respectively). North zone goose hunters had the highest level of satisfaction with every measured aspect of the 2018-19 regular goose season, while South zone hunters had the lowest level of satisfaction with all aspects (Table 18).

## Satisfaction with Season Timing and Zone Configuration

When asked about season timing, a majority of duck hunters in the South Central (56.3\%), Central (53.0\%), and South (52.2\%) zones and thirty-nine percent of hunters in the North Zone reported that the 201819 duck season was timed "too early" (Figure 28 and Table 19). A majority of teal hunters and September Goose hunters in every zone reported those seasons were timed "about right." A majority of goose hunters, across the North and South zones reported timing for the 2018-19 goose season was "about right."


Figure 28. Duck and goose hunter* opinions about the timing of the 2018-19 waterfowl seasons.
*Cases selected for those who hunted for at least one day in the corresponding season and zone.

When asked about the start dates for duck season in the zone intended to hunt most in 2019-20, 72\% of South Zone hunters chose a start date no later than November 16 and $25 \%$ preferred always closing on January 31. The most popular response among North zone hunters was "Oct 19- Dec 17". In the Central zone equal percentages ( $38 \%$ ) of respondents preferred late October or early November as the start date. Almost one third of South Central hunters preferred a late November start date (Table 20). When considering the Duck zone structure for 2021-2025 most hunters in the North, Central, and South zones selected "I do not have a preference" from the options provided. Most South Central hunters would prefer "three duck zones with 2 season segments (2-way split) in one, two or all zones" followed by "I do not have a preference." Keeping the
current 4-zone structure and reconfiguring the zones was least popular among North and Central Zone hunters. Similarly, a three-zone structure was least preferred among South Central and South Zone hunters (Table 21).


Figure 29. Zones hunters intend to hunt most often during the 2019-2020 duck season ( $n=1,759$ ).


Figure 30. Percent of hunters who intend to hunt in South Zone at least one day ( $n=1,662$ ).

Most hunters intended to do the majority of their hunting in the Central zone in 2019-20 (Figure 29). Though $9.4 \%$ of hunters planned to hunt primarily in the South zone, $23 \%$ of hunters intend to hunt at least one day in the South zone (Figure 30). Hunters that expressed an intention to hunt in the South zone were asked a series of follow-up questions to determine preferences toward maximizing duck hunting days in January for the South zone. Almost fifty percent (49.3\%) of prospective South zone hunters would prefer "Opening to maximize the number of January hunting days." Hunters did not have a clear preference for how January days are maximized though $43.1 \%$ indicated "I want January days maximized but have no preference as to how it is accomplished. Of hunters wanting maximized days, 23.6 prefer opening on a Saturday to maximize days as compared to $14.4 \%$ opening on a Thursday (Table 23).

When asked about the current zone lines, hunters were predominately satisfied. Hunters in the North and Central zones had the greatest percent of hunters satisfied with the current zone lines. More than $25 \%$ of South Central hunters were dissatisfied with all the lines that border their zone with the border between the South and South Central zones being the least favored. Similarly, a quarter of South zone hunters dislike the borders around their zone. At least $40 \%$ of South Central and South Zone hunters are satisfied with the current
boundaries (Table 24). Most waterfowl hunters (88.5\%) felt their county was located in the proper zone (Figure 31). Will, Grundy, Fayette, Madison, Franklin, St Clair, and Randolph were the counties hunters identified most often as being in the wrong zones and with the exception of St Clair, at least fifty percent of hunters in each county believe they are located in the correct zone. Most of those unhappy with the current zone of Will county preferred to be in the Central Zone and dissatisfied Perry county hunters unanimously preferred the South Zone
(Table 25).


Figure 31. Percentage of waterfowl hunters that feel the county they hunt most often is in the correct zone ( $n=1,761$ ).

## Regulations and Zone Delineation Central and South Central Zone Hunter Satisfaction

Concern regarding the boundary lines among the Central zone and South Central zone was expressed to Illinois Department of Natural Resources. To better understand current levels of satisfaction along with concerns about the current zone lines and regulations in these areas an additional sample was drawn. An additional 100 questionnaires were sent to waterfowl hunters in each of the targeted counties. Those who spent at least one day hunting in a targeted county are designated as "hunters of concern" for the zone in which they had hunted. Those who hunted in multiple zones or counties, unless noted otherwise, were placed in the zone or county they hunted most often. Targeted counties in the Central zone include: Bond, Champaign, Christian,

Clark, Coles, Cumberland, Dewitt, Douglas, Edgar, Effingham, Fayette, Ford, Grundy, Iroquois, Kankakee, LaSalle, Livingston, Logan, Macon, Macoupin, Madison, McLean, Montgomery, Moultrie, Piatt, Sangamon, Shelby, Vermillion, Will, \& Woodford. Those who spent at least one day afield in Franklin, Hamilton, Jackson, Perry, Randolph, Saline, Union, White, \& Williamson were designated as "South Central Zone hunters of concern".

The attitudes of these hunters were compared to hunters of the rest of the Central and South Central zone hunters. Only hunters who spent at least one day afield in the Central or South Central zone were included in the analysis. When determining if a hunter was a Central or South zone hunter, those who had hunted in both zones were recoded as a hunter of the zone they hunted most often. Hunters of concern spent days afield in every zone, and their efforts were similar to the other hunters in the corresponding zones. Hunters in the Central zone counties of concern were more likely to feel timing of waterfowl seasons were "too early" as compared to the rest of Central zone hunters (Table 26). South Central hunters of concern were less likely to select timing was "Too late" as compared to the rest of South Central zone hunters, but both groups felt that the timing was "Too early". To better understand the satisfaction with zone timing, hunters' opinions of zone timing were examined by the county they hunted most often (Table 27). The counties that had the largest percentage of hunters feeling timing was "Too Early" were Kankakee (84\%), Grundy (82\%), Coles (80\%), Livingston (78\%), and Dewitt (76\%). South zone hunters in White (83\%), Perry (80\%), Randolph (73\%), and Franklin (61\%) felt that the season had been timed too early.

When comparing the satisfaction with the zone lines among groups of concern the results were similar to those discussed earlier. Most hunters were satisfied with the current zone line and a plurality exists. The line between the South Central and South zones caused the highest level of dissatisfaction among South Central hunters (Table 28). Central hunters of concern were more dissatisfied than other Central zone hunters, but over $50 \%$ were still satisfied with the lines.

When asked about zoning options, "other central zone hunters" were more likely to have no preference than any other group (Table 29). When removing no preference from consideration all groups indicated a preference for three zones with 2 segments in one two or all zones. The non-targeted South Central zone hunters were the most interested in this option. A reconfigured four zone was least chosen by both groups of Central zone hunters. A plurality exists regarding zone structure preference and "no change" has the highest percentage of votes among most hunters.

Most hunters in the sample were satisfied with the current zone lines or were "neither satisfied or dissatisfied". However, there exists a group that does want a change back to three duck zones with two-way splits. Central zone hunters of concern prefer a 2-way split, are dissatisfied with the current timing of seasons, and are mostly satisfied with the current lines. Similarly, South Central hunters prefer a 2 -way split and are very dissatisfied with season timing and with the current zone lines. A clear plurality exists making recommendations difficult. The findings presented here are consistent to those reported by Miller and Alessi (2012); they found hunters in the South Central zone harvested more birds, but were less satisfied and had higher expectations than hunters in other zones. Data from the 2018-19 waterfowl harvest support this same perspective, as hunters in the South Central reported the greatest success per effort during duck season but the least satisfaction with the number of ducks seen and that migrated through.

## Hunter Attitudes toward Presented Zone Change Options

To address the concerns of hunters, meet their expectations, and stay within the confine of federal regulations two new zone structures are proposed. These proposed zone changes are completely exploratory and are an attempt to address the needs of the areas of concern. They are completely independent of one another and one, both, or none could be adopted based on hunter support. Option 1 would change the eastern half of the Central zone and combine it with South Central zone (Appendix A, pg. 62). Option 2 would expand the South zone and some counties that are currently in the South Central zone would become part of that zone (Appendix A, pg. 64). Hunters were asked to identify their preference for each option, level of satisfaction, and whether the
lines should move. The current zone structure splits many counties along the border lines into two different zones. Additionally, most hunters can and do hunt in multiple counties each year. The results of a county level analysis, if not properly considered, can be biased by hunters that are counted multiple times. To address this issue county level analysis of Option 1 and Option 2 were based on the question "In which county do you hunt waterfowl most often".

Among the counties of concern in central zone, Kankakee, Edgar, and Montgomery had at least $50 \%$ of hunters prefer Option 1 to "No change", Coles, and Dewitt whereas Woodford, Effingham, and Ford had at least $50 \%$ prefer "No change" (Table 30). Eleven counties preferred "No change", and "No preference" and "Option 1" both had nine counties each. When considering the sample size of each county there a plurality still exists. Among South Central hunters in counties of concern all counties preferred "No change" over Option 1. When examining the preferences of duck hunters, those who hunted at least one day in a county of concern preferred "Option 1" (Table 31). Those who hunted in other counties within the Central zone preferred "No Change". Hunters in South Central counties of concern chose "No preference" $(48.0 \%)$ or "No change" (37.6\%).

Satisfaction with the proposed zone line was like preference in that the majority of hunters chose "Neither satisfied or dissatisfied" (Table 32). A majority of hunters in Champaign, Vermillion, and Kankakee expressed satisfaction with the line, whereas more hunters in the South Central counties of concern expressed dissatisfied than satisfied. A lack of satisfaction or dissatisfaction with the proposed is also supported by the majority of duck hunters, regardless of zone, preferring that option (Table 33). A similar consensus is noticeable with regards to whether the line should move east, west, or not move (Table 34). Most central zone hunters of concern would prefer that the line not move, most hunters in South central chose that option as well, though hunters in White, Williamson, and Randolph would prefer the line move west. This preference is also noted in the examination of duck hunters (Table 35) as hunters in the South Central counties of concern would prefer seeing the line move west. A significant number of duck hunters in counties that are not of concern in Central zone would like for the line to move east.

Option 2 was preferred over No change in all counties of concern in the South Central zone except for Randolph and White (Table 36). Hunters in Hamilton county were evenly split (40\%) between the two choices. Duck hunters in the counties of concern also preferred Option 2 to "No Change" whereas South Central in the remaining counties preferred "No Change" over Option 2 (Table 37). Hunters in Hamilton county expressed the most dissatisfaction with the new line (Table 38) and were the only county to have a greater percentage of hunters dissatisfied than satisfied. This trend was not repeated among duck hunters, who mostly chose "Neither satisfied or dissatisfied" (Table 39). No county had a majority that wanted to see the Option 2 zone line move south and hunters in Perry, Williamson, and Hamilton prefer the line move north (Table 40). The percentage of duck hunters in counties of concern who preferred moving the line north (41\%) was slightly lower than that of those who preferred "No change" (Table 41). Hunters in the remaining South Central zone counties preferred the line moving north and hunters in the south zone preferred "No change".

## Pre-duck season hunting

It would be possible to change the timing of the youth waterfowl hunting days, currently they begin about one week before the beginning of duck season in each zone. Hunters were asked how satisfied they are with the current timing of Youth Waterfowl Hunting days. Hunters that participated in the Youth Waterfowl Hunting days (Figure 32) were more dissatisfied with its timing than were those who did not participate (Figure 33). When asked to select their preferred timing, most participants (57\%) and non-participants ( $66 \%$ ) preferred keeping the current timing. When asked when Military days should occur, forty-three percent of hunters preferred they overlap with Youth Waterfowl Days, one-third preferred they occur before duck season but not overlap with Youth Waterfowl Days, and one-quarter wanted them to occur after duck season closed.


Figure 32. Percent of Waterfowl Youth Hunting Days participants satisfied with its timing ( $n=160$ ).


Figure 33. Percent of Waterfowl Youth Hunting Days non-participants satisfied with its timing ( $n=1,053$ ).

## Hunter Characteristics

Respondents who hunted waterfowl during the 2018-19 waterfowl season hunted waterfowl in Illinois for a mean of 25.9 years. These hunters averaged 48.9 years of age and started at the age of 20.1. The counties with most respondents were Madison (5.9\%), Cook (5.0\%), Will (5.0\%), Williamson (3.8\%), and Tazewell (3.5\%). Females comprised $3.0 \%$ of survey respondents and $1.4 \%$ of those who hunted during the 2018-19 waterfowl hunting seasons (Figure 34). Most respondents (95.6\%) hunted waterfowl in Illinois before this season (Figure 35). Over half (52.0\%) of respondents reported they hunt waterfowl every year in Illinois, whereas 7\% reported that they never hunted waterfowl in Illinois (Figure 36). Thirteen percent of hunters are veterans of the US Armed Forces, less than one percent are on active duty, less than one percent are serving but not on active duty, and the majority ( $86.0 \%$ ) have never served.


Figure 34. Gender distribution of respondents who hunted* waterfowl during one of the 2018-19 waterfowl seasons ( $n=1,467$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day or more during the 2018-19 waterfowl seasons.


Figure 35. Number of hunters* whose first time hunting waterfowl in Illinois was during one of the 2018-19 waterfowl seasons ( $n=1,451$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted at least one day during the 2018-19 waterfowl seasons.


Figure 36. How often respondents hunt waterfowl in Illinois ( $n=2,078$ ).
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Table 1. Summary of Illinois Migratory Waterfowl Stamps purchased, hunter activity, and waterfowl harvest in Illinois from 2006 through 2018 hunting seasons.

| Season <br> (Year) | Stamps <br> Purchased | Estimated <br> Hunters | Estimated <br> Days Hunted | Estimated <br> Harvest $^{\text {b }}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2006 | 63,965 | 58,302 | $1,194,801$ | 700,571 |
| 2007 | 66,765 | 57,454 | $1,150,304$ | 678,623 |
| 2008 | 69,590 | 59,379 | $1,175,243$ | 660,306 |
| 2009 | 68,549 | 59,987 | $1,222,980$ | 613,335 |
| 2010 | 64,828 | 50,936 | 985,075 | 513,882 |
| 2011 | 66,581 | 52,660 | $1,147,037$ | 577,654 |
| 2012 | 64,896 | 50,740 | $1,155,346$ | 580,557 |
| 2013 | 66,394 | 49,170 | $1,052,728$ | 605,720 |
| 2014 | 70,391 | 50,698 | 982,193 | 550,946 |
| 2015 | 58,247 | 40,104 | 795,289 | 488,321 |
| 2016 | 54,920 | 41,242 | 870,721 | 490,463 |
| 2017 | 52,069 | 37,215 | 732,166 | 421,384 |
| 2018 | 55,303 | 40,047 | 831,043 | 412,402 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Full listing for harvest 1981-Present can be found in Appendix F.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Teal, ducks, coots, and geese combined, and including September Teal and Canada goose seasons and youth hunt.

Table 2. The percentage of waterfowl hunters who hunted exclusively ducks, exclusively geese, or both ducks and geese in Illinois from 2006 through 2018 seasons.

| Season <br> (Year) | Hunted <br> Ducks Only | Hunted <br> Geese Only | Hunted Both <br> Ducks and Geese | Duck <br> Hunters | Goose <br> Hunters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 2006 | $28.8 \%$ | $13.5 \%$ | $57.7 \%$ | $86.5 \%$ | $71.2 \%$ |
| 2007 | $27.7 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $60.1 \%$ | $87.8 \%$ | $72.3 \%$ |
| 2008 | $25.9 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ | $63.5 \%$ | $89.4 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $74.1 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 2009 | $27.5 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ | $64.1 \%$ | $91.6 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $72.5 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 2010 | $25.0 \%$ | $13.1 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ | $86.9 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $75.0 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 2011 | $20.7 \%$ | $18.3 \%$ | $61.0 \%$ | $81.7 \%$ | $79.3 \%$ |
| 2012 | $29.4 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $60.8 \%$ | $90.2 \%$ | $70.6 \%$ |
| 2013 | $30.2 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $90.2 \%$ | $69.8 \%$ |
| 2014 | $30.8 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $58.3 \%$ | $89.1 \%$ | $69.2 \%$ |
| 2015 | $28.3 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $63.0 \%$ | $91.3 \%$ | $71.6 \%$ |
| 2016 | $29.3 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ | $91.8 \%$ | $70.7 \%$ |
| 2017 | $29.8 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ | $57.8 \%$ | $87.6 \%$ | $70.1 \%$ |
| 2018 | $31.9 \%$ | $9.2 \%$ | $58.9 \%$ | $90.8 \%$ | $68.1 \%$ |

[^0]Table 3. Summary of Teal harvest and hunter activity during September Teal season (Illinois, 2006-18).

| Season ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> (Year) | Estimated <br> Hunters | Estimated <br> Days Hunted | Estimated <br> Teal Harvest |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | 12,378 | 43,223 | 28,016 |
| 2007 | 13,478 | 48,115 | 29,800 |
| 2008 | 14,652 | 52,365 | 19,981 |
| 2009 | 15,436 | 55,139 | $19,222 \pm 7,372$ |
| 2010 | 13,038 | 49,038 | $20,127 \pm 9,332$ |
| 2011 | 11,221 | 42,811 | $21,227 \pm 7,993$ |
| 2012 | 10,944 | 46,719 | $31,942 \pm 11,740$ |
| 2013 | 10,378 | 37,431 | $21,967 \pm 7,169$ |
| 2014 | 11,282 | 42,635 | $29,058 \pm 10,909$ |
| 2015 | 9,615 | 37,574 | $28,031 \pm 9,911$ |
| 2016 | 8,969 | 38,610 | $25,346 \pm 9,296$ |
| 2017 | 7,526 | 28,306 | $15,062 \pm 5,480$ |
| 2018 | 9,263 | 35,334 | $23,326 \pm 8,817$ |

${ }^{\text {a }} 1981-2018$ information can be located in Appendix F.

Table 4. Teal harvest and hunter activity by zones during September Teal season (Illinois, 2018).

|  | $n$ | Estimated <br> Hunters $^{\mathbf{a}}$ | Estimated Days <br> Hunted | Estimated Teal <br> Harvested |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Zone | 86 | 2,343 | 8,990 | 4,299 |
| Central Zone | 181 | 4,931 | 18,280 | 12,284 |
| South Central Zone | 60 | 1,635 | 6,130 | 6,265 |
| South Zone | 599 | 1,934 | 478 |  |
| Unknown | 22 | - | - | - |

[^1]Table 5. Rates of Teal harvest and hunter activity during September Teal season (Illinois, 2006-2018).

|  |  |  | Teal Harvest per Hunter |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season <br> (Year) | Season Length/ <br> Bag Limit | Days Hunted <br> Per Hunter | Per Day | Per Season |
| 2006 | $16 / 4$ | 3.49 | 0.65 | 2.26 |
| 2007 | $16 / 4$ | 3.60 | 0.62 | 2.21 |
| 2008 | $16 / 4$ | 3.57 | 0.38 | 1.36 |
| 2009 | $16 / 4$ | 3.57 | 0.35 | 1.25 |
| 2010 | $16 / 4$ | 3.76 | 0.41 | 1.54 |
| 2011 | $16 / 4$ | 3.82 | 0.50 | 1.90 |
| 2012 | $16 / 4$ | 4.27 | 0.68 | 2.92 |
| 2013 | $16 / 6$ | 3.61 | 0.59 | 2.12 |
| 2014 | $16 / 6$ | 3.78 | 0.68 | 2.58 |
| 2015 | $16 / 6$ | 3.91 | 0.75 | 2.92 |
| 2016 | $16 / 6$ | 4.31 | 0.66 | 2.83 |
| 2017 | $16 / 6$ | 3.76 | 0.53 | 2.00 |
| 2018 | $16 / 6$ | 3.81 | 0.66 | 2.52 |
| 10218 |  |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }} 1981-2018$ information can be located in Appendix F.

Table 6. Waterfowl harvest and hunter activity during Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days, 2006-2018.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season }^{\mathrm{a}} \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Adult <br> Participation | Youth <br> Participation | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Days } \\ & \text { Hunting } \end{aligned}$ | Mean <br> Youths/ <br> Hunting <br> Party | Total <br> Ducks | Ducks/ <br> Youth/Day | Total Coots | Coots/ Youth/ Day | Total Geese | Geese <br> Youth/ <br> Day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 5,447 | 8,024 | 11,903 | 1.48 | 9,863 | 0.83 | 133 | 0.01 | 732 | 0.06 |
| 2007 | 6,259 | 8,981 | 14,356 | 1.60 | 9,141 | 0.64 | 850 | 0.06 | 1,701 | 0.12 |
| 2008 | 6,402 | 9,878 | 14,799 | 1.50 | 10,380 | 0.70 | 241 | 0.02 | 1,466 | 0.10 |
| 2009 | 7,073 | 9,772 | 15,922 | 1.63 | 11,229 | 0.71 | 599 | 0.04 | 2,396 | 0.15 |
| 2010 | 5,471 | 7,452 | 11,828 | 1.59 | 9,156 | 0.77 | 419 | 0.04 | 1,420 | 0.12 |
| 2011 | 6,325 | 8,642 | 14,059 | 1.63 | 9,569 | 0.68 | 1,333 | 0.09 | 1,318 | 0.09 |
| 2012 | 7,825 | 10,001 | $52,448^{\text {b }}$ | 1.27 | 8,147 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.41 | $503{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.03 | 1,064 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.05 |
| 2013 | 8,438 | 8,639 | 19,136 | 1.02 | 12,715 | 1.33 | 359 | 0.04 | 2,065 | 0.23 |
| 2014 | 6,405 | 8,572 | 13,798 | 1.33 | 9,004 | 1.30 | 192 | 0.03 | 929 | 0.14 |
| 2015 | 4,718 | 6,291 | 9,873 | 1.33 | 8,171 | 1.65 | 117 | 0.02 | 571 | 0.12 |
| 2016 | 4,398 | 5,921 | 8,553 | 1.34 | 6,731 | 1.57 | 139 | 0.03 | 927 | 0.23 |
| 2017 | 4,780 | 6,459 | 9,956 | 1.35 | 8,283 | 1.66 | 89 | 0.02 | 1464 | 0.32 |
| 2018 | 4,822 | 5,775 | 8,663 | 1.20 | 7,452 | 1.72 | 205 | 0.05 | 729 | 0.18 |

[^2]Table 7. Summary of duck and coot harvest and hunter activity during the regular duck season (Illinois 2006-2018).

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) }^{a} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Hunters | Days <br> Afield | Number of Ducks |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mallards | Wood Ducks | Canvasback | Other Ducks | Total | Coots |
| 2006 | 50,437 | 658,881 | 308,000 | 38,366 | 5,927 | 155,171 | 507,464 | 3,065 |
| 2007 | 49,114 | 600,614 | 265,369 | 34,628 | 5,925 | 158,444 | 464,366 | 3,771 |
| 2008 | 50,683 | 600,574 | 247,895 | 43,051 | --- | 156,849 | 447,795 | 2,266 |
| 2009 | 49,648 | 626,832 | 228,211 | 41,549 | ---b | 129,795 | $399,555 \pm 69,698$ | $3,904 \pm 3,342$ |
| 2010 | 43,450 | 499,758 | 193,758 | 39,611 | ---b | 121,375 | $354,859 \pm 60,571$ | 1,770 $\pm 2,435$ |
| 2011 | 46,619 | 632,712 | 222,405 | 54,294 | ---b | 150,786 | $427,484 \pm 66,551$ | $4,327 \pm 2,663$ |
| 2012 | 43,444 | 630,233 | 244,988 | 47,623 | ---b | 185,776 | $478,387 \pm 50,294$ | $4,133 \pm 3,536$ |
| 2013 | 43,653 | 563,961 | 225,873 | 49,001 | ---b | 155,306 | $430,179 \pm 29,431$ | $2,143 \pm 4,031$ |
| 2014 | 44,019 | 525,114 | 197,997 | 48,216 | 4,820 | 133,795 | $384,828 \pm 39,741$ | $4,681 \pm 3,311$ |
| 2015 | 36,499 | 496,656 | 166,506 | 43,655 | 4,437 | 115,182 | $329,780 \pm 34,835$ | 3,185 $\pm 1,960$ |
| 2016 | 34,386 | 459,029 | 154,698 | 47,986 | 6,794 | 123,928 | $333,406 \pm 37,408$ | $4,424 \pm 1,338$ |
| 2017 | 30,025 | 394,034 | 136,381 | 29,372 | 3,642 | 108,295 | $277,689 \pm 24,826$ | $1,544 \pm 921$ |
| 2018 | 33,836 | 464,327 | 147,733 | 29,003 | 5,200 | 90,887 | $272,823 \pm 28,512$ | $2,088 \pm 1,764$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2018 information can be located in Appendix F.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Hunters were not asked to distinguish Canvasback from Other Ducks and are included in Other Ducks for this year.

Table 8. Duck harvest and hunter activity by waterfowl zones and selected areas during the regular duck season (Illinois 2018-19).

|  |  |  | Estimated <br> Days <br> Hunted | Estimated <br> Ducks <br> Harvested | Days <br> Hunted/ <br> Hunter | Ducks/ <br> Hunter/ <br> Day | Ducks/ <br> Hunter/ <br> Season |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone | $n$ | Hunters $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | Has <br> North | 363 | 9,889 | 105,076 | 55,236 |
| Central | 642 | 17,490 | 227,233 | 139,831 | 12.99 | 0.53 | 5.59 |
| South Central | 222 | 6,048 | 81,102 | 47,948 | 13.41 | 0.62 | 7.99 |
| South | 181 | 4,931 | 50,917 | 29,809 | 10.33 | 0.59 | 7.93 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | - | - | 6.05 |
| Statewide | 1242 | 33,836 | 464,327 | 272,823 | 13.72 | 0.59 | 8.06 |

${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ The number of individual duck hunters in the state is less than the sum of duck hunters from the categories above because some hunted in more than one zone.

Table 9. Rates of duck harvest and hunter activity during the regular duck season (Illinois 2006-2018).

|  |  |  | Duck Harvest/Hunter $^{\text {b }}$ |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season <br> (Year) | Season Length/ <br> Bag Limit | Days Afield/ <br> Hunter |  | Per Day | Per Season |
| 2006 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 13.06 | 0.77 | 10.06 |  |
| 2007 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 12.23 | 0.77 | 9.45 |  |
| 2008 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 11.85 | 0.75 | 8.84 |  |
| 2009 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 12.63 | 0.64 | 8.05 |  |
| 2010 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 11.50 | 0.71 | 8.17 |  |
| 2011 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 13.57 | 0.68 | 9.17 |  |
| 2012 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 14.51 | 0.76 | 11.01 |  |
| 2013 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 12.92 | 0.76 | 9.85 |  |
| 2014 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 11.93 | 0.73 | 8.74 |  |
| 2015 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 13.61 | 0.66 | 9.01 |  |
| 2016 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 13.35 | 0.73 | 9.70 |  |
| 2017 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 13.12 | 0.70 | 9.25 |  |
| 2018 | $60 / 6(4,2)$ | 13.72 | 0.59 | 8.06 |  |

${ }^{\text {a }} 1981-2018$ information can be located in Appendix F.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Excludes ducks harvested coincidentally while goose hunting.

Table 10. Distribution of the number of days afield and number of ducks harvested in 2018-19.

|  | Days Hunting Ducks <br> $(\%)$ | Number of Ducks Harvested <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | --- | $17.8 \%$ |
| $1-5$ | $33.8 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ |
| $6-10$ | $21.8 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ |
| $11-15$ | $12.0 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ |
| $16-20$ | $11.3 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ |
| $21-25$ | $5.6 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ |
| $26-30$ | $5.6 \%$ | $3.5 \%$ |
| $>30$ | $10.0 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ |

[^3]Table 11. Canada goose harvest and hunter activity during the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 2006-2018).

|  | Year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Statewide | Waterfowl Zone |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | North | Central | South Central | South | Unknown |
| Hunters ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 2006 | 12,609 | 4,848 | 6,607 |  | 1,154 | 0 |
|  | 2007 | 12,788 | 4,723 | 6,413 |  | 1,652 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 13,157 | 4,934 | 6,690 |  | 1,533 | 0 |
|  | 2009 | 15,102 | 5,232 | 8,089 |  | 1,781 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 11,015 | 3,918 | 5,813 |  | 1,285 | 0 |
|  | 2011 | 14,214 | 4,625 | 7,889 |  | 1,700 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 11,192 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 4,601 | 5,928 | 1,161 | 249 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 10,865 ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 3,646 | 6,076 | 681 | 462 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 12,147 | 4,153 | 6,679 | 934 | 554 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 10,659 | 3,226 | 6,104 | 1,075 | 443 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 9,973 | 3,324 | 5,125 | 1,316 | 381 | 0 |
|  | 2017 | 9,225 | 2,746 | 5,472 | 849 | 296 | 0 |
|  | 2018 | 9,916 | 3,187 | 5,503 | 899 | 599 | 0 |
| Days Afield | 2006 | 42,444 | 16,735 | 22,621 |  | 3,088 | 0 |
|  | 2007 | 41,549 | 14,169 | 22,080 |  | 5,300 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 45,637 | 17,305 | 23,174 |  | 5,158 | 0 |
|  | 2009 | 51,318 | 19,591 | 26,048 |  | 5,678 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 39,019 | 15,929 | 19,236 |  | 3,854 | 0 |
|  | 2011 | 49,306 | 16,832 | 27,441 |  | 5,033 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 39,589 | 17,079 | 18,613 | 3,524 | 373 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 40,955 | 12,323 | 24,816 | 2,042 | 1,774 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 44,919 | 16,300 | 23,844 | 3,288 | 1,488 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 38,744 | 13,505 | 21,191 | 2,404 | 1,645 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 41,935 | 14,925 | 20,950 | 4,883 | 1,177 | 0 |
|  | 2017 | 33,817 | 9,442 | 19,714 | 3,595 | 1,067 | 0 |
|  | 2018 | 35,361 | 12,777 | 18,035 | 2,779 | 1,771 | 0 |
| Canada Geese | 2006 | 14,578 | 6,771 | 6,717 |  | 1,090 | 0 |
|  | 2007 | 16,207 | 6,057 | 8,645 |  | 1,505 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 17,419 | 7,343 | 8,951 |  | 1,125 | 0 |
|  | 2009 | 16,212 | 6,101 | 8,336 |  | 1,774 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 17,115 | 7,967 | 7,859 |  | 1,289 | 0 |
|  | 2011 | 18,790 | 6,339 | 10,874 |  | 1,577 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 18,028 | 8,557 | 7,664 | 1,599 | 228 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 15,644 | 5,165 | 9,271 | 523 | 685 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 19,089 | 7,527 | 9,015 | 1,770 | 777 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 15,693 | 4,233 | 8,587 | 2,147 | 726 | 0 |
|  | 2016 | 17,711 | 7,895 | 7,780 | 1,539 | 497 | 0 |
|  | 2017 | 16,155 | 4,154 | 10,282 | 1,199 | 510 | 20 |
|  | 2018 | 13,165 | 4,909 | 6,928 | 925 | 404 | 0 |

[^4]Table 12. Summary of goose harvest and hunter activity during the regular goose season (Illinois 2006 through 2018).

| Season <br> (Year) | Hunters | Days Afield | Number of Geese |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Canada Geese | Other Geese | Total |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 41,521 | 438,350 | $122,294(1,338)$ | $14,426(869)$ | $136,720(2,207)$ |  |
| 2007 | 43,046 | 445,670 | $141,205(404)$ | $11,582(55)$ | $152,787(459)$ |  |
| 2008 | 44,404 | 461,868 | $142,806(590)$ | $17,956(0)$ | $160,762(590)$ |  |
| 2009 | 44,601 | 473,769 | $142,836(585)$ | $17,382(355)$ | $160,218(940) \pm 36,569$ |  |
| 2010 | 36,803 | 385,432 | $99,422(534)$ | $9,594(46)$ | $109,016(580) \pm 22,523$ |  |
| 2011 | 36,996 | 411,380 | $75,061(618)$ | $19,862(33)$ | $94,923(651) \pm 22,387$ |  |
| 2012 | 34,034 | 386,356 | $72,682(0)$ | $19,597(0)$ | $92,280(0) \pm 19,570$ |  |
| 2013 | 33,809 | 391,246 | $104,887(0)$ | $15,859(0)$ | $120,746(0) \pm 12,775$ |  |
| 2014 | 34,226 | 369,179 | $87,672(50)$ | $20,313(0)$ | $107,985(50) \pm 15,517$ |  |
| 2015 | 31,280 | 330,482 | $75,198(0)$ | $27,576(0)$ | $102,774(0) \pm 17,608$ |  |
| 2016 | 26,490 | 312,725 | $77,216(0)$ | $24,563(0)$ | $101,779(0) \pm 18,215$ |  |
| 2017 | 24,039 | 276,009 | $78,850(0)$ | $27,637(0)$ | $106,486(0) \pm 14,607$ |  |
| 2018 | 25,363 | 296,021 | $71,035(0)$ | $21,578(0)$ | $92,613(0) \pm 16,720$ |  |

Numbers in parentheses represent the number of geese harvested while duck hunting.
${ }^{\text {a }} 1981$-2018 information can be located in Appendix F.

Table 13. Distribution of the number of days afield and number of geese harvested.

|  | Days Hunting Geese <br> $(\%)$ | Number of Geese Harvested <br>  <br>  <br>  <br> 0 |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| --- | $26.3 \%$ |  |
| $1-5$ | $41.5 \%$ | $36.8 \%$ |
| $6-10$ | $21.6 \%$ | $16.0 \%$ |
| $11-15$ | $12.5 \%$ | $7.0 \%$ |
| $16-20$ | $8.7 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ |
| $21-25$ | $4.4 \%$ | $2.3 \%$ |
| $26-30$ | $4.2 \%$ | $1.9 \%$ |
| $>30$ | $7.2 \%$ | $5.2 \%$ |

[^5]Table 14. Goose harvest and hunter activity by zones, regular season (Illinois 2018-19).

| Zone | Hunters | Days Afield | Estimated Goose Harvest |  |  |  | Total Days Hunted/ Hunter | Total <br> Geese/ <br> Hunter/ <br> Day | Total <br> Geese/ <br> Hunter <br> Season |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Canada Geese | White- <br> Fronted Geese | Snow/ Blue Geese ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Total Geese |  |  |  |
| North | 8,854 | 100,662 | 29,352 | 286 | 586 | 30,224 | 11.37 | 0.29 | 3.32 |
| Central | 13,077 | 142,589 | 35,407 | 5,404 | 3,724 | 44,536 | 10.90 | 0.25 | 2.71 |
| South <br> Central | 3,051 | 30,458 | 3,490 | 2,696 | 6,498 | 12,684 | 9.98 | 0.11 | 1.14 |
| South | 2,343 | 22,312 | 2,787 | 938 | 1,445 | 5,170 | 9.52 | 0.12 | 1.19 |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | - | - | - | - |  |
| Statewide | 25,363 | 296,021 | 71,035 | 9,324 | 12,254 | 92,613 | 11.67 | 0.24 | 2.80 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Less than the sum of hunters in individual zones because some hunters hunted more than 1 zone.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Harvest estimates include Ross' geese.

Table 15. Canada goose harvest by zone during the regular goose season, three-year trend (Illinois 2016-17 through 2018-19).

| Zone | $2016-17$ | $2017-18$ | $2018-19$ | 3-Year Mean | S.D. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | 29,347 | 17,723 | 29,352 | 25,474 | 6,713 |
| Central | 38,699 | 45,302 | 35,407 | 39,803 | 5,039 |
| South Central | 5,413 | 10,141 | 3,490 | 6,348 | 3,423 |
| South | 3,757 | 5,684 | 2,787 | 4,076 | 1,475 |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | - |
| Statewide | 77,216 | 78,850 | 71,035 | 75,700 | 4,122 |

Table 16. Summary of the number of ducks and geese crippled (Illinois 2006-2018 regular seasons).

| Season $^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Year) |$\quad$| Estimated Ducks |  |  | Estimated Geese |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 2006 | Total | Per 100 Bagged |  | Total | Per 100 Bagged |
| 2007 | 83,648 | 16.5 |  | 14,110 | 10.3 |
| 2008 | 77,914 | 16.8 |  | 16,627 | 10.9 |
| 2009 | 74,044 | 16.5 |  | 14,166 | 8.8 |
| 2010 | 67,718 | 16.9 |  | 12,245 | 7.6 |
| 2011 | 57,388 | 16.2 |  | 9,217 | 8.5 |
| 2012 | 64,268 | 15.0 |  | 6,937 | 7.3 |
| 2013 | $71,054^{*}$ | $14.9^{*}$ |  | $10,452^{*}$ | $11.3^{*}$ |
| 2014 | 59,064 | 13.7 |  | 8,847 | 7.3 |
| 2015 | 51,909 | 13.5 |  | 7,856 | 7.3 |
| 2016 | 47,442 | 14.4 |  | 7,622 | 7.4 |
| 2017 | 43,666 | 13.1 |  | 6,149 | 5.6 |
| 2018 | 37,491 | 13.5 |  | 6,657 | 6.3 |

${ }^{\text {a }} 1981-2018$ information can be located in Appendix F.
*Amended from 2012-13 report.

Table 17. Illinois duck hunters' levels of satisfaction with various aspects of the 2018-19 duck seasons.

|  | Zone | Very Dissatisfied <br> (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dissatisfied } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | Unsure (\%) | Satisfied <br> (\%) | Very Satisfied (\%) (\%) | $\overline{\mathrm{x}}$ (S.D. $)^{\mathrm{a}}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of ducks you saw | North $n=321$ | 15.9\% | 30.5\% | 28.3\% | 21.2\% | 4.0\% | 2.67(1.10) |
|  | Central $n=566$ | 27.7\% | 33.4\% | 22.3\% | 15.0\% | 1.6\% | 2.29(1.08) |
|  | South Central $n=180$ | 46.7\% | 32.8\% | 13.3\% | 6.1\% | 1.1\% | 1.82(0.96) |
|  | South $n=123$ | 35.8\% | 34.1\% | 22.0\% | 7.3\% | 0.8\% | 2.03(0.97) |
| Mid-season matched peak of migration | North $n=308$ | 20.1\% | 30.8\% | 33.4\% | 13.3\% | 2.3\% | 2.47(1.03) |
|  | Central $n=553$ | 30.6\% | 35.6\% | 23.9\% | 9.0\% | 0.9\% | 2.14(0.98) |
|  | South Central $n=177$ | 45.8\% | 33.9\% | 14.7\% | 4.5\% | 1.1\% | 1.81(0.93) |
|  | South $n=119$ | 42.9\% | 33.6\% | 16.8\% | 6.7\% | 0.0\% | 1.87(0.93) |
| Amount of shooting you got in | North $n=315$ | 21.3\% | 31.1\% | 27.3\% | 17.5\% | 2.9\% | 2.50(1.10) |
|  | Central $n=559$ | 28.3\% | 36.7\% | 20.4\% | 13.8\% | 0.9\% | 2.22(1.03) |
|  | South Central $n=178$ | 43.3\% | 32.0\% | 15.2\% | 9.0\% | 0.6\% | 1.92(1.00) |
|  | South $n=122$ | 33.6\% | 33.6\% | 23.8\% | 9.0\% | 0.0\% | 2.08(0.97) |
| Number of ducks that migrated through areas you hunted | North $n=317$ | 19.2\% | 35.0\% | 24.3\% | 18.0\% | 3.5\% | 2.51(1.10) |
|  | Central $n=559$ | 26.5\% | 40.8\% | 21.5\% | 10.0\% | 1.3\% | 2.19(0.98) |
|  | South Central $n=179$ | 46.4\% | 30.7\% | 17.3\% | 5.0\% | 0.6\% | 1.83(0.93) |
|  | South $n=122$ | 33.6\% | 37.7\% | 19.7\% | 7.4\% | 1.6\% | $2.06(0.99)$ |
| Amount of time you spent duck hunting | North $n=318$ | 13.8\% | 23.9\% | 30.5\% | 26.1\% | 5.7\% | 2.86(1.12) |
|  | Central $n=555$ | 13.2\% | 23.6\% | 30.3\% | 27.4\% | 5.6\% | 2.89(1.12) |
|  | South Central $n=178$ | 15.2\% | 20.8\% | 29.2\% | 27.0\% | 7.9\% | 2.92(1.18) |
|  | South $n=121$ | 22.3\% | 23.1\% | 28.1\% | 20.7\% | 5.8\% | 2.64(1.20) |
| Number of ducks you harvested | North $n=318$ | 24.5\% | 31.8\% | 24.5\% | 16.7\% | 2.5\% | 2.41(1.10) |
|  | Central $n=557$ | 32.7\% | 32.9\% | 18.9\% | 14.5\% | 1.1\% | 2.18(1.08) |
|  | South Central $n=180$ | 43.9\% | 33.9\% | 10.6\% | 10.0\% | 1.7\% | 1.92(1.05) |
|  | South $n=121$ | 38.0\% | 31.4\% | 19.8\% | 10.7\% | 0.0\% | 2.03(1.01) |
| Weather during duck season | North $n=318$ | 16.7\% | 19.5\% | 41.2\% | 20.1\% | 2.5\% | 2.72(1.04) |
|  | Central $n=558$ | 16.1\% | 26.9\% | 38.7\% | 16.8\% | 1.4\% | 2.61(0.99) |
|  | South Central $n=179$ | 23.5\% | 22.9\% | 33.5\% | 19.0\% | 1.1\% | 2.51(1.08) |
|  | South $n=122$ | 27.9\% | 25.4\% | 31.1\% | 15.6\% | 0.0\% | 2.34(1.05) |

[^6]Table 18. Illinois goose hunters' levels of satisfaction with various aspects of the 2018-19 goose seasons.

|  |  | $\qquad$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dissatisfied } \\ (\%) \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | Unsure (\%) | Satisfied (\%) | Very Satisfied (\%) | $\overline{\mathrm{X}}$ (S.D.) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of geese you saw | North $n=299$ | 7.0\% | 10.7\% | 26.1\% | 40.8\% | 15.4\% | 3.47(1.09) |
|  | Central $n=426$ | 19.2\% | 22.8\% | 29.6\% | 24.6\% | 3.8\% | 2.71(1.15) |
|  | South Central $n=95$ | 38.9\% | 25.3\% | 18.9\% | 11.6\% | 5.3\% | 2.19(1.22) |
|  | South $n=72$ | 38.9\% | 38.9\% | 11.1\% | 5.6\% | 5.6\% | 2.00(1.11) |
| Mid-season matched peak of migration | North $n=292$ | 9.2\% | 17.8\% | 32.5\% | 32.9\% | 7.5\% | 3.12(1.08) |
|  | Central $n=421$ | 22.1\% | 30.9\% | 30.4\% | 15.0\% | 1.7\% | 2.43(1.04) |
|  | South Central $n=93$ | 36.6\% | 32.3\% | 18.3\% | 9.7\% | 3.2\% | 2.11(1.11) |
|  | South $n=71$ | 40.8\% | 36.6\% | 15.5\% | 4.2\% | 2.8\% | 1.92(1.00) |
| Amount of shooting you got in | North $n=295$ | 15.6\% | 27.1\% | 22.4\% | 26.8\% | 8.1\% | 2.85(1.21) |
|  | Central $n=424$ | 26.9\% | 31.8\% | 25.7\% | 13.7\% | 1.9\% | 2.32(1.07) |
|  | South Central $n=93$ | 39.8\% | 30.1\% | 17.2\% | 10.8\% | 2.2\% | 2.05(1.10) |
|  | South $n=71$ | 38.0\% | 33.8\% | 19.7\% | 7.0\% | 1.4\% | 2.00(1.00) |
| Number of geese that migrated through areas you hunted | North $n=296$ | 7.1\% | 18.9\% | 32.4\% | 32.4\% | 9.1\% | $3.18(1.07)$ |
|  | Central $n=425$ | 20.9\% | 34.4\% | 22.8\% | 19.3\% | 2.6\% | 2.48(1.10) |
|  | South Central $n=93$ | 39.8\% | 31.2\% | 14.0\% | 11.8\% | 3.2\% | 2.08(1.14) |
|  | South $n=70$ | 38.6\% | 41.4\% | 12.9\% | 4.3\% | 2.9\% | 1.91(0.97) |
| Amount of time you spent goose hunting | North $n=296$ | 10.8\% | 23.6\% | 28.0\% | 32.4\% | 5.1\% | 2.97(1.10) |
|  | Central $n=421$ | 12.6\% | 20.7\% | 35.9\% | 26.1\% | 4.8\% | 2.90(1.07) |
|  | South Central $n=93$ | 18.3\% | 22.6\% | 30.1\% | 23.7\% | 5.4\% | 2.75 (1.17) |
|  | South $n=72$ | 26.4\% | 16.7\% | 30.6\% | 23.6\% | 2.8\% | 2.60(1.19) |
| Number of geese you harvested | North $n=296$ | 21.3\% | 26.0\% | 20.9\% | 27.4\% | 4.4\% | 2.68(1.21) |
|  | Central $n=418$ | 28.9\% | 28.2\% | 24.6\% | 17.5\% | 0.7\% | 2.33(1.09) |
|  | South Central $n=93$ | 41.9\% | 26.9\% | 20.4\% | 10.8\% | 0.0\% | 2.00(1.03) |
|  | South $n=71$ | 43.7\% | 36.6\% | 11.3\% | 8.5\% | 0.0\% | 1.85(0.94) |
| Weather during goose season | North $n=294$ | 10.2\% | 16.7\% | 41.5\% | 26.9\% | 4.8\% | 2.99(1.02) |
|  | Central $n=421$ | 15.9\% | 25.9\% | 38.5\% | 18.3\% | 1.4\% | 2.63(1.00) |
|  | South Central $n=92$ | 21.7\% | 21.7\% | 37.0\% | 18.5\% | 1.1\% | $2.55(1.06)$ |
|  | South $n=72$ | 26.4\% | 15.3\% | 43.1\% | 12.5\% | 2.8\% | 2.50(1.10) |

[^7]Table 19. Hunter* opinions of the timing of 2018-19 waterfowl seasons**.

| Season | $n$ | Too Early <br> $(\%)$ | About Right <br> $(\%)$ | Too Late <br> $(\%)$ | Not Sure <br> $(\%)$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Teal | 81 | $21.0 \%$ | $58.0 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ |
| Central Teal | 169 | $16.0 \%$ | $72.8 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $5.3 \%$ |
| South Central Teal | 54 | $27.8 \%$ | $55.6 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ |
| South Teal | 19 | $26.3 \%$ | $57.9 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ |
| Teal Combined | 323 | $19.8 \%$ | $65.3 \%$ | $6.2 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ |
| North Sept. Goose | 108 | $22.2 \%$ | $65.7 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |
| Central Sept. Goose | 180 | $13.9 \%$ | $73.3 \%$ | $2.8 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
| South Central Sept. Goose | 29 | $24.1 \%$ | $69.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ |
| South Sept. Goose | 22 | $0.0 \%$ | $86.4 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Sept. Goose Combined | 339 | $16.5 \%$ | $71.4 \%$ | $2.4 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |
| North Reg. Duck | 313 | $39.0 \%$ | $41.9 \%$ | $11.2 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |
| Central Reg. Duck | 551 | $53.0 \%$ | $28.5 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ |
| South Central Reg. Duck | 183 | $56.3 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |
| South Reg. Duck | 115 | $52.2 \%$ | $25.2 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $13.9 \%$ |
| Reg. Duck Combined | 1162 | $49.7 \%$ | $31.6 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $9.3 \%$ |
| North Reg. Goose | 294 | $24.5 \%$ | $61.2 \%$ | $6.1 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| Central Reg. Goose | 423 | $43.0 \%$ | $47.3 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ |
| South Central Reg. Goose | 91 | $48.4 \%$ | $40.7 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ |
| South Reg. Goose | 67 | $47.8 \%$ | $32.8 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $16.4 \%$ |
| South Reg. Combined | 875 | $37.7 \%$ | $50.2 \%$ | $4.0 \%$ | $8.1 \%$ |

*Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted at least 1 day during the corresponding zone/season in 2018-19.
**Zone determined by zone hunted in most often for species in 2018-19 season.

Table 20. Duck hunter preferred duck season dates by zone intended to hunt in 2019-20.

| Preferred Season Dates | North <br> $(n=433)$ | Central <br> $(n=803)$ | South Central <br> $(n=246)$ | South <br> $(n=152)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| No Preference | $12 \%$ | $13 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Oct. 5 - Dec. 3 | $6 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Oct. 12 - Dec. 10 | $10 \%$ | $3 \%$ | $0 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Oct. 19 - Dec. 17 | $23 \%$ | $8 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Oct. 26 - Dec. 24 | $20 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $5 \%$ | $1 \%$ |
| Nov. 2 - Dec. 31 | $15 \%$ | $19 \%$ | $7 \%$ | $3 \%$ |
| Nov. 9 - Jan. 7 | $6 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $18 \%$ | $4 \%$ |
| Nov. 16 - Jan. 14 | $4 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $5 \%$ |
| Nov. 23 - Jan. 21 | $1 \%$ | $6 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $25 \%$ |
| Dec. 7 - Jan. 28 | $2 \%$ | $2 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $22 \%$ |
| Always close Jan. 31 | $3 \%$ | $4 \%$ | $10 \%$ | $25 \%$ |

Table 21. Duck hunter zoning option preferences for 2021 through 2025 by Duck zone intended to hunt most.

|  | North <br> Zone <br> $(n=141)$ | Central <br> Zone <br> $(n=315)$ | South <br> Central <br> $(n=161)$ | South <br> Zone <br> $(n=104)$ | Total <br> $(n=1,187)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Three duck zones with no split seasons. | $12.9 \%$ | $12.6 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ |
| Three duck zones with 2 season segments <br> (2-way split) in one, two, or all zones | $15.9 \%$ | $28.7 \%$ | $38.7 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ | $26.5 \%$ |
| Four duck zones (no change from current <br> system) | $14.2 \%$ | $12.2 \%$ | $12.4 \%$ | $20.0 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Keep a 4-zone structure but reconfigure <br> the current zone configuration. | $9.4 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $11.7 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ |
| I do not have a preference. | $47.6 \%$ | $39.3 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $39.3 \%$ |

*Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for DUCKS in the corresponding zone.

Table 22. Percentage of hunters who preferred indicated season structure among those who intend to hunt at least one day in the South zone.

| $n=361$ | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Opening to maximize number of January hunting days | $49.3 \%$ |
| Opening on Thanksgiving, no change. | $31.0 \%$ |
| Opening on the Saturday following Thanksgiving. | $19.7 \%$ |

Restricted to those who intend to hunt at least one day in the South Zone during 2019-20.

Table 23. Percentage of hunters who preferred the indicated season structure to maximize number of January hunting days.

| $n=174$ | $\%$ |
| :--- | :---: |
| Opening duck season on Saturday that ensures duck season closes as close to Jan. 31. | $23.6 \%$ |
| Opening duck season on Thursday that ensures duck season closes as close to Jan. 31. | $14.4 \%$ |
| Opening duck season on Dec. 3, to maximize the number of total Jan. days. | $14.9 \%$ |
| I want Jan. days maximized but have no preference to how it is accomplished. | $43.1 \%$ |
| I do not care about maximizing January days. | $4.0 \%$ |

Restricted to those who intend to hunt at least one day in the South Zone during 2019-20 and wanted to maximize number of days in January.

Table 24. Illinois waterfowl hunter satisfaction with current zone lines

| Zone line | Hunters | $n$ | Dissatisfied <br> $\%$ | Neither <br> $\%$ | Satisfied <br> $\%$ |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North/Central Zones line | North hunters | 364 | $24 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
|  | Central hunters | 848 | $13 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| Central/South Central Zones line | Central hunters | 850 | $15 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
|  | South Central hunters | 292 | $26 \%$ | $23 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Central/South Zones line | Central hunters | 804 | $14 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
|  | South hunters | 189 | $25 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $43 \%$ |
| South Central/South Zones line | South Central hunters | 327 | $38 \%$ | $17 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
|  | South hunters | 263 | $30 \%$ | $22 \%$ | $48 \%$ |

[^8]Table 25. Preferred zone placement for hunters who feel their county is in the wrong zone.

| County | \# of hunters dissatisfied with zone | Preferred zone location |  |  |  | \# of hunters who hunt this county most often |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | North | Central | South <br> Central | South |  |
| Will | 25 | 17\% | 79\% | 4\% | 0\% | 99 |
| Grundy | 15 | 13\% | 53\% | 33\% | 0\% | 59 |
| Fayette | 12 | 0\% | 0\% | 50\% | 50\% | 52 |
| Madison | 11 | 9\% | 0\% | 82\% | 9\% | 41 |
| Perry | 11 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 31 |
| Franklin | 9 | 0\% | 0\% | 11\% | 89\% | 23 |
| St. Clair | 9 | 0\% | 0\% | 22\% | 78\% | 18 |
| Randolph | 8 | 0\% | 0\% | 38\% | 63\% | 22 |
| Clinton | 7 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 31 |
| Williamson | 7 | 0\% | 0\% | 14\% | 86\% | 38 |
| Jackson | 6 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 26 |
| Monroe | 6 | 0\% | 17\% | 83\% | 0\% | 15 |
| Putnam | 6 | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 17 |
| Bureau | 5 | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 23 |
| Jefferson | 5 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 24 |
| LaSalle | 5 | 40\% | 40\% | 0\% | 20\% | 40 |
| Montgomery | 5 | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 14 |
| Shelby | 5 | 0\% | 0\% | 80\% | 20\% | 18 |
| Jersey | 4 | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 28 |
| Kankakee | 4 | 0\% | 67\% | 33\% | 0\% | 37 |
| Saline | 4 | 0\% | 0\% | 0\% | 100\% | 13 |
| Kendall | 3 | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% | 0\% | 21 |

Table 26. Hunters of concern: opinions of the timing of 2018-19 waterfowl seasons.

| Season | $n$ | Too Early <br> $(\%)$ | About Right <br> $(\%)$ | Too Late <br> $(\%)$ | Not Sure <br> $(\%)$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| CZ of Concern | 681 | $64.2 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $6.8 \%$ | $7.2 \%$ |
| CZ no Concern | 350 | $41.7 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ |
| SCZ of Concern | 302 | $59.9 \%$ | $23.5 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ |
| SCZ no Concern | 53 | $56.6 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | $13.2 \%$ | $11.3 \%$ |

Table 27. Duck hunters of concern: opinions of duck season dates timing.

| County | $n$ | Too Early | About Right | Too Late | Not Sure |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bond | 16 | 56\% | 19\% | 6\% | 19\% |
| Champaign | 10 | 70\% | 20\% | 10\% | 0\% |
| Christian | 7 | 71\% | 14\% | 14\% | 0\% |
| Clark | 22 | 73\% | 18\% | 0\% | 9\% |
| Coles | 15 | 80\% | 13\% | 0\% | 7\% |
| Cumberland | 12 | 50\% | 25\% | 8\% | 17\% |
| Dewitt | 66 | 76\% | 9\% | 6\% | 9\% |
| Douglas | 11 | 36\% | 55\% | 0\% | 9\% |
| Edgar | 17 | 71\% | 12\% | 6\% | 12\% |
| Effingham | 5 | 60\% | 0\% | 20\% | 20\% |
| Fayette | 84 | 42\% | 40\% | 8\% | 10\% |
| Ford | 10 | 20\% | 80\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Grundy | 72 | 82\% | 13\% | 4\% | 1\% |
| Iroquois | 19 | 53\% | 21\% | 11\% | 16\% |
| Kankakee | 50 | 84\% | 12\% | 4\% | 0\% |
| LaSalle | 37 | 41\% | 46\% | 8\% | 5\% |
| Livingston | 18 | 78\% | 17\% | 6\% | 0\% |
| Logan | 11 | 45\% | 45\% | 9\% | 0\% |
| Macon | 18 | 50\% | 17\% | 22\% | 11\% |
| Macoupin | 19 | 37\% | 26\% | 16\% | 21\% |
| Madison | 41 | 54\% | 22\% | 12\% | 12\% |
| McLean | 15 | 60\% | 27\% | 7\% | 7\% |
| Montgomery | 25 | 68\% | 24\% | 0\% | 8\% |
| Moultrie | 36 | 53\% | 39\% | 6\% | 3\% |
| Piatt | 5 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Sangamon | 14 | 50\% | 50\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Shelby | 48 | 54\% | 27\% | 2\% | 17\% |
| Vermillion | 25 | 72\% | 28\% | 0\% | 0\% |
| Will | 86 | 70\% | 20\% | 7\% | 3\% |
| Woodford | 50 | 54\% | 36\% | 2\% | 8\% |
| Franklin | 36 | 61\% | 28\% | 3\% | 8\% |
| Hamilton | 11 | 45\% | 18\% | 9\% | 27\% |
| Jackson | 34 | 56\% | 26\% | 6\% | 12\% |
| Perry | 45 | 80\% | 9\% | 0\% | 11\% |
| Randolph | 37 | 73\% | 22\% | 0\% | 5\% |
| Saline | 20 | 40\% | 35\% | 10\% | 15\% |
| Union | 59 | 41\% | 36\% | 10\% | 14\% |
| White | 24 | 83\% | 8\% | 0\% | 8\% |
| Williamson | 48 | 58\% | 27\% | 4\% | 10\% |

Table 28. Illinois waterfowl hunter satisfaction with current zone lines

| Zone line |  | $n$ | Dissatisfied | Neither | Satisfied |
| :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Central Zone of Concern | 587 | $17.9 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $54.9 \%$ |
| Central/South Central | Central Zone no Concern | 327 | $9.2 \%$ | $29.7 \%$ | $61.2 \%$ |
| Zones line | South Central Zone of Concern | 201 | $29.9 \%$ | $29.9 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ |
|  | South Central Zone of no Concern | 47 | $25.5 \%$ | $27.7 \%$ | $46.8 \%$ |
|  | Central Zone of Concern | 562 | $16.9 \%$ | $29.4 \%$ | $53.7 \%$ |
| Central/South Zones | Central Zone no Concern | 302 | $7.3 \%$ | $30.8 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ |
| line | South hunters | 24 | $16.7 \%$ | $20.8 \%$ | $62.5 \%$ |
|  | South Central Zone of Concern | 299 | $40.1 \%$ | $18.7 \%$ | $41.1 \%$ |
| South Central/South | South Central Zone of no Concern | 49 | $40.8 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ | $40.8 \%$ |
| Zones line | South hunters | 46 | $21.7 \%$ | $21.7 \%$ | $56.5 \%$ |

$1=$ Very Dissatisfied to $5=$ Very Satisfied condensed to scale of 3,
*Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for waterfowl.

Table 29. Duck hunters* of concern: zoning option preferences for 2021 through 2025

|  | CZ of <br> concern <br> $n=698$ | Other CZ <br> hunters <br> $n=360$ | SCZ of <br> concern <br> $n=309$ | Other SCZ <br> hunters <br> $n=56$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Three duck zones with no split seasons. | $11.6 \%$ | $11.9 \%$ | $9.4 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |
| Three duck zones with 2 season segments (2- <br> way split) in one, two, or all zones. | $33.4 \%$ | $22.8 \%$ | $28.8 \%$ | $41.1 \%$ |
| Four duck zones (no change from current <br> system). | $12.9 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ | $17.5 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| Keep a 4-zone structure but reconfigure the <br> current zone configuration. | $9.7 \%$ | $5.6 \%$ | $13.3 \%$ | $10.7 \%$ |
| I do not have a preference. | $32.4 \%$ | $46.1 \%$ | $31.1 \%$ | $25.0 \%$ |

*Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for DUCKS in the corresponding zone.

Table 30. Option \#1 zone change preference of hunters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ of concern

| County | $n$ | Option \#1 | No Change | No preference |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bond | 16 | 47\% | 26\% | 26\% |
| Champaign | 10 | 46\% | 15\% | 38\% |
| Christian | 7 | 36\% | 18\% | 45\% |
| Clark | 22 | 32\% | 26\% | 42\% |
| Coles | 15 | 31\% | 31\% | 38\% |
| Cumberland | 12 | 17\% | 17\% | 67\% |
| Dewitt | 66 | 37\% | 20\% | 44\% |
| Douglas | 11 | 28\% | 22\% | 50\% |
| Edgar | 17 | 57\% | 5\% | 38\% |
| Effingham | 5 | 13\% | 50\% | 38\% |
| Fayette | 84 | 33\% | 41\% | 26\% |
| Ford | 10 | 13\% | 50\% | 38\% |
| Grundy | 72 | 43\% | 27\% | 30\% |
| Iroquois | 19 | 44\% | 26\% | 30\% |
| Kankakee | 50 | 57\% | 11\% | 31\% |
| LaSalle | 37 | 19\% | 42\% | 39\% |
| Livingston | 18 | 24\% | 12\% | 64\% |
| Logan | 11 | 27\% | 40\% | 33\% |
| Macon | 18 | 27\% | 40\% | 33\% |
| Macoupin | 19 | 27\% | 40\% | 33\% |
| Madison | 41 | 27\% | 40\% | 33\% |
| McLean | 15 | 0\% | 25\% | 75\% |
| Montgomery | 25 | 50\% | 43\% | 7\% |
| Moultrie | 36 | 32\% | 36\% | 32\% |
| Piatt | 5 | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% |
| Sangamon | 14 | 24\% | 43\% | 33\% |
| Shelby | 48 | 41\% | 28\% | 31\% |
| Vermillion | 25 | 39\% | 21\% | 39\% |
| Will | 86 | 38\% | 19\% | 44\% |
| Woodford | 50 | 21\% | 52\% | 27\% |
| Franklin | 36 | 13\% | 39\% | 48\% |
| Hamilton | 11 | 29\% | 29\% | 43\% |
| Jackson | 34 | 14\% | 30\% | 57\% |
| Perry | 45 | 16\% | 30\% | 54\% |
| Randolph | 37 | 14\% | 43\% | 43\% |
| Saline | 20 | 17\% | 58\% | 25\% |
| Union | 59 | 10\% | 27\% | 63\% |
| White | 24 | 18\% | 23\% | 59\% |
| Williamson | 48 | 13\% | 37\% | 50\% |

[^9]Table 31. Option \#1 zone change preference for duck hunters.

|  | $n$ | Option \#1 | Do not change | I have no preference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Zone hunters | 94 | $17.0 \%$ | $18.1 \%$ | $64.9 \%$ |
| CZ of Concern | 604 | $40.9 \%$ | $30.1 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ |
| CZ no Concern | 299 | $14.0 \%$ | $42.5 \%$ | $43.5 \%$ |
| SCZ of Concern | 229 | $14.4 \%$ | $37.6 \%$ | $48.0 \%$ |
| SCZ no Concern | 47 | $23.4 \%$ | $42.6 \%$ | $34.0 \%$ |
| South Zone | 28 | $7.1 \%$ | $46.4 \%$ | $46.4 \%$ |

Table 32. Option \#1 satisfaction with new zone line among South Central Zone hunters ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$

| County | $n$ | Dissatisfied | Neither | Satisfied |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bond | 18 | 22\% | 44\% | 33\% |
| Champaign | 11 | 18\% | 27\% | 55\% |
| Christian | 11 | 0\% | 45\% | 55\% |
| Clark | 25 | 20\% | 48\% | 32\% |
| Coles | 15 | 13\% | 53\% | 33\% |
| Cumberland | 13 | 15\% | 77\% | 8\% |
| Dewitt | 76 | 9\% | 50\% | 41\% |
| Douglas | 18 | 11\% | 67\% | 22\% |
| Edgar | 24 | 8\% | 33\% | 58\% |
| Effingham | 9 | 22\% | 56\% | 22\% |
| Fayette | 85 | 29\% | 41\% | 29\% |
| Ford | 16 | 13\% | 63\% | 25\% |
| Grundy | 83 | 13\% | 52\% | 35\% |
| Iroquois | 28 | 21\% | 39\% | 39\% |
| Kankakee | 56 | 7\% | 38\% | 55\% |
| Lasalle | 38 | 29\% | 53\% | 18\% |
| Livingston | 29 | 7\% | 66\% | 28\% |
| Logan | 13 | 23\% | 38\% | 38\% |
| Macon | 13 | 23\% | 38\% | 38\% |
| Macoupin | 13 | 23\% | 38\% | 38\% |
| Madison | 13 | 23\% | 38\% | 38\% |
| McLean | 7 | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |
| Montgomery | 29 | 28\% | 24\% | 48\% |
| Moultrie | 49 | 29\% | 43\% | 29\% |
| Piatt | 6 | 33\% | 33\% | 33\% |
| Sangamon | 22 | 14\% | 64\% | 23\% |
| Shelby | 60 | 12\% | 42\% | 47\% |
| Vermillion | 34 | 6\% | 38\% | 56\% |
| Will | 105 | 13\% | 57\% | 30\% |
| Woodford | 52 | 31\% | 42\% | 27\% |
| Franklin | 31 | 39\% | 55\% | 6\% |
| Hamilton | 13 | 31\% | 54\% | 15\% |
| Jackson | 44 | 23\% | 59\% | 18\% |
| Perry | 43 | 30\% | 63\% | 7\% |
| Randolph | 37 | 35\% | 46\% | 19\% |
| Saline | 21 | 10\% | 81\% | 10\% |
| Union | 58 | 16\% | 71\% | 14\% |
| White | 25 | 12\% | 72\% | 16\% |
| Williamson | 49 | 29\% | 57\% | 14\% |

[^10]Table 33. Option \#1 satisfaction with new zone line among duck hunters.

|  | $n$ | Dissatisfied | Neither | Satisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Zone hunters | 197 | $11.2 \%$ | $72.1 \%$ | $16.8 \%$ |
| CZ of Concern | 647 | $19.0 \%$ | $42.2 \%$ | $38.8 \%$ |
| CZ no Concern | 340 | $27.9 \%$ | $56.8 \%$ | $15.3 \%$ |
| SCZ of Concern | 278 | $26.6 \%$ | $61.9 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ |
| SCZ no Concern | 50 | $32.0 \%$ | $44.0 \%$ | $24.0 \%$ |
| South Zone | 44 | $15.9 \%$ | $68.2 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ |

Table 34. Option \#1 zone line movement preference for hunters of concern ${ }^{\text {a }}$.

| County | $n$ | East | Do not move | West |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bond | 13 | 15\% | 77\% | 8\% |
| Champaign | 8 | 13\% | 63\% | 25\% |
| Christian | 9 | 0\% | 78\% | 22\% |
| Clark | 16 | 0\% | 75\% | 25\% |
| Coles | 13 | 0\% | 92\% | 8\% |
| Cumberland | 7 | 0\% | 100\% | 0\% |
| Dewitt | 64 | 9\% | 67\% | 23\% |
| Douglas | 11 | 9\% | 82\% | 9\% |
| Edgar | 20 | 0\% | 80\% | 20\% |
| Effingham | 8 | 25\% | 75\% | 0\% |
| Fayette | 60 | 18\% | 72\% | 10\% |
| Ford | 14 | 14\% | 79\% | 7\% |
| Grundy | 60 | 8\% | 70\% | 22\% |
| Iroquois | 23 | 13\% | 65\% | 22\% |
| Kankakee | 42 | 7\% | 76\% | 17\% |
| Lasalle | 25 | 16\% | 56\% | 28\% |
| Livingston | 23 | 13\% | 65\% | 22\% |
| Logan | 12 | 25\% | 42\% | 33\% |
| Macon | 12 | 25\% | 42\% | 33\% |
| Macoupin | 12 | 25\% | 42\% | 33\% |
| Madison | 12 | 25\% | 42\% | 33\% |
| McLean | 16 | 19\% | 63\% | 19\% |
| Montgomery | 28 | 25\% | 57\% | 18\% |
| Moultrie | 35 | 23\% | 54\% | 23\% |
| Piatt | 5 | 40\% | 60\% | 0\% |
| Sangamon | 16 | 38\% | 38\% | 25\% |
| Shelby | 48 | 13\% | 67\% | 21\% |
| Vermillion | 25 | 16\% | 72\% | 12\% |
| Will | 80 | 38\% | 19\% | 44\% |
| Woodford | 48 | 21\% | 52\% | 27\% |
| Franklin | 12 | 17\% | 67\% | 17\% |
| Hamilton | 3 | 67\% | 0\% | 33\% |
| Jackson | 25 | 36\% | 48\% | 16\% |
| Perry | 19 | 11\% | 58\% | 32\% |
| Randolph | 22 | 27\% | 32\% | 41\% |
| Saline | 5 | 0\% | 80\% | 20\% |
| Union | 19 | 0\% | 74\% | 26\% |
| White | 22 | 18\% | 23\% | 59\% |
| Williamson | 38 | 13\% | 37\% | 50\% |

[^11]Table 35. Option \#1 zone line movement preference for duck hunters.

|  | $n$ | East | Do not move | West |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Zone hunters | 56 | $26.8 \%$ | $64.3 \%$ | $8.9 \%$ |
| CZ of Concern | 500 | $17.2 \%$ | $63.0 \%$ | $19.8 \%$ |
| CZ no Concern | 261 | $28.0 \%$ | $53.6 \%$ | $18.4 \%$ |
| SCZ of Concern | 123 | $17.9 \%$ | $56.1 \%$ | $26.0 \%$ |
| SCZ no Concern | 33 | $30.3 \%$ | $51.5 \%$ | $18.2 \%$ |
| South Zone | 13 | $23.1 \%$ | $76.9 \%$ | - |

Table 36. Option \#2 zone change preference of South Central Zone hunters ${ }^{\text {a }}$ of concern

| County | $n$ | Option <br> $\# 2$ | No <br> Change | No <br> Preference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Franklin | 34 | $41 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| Hamilton | 10 | $40 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Jackson | 40 | $50 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| Perry | 41 | $56 \%$ | $24 \%$ | $20 \%$ |
| Randolph | 31 | $32 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $32 \%$ |
| Saline | 16 | $38 \%$ | $31 \%$ | $31 \%$ |
| Union | 50 | $42 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $30 \%$ |
| White | 26 | $23 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $35 \%$ |
| Williamson | 43 | $44 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $26 \%$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Those who indicated this county is where they hunt waterfowl most often

Table 37. Option \#2 zone change preference for duck hunters.

|  | $n$ | Option | No <br> Change | No <br> Preference |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Zone | 63 | $17 \%$ | $16 \%$ | $67 \%$ |
| Central Zone (Special Concern) | 421 | $22 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Central Zone (Remainder) | 215 | $13 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $60 \%$ |
| South Central Zone (Special Concern) | 262 | $43 \%$ | $34 \%$ | $23 \%$ |
| South Central Zone (Remainder) | 42 | $29 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $26 \%$ |
| South Zone | 43 | $33 \%$ | $28 \%$ | $40 \%$ |

Table 38. Option \#2 satisfaction with new zone line among South Central Zone hunters ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  | $n$ | Dissatisfied | Neither | Satisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cranklin | 33 | $24 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $36 \%$ |
| Hamilton | 10 | $60 \%$ | $30 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Jackson | 38 | $18 \%$ | $32 \%$ | $50 \%$ |
| Perry | 42 | $26 \%$ | $29 \%$ | $45 \%$ |
| Randolph | 38 | $24 \%$ | $39 \%$ | $37 \%$ |
| Saline | 16 | $19 \%$ | $38 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| Union | 57 | $12 \%$ | $40 \%$ | $47 \%$ |
| White | 25 | $20 \%$ | $52 \%$ | $28 \%$ |
| Williamson | 51 | $29 \%$ | $35 \%$ | $35 \%$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Those who indicated this county is where they hunt waterfowl most often

Table 39. Option \#2 satisfaction with new zone line among duck hunters.

|  | $n$ | Dissatisfied | Neither |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North Zone | 185 | $11 \%$ | $72 \%$ |
| Central Zone (Special Concern) | 560 | $19 \%$ | $42 \%$ |
| Central Zone (Remainder) | 299 | $28 \%$ | $57 \%$ |
| South Central Zone (Special Concern) | 277 | $27 \%$ | $62 \%$ |
| South Central Zone (Remainder) | 50 | $32 \%$ | $44 \%$ |
| South Zone | 43 | $16 \%$ | $68 \%$ |

Table 40. Option \#2 zone line movement preference for South Central Zone hunters ${ }^{\text {a }}$

|  |  |  | No |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| County | $n$ | North | Change | South |
| Franklin | 27 | $41 \%$ | $41 \%$ | $19 \%$ |
| Hamilton | 11 | $91 \%$ | $9 \%$ | $0 \%$ |
| Jackson | 36 | $36 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Perry | 37 | $57 \%$ | $27 \%$ | $16 \%$ |
| Randolph | 31 | $45 \%$ | $45 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Saline | 14 | $36 \%$ | $50 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| Union | 46 | $30 \%$ | $63 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| White | 22 | $27 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $18 \%$ |
| Williamson | 43 | $47 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $9 \%$ |

[^12]Table 41. Option \#2 zone line movement preference for duck hunters.

|  |  |  | No |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | $n$ | North | Change | South |
| North Zone | 43 | $30 \%$ | $58 \%$ | $12 \%$ |
| Central Zone (Special Concern) | 336 | $29 \%$ | $61 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| Central Zone (Remainder) | 144 | $23 \%$ | $70 \%$ | $7 \%$ |
| South Central Zone (Special Concern) | 241 | $41 \%$ | $44 \%$ | $14 \%$ |
| South Central Zone (Remainder) | 48 | $48 \%$ | $42 \%$ | $10 \%$ |
| South Zone | 38 | $39 \%$ | $55 \%$ | $5 \%$ |

# Illinois Waterfowl Hunter Survey 2018-19 Season 



## Illinois Department of Natural Resources Division of Wildlife Resources <br> \& The Illinois Natural History Survey

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. This study is funded by the federal Wildlife Restoration Fund through your purchase of sporting arms and ammunition.

## THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

All of your responses will be kept confidential.
Please return this survey in the postage-paid return envelope provided.
Section 1. Waterfowl Hunting in Illinois. Please provide the following information so that Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) waterfowl biologists may better understand hunters in Illinois.

1. Did you purchase an Illinois State Waterfowl Stamp for the 2018-19 seasons?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No
2. Which of the following best describes how often you hunt waterfowl (ducks, geese, or coots) in Illinois?
$\qquad$ Every year $\qquad$ Most years $\qquad$ Occassional years $\qquad$ Rarely $\qquad$ Never

## If you never hunt waterfowl in Illinois, please go to Section 7 on the back cover.

3. Did you hunt waterfowl in Illinois during the 2018-19 waterfowl hunting seasons?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No (If "No," please go to Section 3)

3a. Was the 2018-19 Illinois waterfowl season your first time hunting waterfowl in Illinois?
$\qquad$ No $\qquad$ Yes (new Illinois resident hunter) $\qquad$ Yes (new nonresident hunter

Please refer to the zone map on the back of the included cover letter to answer question 3 b .

3b. In which of the following zones did you hunt waterfowl MOST often? (Please select one)
$\qquad$ North Zone $\qquad$ Central Zone $\qquad$ South Central Zone $\qquad$ South Zone
4. Did you use a spinning-wing decoy to hunt ducks in Illinois during the 2018-19 season?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No
5. Did you hunt waterfowl on Illinois state public land during the 2018-19 seasons?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No

5a. If "Yes," in what zone(s) did you hunt waterfowl on public land? (Please check all that apply)
$\qquad$ North Zone $\qquad$ Central Zone $\qquad$ South Central Zone $\qquad$
5 b. Did any of your hunts on public lands use a blind awarded through a lottery?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No
6. How does the number of white-fronted (specklebelly) geese you saw this year compare to the last 5 years?
$\qquad$ Much less Less About the same $\qquad$ More $\qquad$ Much more
7. Did you target white-fronted (specklebelly) geese during the Regular Goose Season? (Please check all that apply)
$\qquad$ Yes, I used white-fronted (specklebelly) decoys
$\qquad$ Yes, I used a white-fronted (specklebelly) call
$\qquad$ No, I did not target them, but I shot at them when I had the opportunity
$\qquad$ No, I did not target or shoot at them

Section 2. Waterfowl Harvest in Illinois. Please provide the following information so that IDNR waterfowl biologists may estimate waterfowl harvest, conserve waterfowl populations, and provide hunting opportunities in Illinois. If you did not hunt waterfowl in Illinois during the 2018-19 seasons, please go to Section 3.

1. Please report your hunting effort and harvest in Illinois between September 2018 and January $31^{\text {st }}, 2019$ in the following tables.

- Include only your personal effort and harvest (DO NOT include harvests for party)
- Count part of 1 day as 1 whole day.
- Only report days hunted in the table for the species you targeted that day.
a. September Teal Season (DO NOT include harvest after September.)

| Zone hunted |  | County hunted |  | Total days <br> hunted |  | Teal <br> harvested | Teal downed but <br> not retrieved |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

b. September Canada Goose Season (DO NOT include harvest after September.)

| Zone hunted | County hunted | Total days <br> hunted |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  |  |  | Geese <br> harvested | Geese downed but <br> not retrieved |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |

c. Regular Duck Season (DO NOT include harvest from September.)

| Zone hunted | County hunted | Total days hunted | Mallards harvested | Wood <br> ducks harvested | Canvasbacks harvested | Other ducks harvested | Coots harvested | Ducks downed but not retrieved |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

d. Regular Goose Season (DO NOT include harvest from September or Conservation Order Light Goose season that occurs after regular goose season closes.)

| Zone hunted |  | County hunted | Total days <br> hunted | Canada <br> geese <br> harvested | White-fronted <br> (Specklebelly) <br> geese harvested | Snow/Blue/ <br> Ross'geese <br> harvested | Geese downed <br> but not <br> retrieved |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

Section 3. Youth Hunts. Please answer the following questions about mentoring youth hunters in Illinois. Please note: "Youths" are defined as hunters 17 years of age or younger.

1. Did you take a youth (17 years old or younger) hunting during the 2018 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No (If "No," Please go to question 2)

1a. If "Yes," was this at least one youth's first time duck or goose hunting? $\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No

1b. Was this YOUR first time accompanying a youth during the Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days?
$\qquad$ Yes No

1c. Please report information for each youth that hunted during the 2018 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days. (North Zone: Oct. 13-14, Central Zone: Oct. 20-21, South Central Zone: Nov. 3-4, South Zone: Nov. 10-11) Enter $\mathbf{0}$ if the youth did not harvest any ducks, geese, or coots.

| Number <br> of Days <br> hunted |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | County <br> hunted | Mallards <br> harvested | Wood <br> ducks <br> harvested | Other <br> ducks <br> harvested | Geese <br> harvested | Coots <br> harvested |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Youth 1 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth 2 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth 3 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Youth 4 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |

2. Did you take a youth hunting during the 2018-19 regular duck or goose seasons in Illinois?
$\qquad$ Yes (If "Yes," please check which season(s)): $\qquad$ Regular Duck $\qquad$ Regular Goose
$\qquad$ No

A youth accompanied me hunting, but they did not hunt
Section 4. Satisfaction and zone timing. The following questions will tell us about your satisfaction with the most recent duck and/or goose season(s).

1. Please rate your SATISFACTION with the most recent duck season(s) you hunted in Illinois by circling the number that best matches your response. If you did not hunt ducks during 2018-19, please go to question 2.

| REGULAR DUCK SEASON | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neutral | Satisfied | Very <br> Satisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of ducks you saw | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Mid-season matched peak of duck migration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Amount of shooting you got in | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of ducks migrating through areas you hunted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Amount of time you spent duck hunting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of ducks you harvested | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Season start date allowed the season to match migration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Weather during duck season | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. Please rate your SATISFACTION with the most recent goose season(s) you hunted in Illinois by circling the number that best matches your response. If you did not hunt geese during 2018-19, please go to question 3.

| REGULAR GOOSE SEASON | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neutral | Satisfied | Very <br> Satisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of geese you saw | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Mid-season matched peak of goose migration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Amount of shooting you got in | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of geese that migrated through areas you hunted | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Amount of time you spent goose hunting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of geese you harvested | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Season start date allowed the season to match migration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Weather during goose season | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

3. Do you feel the dates of the 2018-19 waterfowl hunting seasons were too early, about right, or too late in the zone where you hunted most often? (Please circle one number for each season.)

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Too <br> early | About <br> right | Too late | I am <br> not sure | I did not <br> hunt this <br> season. |
| Teal season (September only) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| September Canada Goose Season (September only) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duck Season | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Canada Goose Season | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

4. Please select your preferred 2019-20 Duck season dates for the zone you intend to hunt in most often during the 2019-20 duck season. The 2018-19 duck season dates were as follows: North Zone: Oct. 20 - Dec. 18, Central Zone: Oct. 27 - Dec. 25 South Central Zone: Nov. 10 - Jan. 8, South Zone: Nov. 22 - Jan. 20.

Please select ONLY ONE Duck Season start date

| Oct. 5 - Dec. 3 | Nov. 2 - Dec. 31 | Dec. 7 - Jan. 28 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Oct. $12-$ Dec. 10 | Nov. 9 - Jan. 7 | Always Close Jan. 31 |
| Oct. 19 - Dec. 17 | Nov. 16 - Jan. 14 | No Preference |
| Oct. 26 - Dec. 24 | Nov. 23 - Jan. 21 |  |

5. Are you satisfied with the current length of the September Goose Season? _____ No

5a. How supportive would you be of shortening the 15-day September Canada Goose season to a 9-day season to allow the addition of six days of Regular Canada Goose hunting in the North and Central zones?

| Extremely <br> Unsupportive | Very <br> Unsupportive | Unsupportive | Neither | Supportive | Very <br> Supportive | Extremely <br> Supportive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

5b. How supportive would you be of overlapping the September Canada Goose and September Teal season if doing so meant September Canada Goose would only last 9 days and open on a Saturday later in September?

| Extremely <br> Unsupportive | Very <br> Unsupportive | Unsupportive | Neither | Supportive | Very <br> Supportive | Extremely <br> Supportive |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

6. Are you satisfied with the current timing of Youth Waterfowl Hunting days? $\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No

6a. Which of the following would you prefer for the timing of the Youth Waterfowl Hunting days?
$\qquad$ Youth Waterfowl Days should occur 2 weeks before duck opener, though there may be fewer ducks.
Keep the current timing, Youth Waterfowl Days should occur 1 week before duck opener.
Youth Waterfowl Days should occur 1 week after duck season closes, though the Conservation Order may be later in the South Zone.

Section 5. Regulations and Zone Delineation. Please answer the following question concerning your season date preferences and the position of current and future zone lines.

1. In which zone do you intend to hunt DUCKS most often during the 2019-20 duck hunting season?
$\qquad$ North Zone $\qquad$ Central Zone $\qquad$ South Central Zone $\qquad$ South Zone

1a. Do you intend to hunt in the South zone at least one day? $\qquad$ Yes (Go to 1 b ) $\qquad$ No (Skip to \#2)

1b. To avoid a conflict with gun deer season, the South Duck Zone has recently opened on Thanksgiving. However, the season could open later and last further into January but with fewer total goose hunting days. Which structure do you prefer?
$\qquad$ Opening to maximize number January hunting days (If so, go to 1c.)
$\qquad$ Opening on Thanksgiving, no change (If so, go to \#2.)
$\qquad$ Opening on the Saturday following Thanksgiving (If so, go to \#2)

1c. To maximize the total number of South Zone duck hunting days in January, IDNR has several options. Open the season on Dec $3^{\text {rd }}$ regardless of day of the week and have fewer weekend hunting days but maximized January days OR open on the Thursday or Saturday that allows the season to close closest to Jan 31. Which opening date structure do you prefer?
$\qquad$ Opening duck season on the Saturday that ensures duck season closes as close to Jan 31 as possible.
$\qquad$ Opening duck season on the Thursday that ensures duck season closes as close to Jan 31 as possible.
$\qquad$ Opening duck season on Dec 3. to maximize the number of total January days, but lose some weekend hunting days.
$\qquad$ I want January days maximized but have no preference to how it is accomplished.
$\qquad$ I do not care about maximizing January days.

Please refer to the zone map on the back of the included cover letter to answer questions 2-4.
2. Using the table below, please indicate your satisfaction with the current Illinois Waterfowl Zone lines.

| Zone line between... | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neither | Satisfied | Very SatisfiedI do not hunt <br> these zones |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North and Central Zones | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Central and South Central Zones | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| Central and South Zones | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |
| South Central and South Zones | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 0 |

3. In which county do you hunt waterfowl most often?

3a. Do you feel this county is located in the correct zone? $\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No

3b. If no, in which zone do you feel this county should be placed?
$\qquad$ North Zone
Central Zone $\qquad$ South Central Zone $\qquad$ South Zone
4. Currently Illinois has a continuous duck season with 4 duck hunting zones. The next opportunity to change zone options will be for the period 2021 through 2025. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service likely will allow the following duck season zoning options. Which option do you prefer for Illinois for the period 2021 through 2025?

## Please choose ONE response.

$\qquad$ Three duck zones with no split seasons.
$\qquad$ Three duck zones with 2 season segments (2-way split) in one, two, or all zones.
$\qquad$ Four duck zones (Split season prohibited by U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, no change from current system).
$\qquad$ Keep a 4-zone structure but reconfigure the current zone configuration.
$\qquad$ I do not have a preference.
5. New federal legislation, if signed into law, will create 2 special waterfowl hunting days for veterans and members of the Armed Forces on active duty. These days must occur outside the regular duck season but can overlap with existing youth waterfowl days. Which of the following would you prefer for the timing of these days?
$\qquad$ The Military days should overlap with Youth Waterfowl Days.
$\qquad$ The Military days should occur before regular duck season but not overlap with Youth Waterfowl Days.
$\qquad$ The Military days should occur after the close of each zones' regular duck season. (This may change the timing of Spring Light Goose Conservation Order in the South Zone.)

Section 6. Hunting regulations \& proposed new zone lines. Please answer the following question concerning the position of future zone lines.

New zone structures are proposed. Proposed changes would not start until 2021-22, and these changes are currently exploratory. Please refer to the PROPOSED Zone Maps on the opposite pages when answering the following questions. These options are independent of one another and one or both could be adopted.

Option 1 - This proposed change would expand the South Central Zone by combining the eastern half of the Central Zone with the South Central Zone. This new zone would be Zone 3, and the remainder of the Central Zone would become Zone 2. The boundary between Zones 2 and 3 follows Interstate 39 to Interstate 55 to Route 4 to Route 161 to Route 158 to Route 159 to Route 3. (West of line is Zone 2 and East of line is Zone 3).

Option 2 - This proposed change would expand the South Zone by combining part of it with the South Central Zone. This expanded zone would be Zone 4, and the remainder of the South Central Zone would be Zone 3. The boundary between Zones 3 and 4 follows Interstate 70 to Route 45 to Route 14 to Route 148 to Route 154 to Route 4 to Route 150. (North or West of line is Zone 3 and South or East of line is Zone 4).

Please refer to the Option 1 map opposite this page to answer questions 1-3.

1. A change to the current zone lines has been proposed that would combine the east half of the Central Zone with the South Central Zone (Option 1). This new zone would be called Zone 3 and open around 2 weeks after the current Central Zone's dates, maintaining the current South Central Zone's dates. The remainder of the Central Zone would be called Zone 2 and continue to open around the current Central Zone dates. Please select which of the following best describes your preference.
___ Option 1. The boundary follows Interstate 39 to Interstate 55 to Route 4 to Route 161 to Route 158 to Route 159 to Route 3. (West of line is Zone 2 and East of line is Zone 3). The border between Zone 3 and Zone 4 could use the current South Central Zone/South Zone boundary OR Option 2.
$\qquad$ Do not change the boundary line of the Central and South Central Zones.
$\qquad$ I have no preference on the location of this boundary.
$\qquad$ I do not hunt these areas.
2. Please use the table below to indicate your level of satisfaction with the proposed new Zone 2 and Zone 3 line.

| Extremely <br> dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neither dissatisfied <br> or satisfied | Satisfied | Very Satisfied | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

3. If the proposed boundary line running north-south dividing the Central Zone was not fixed but could move east to west, use the table below to indicate how you feel the proposed Option 1 zone line should move east to west.

|  | I do not hunt <br> these areas | Significantly <br> Farther <br> East | Slightly <br> Farther <br> East | The line <br> should stay as <br> proposed | Slightly <br> Farther <br> West | Significantly <br> Farther <br> West |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone 2 and Zone 3 | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

## OPTION 1: Change to Central Zone and South Central Zone

The boundary between Zone 2 and Zone 3 follows Interstate 39 to Interstate 55 to Route 4 to Route 161 to Route 158 to Route 159 to Route 3. (West of line is Zone 2 and East of line is Zone 3.


## Please refer to the Option 2 map opposite this page to answer questions 4-6.

4. A change to the current zone lines has been proposed that would expand the South zone by combining part of it with the South Central Zone (Option 2). The expanded South zone would become Zone 4 and the remainder of the South Central zone would be Zone 3. Zone 3 could be only the remainder of the South Central Zone or could be combined with the eastern half of the Central Zone, Option 1, if preferred. Please select which of the following best describes your preference.
$\qquad$ Option 2. The boundary follows Interstate 70 to Route 45 to Route 14 to Route 148 to Route 154 to Route 4 to Route 150.
$\qquad$ Do not change the boundary line of the South Central and South Zones.
$\qquad$ I have no preference on the location of this boundary.
$\qquad$ I do not hunt these areas.
5. Please use the table below to indicate your level of satisfaction with the proposed Zone 3 and Zone 4 line.

| Extremely <br> dissatisfied | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neither dissatisfied <br> or satisfied | Satisfied | Very Satisfied | Extremely <br> Satisfied |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

6. If the proposed boundary running east-west between the South-Central and South Zones was not fixed but could move north or south, use the table below to indicate how you feel the proposed Option 2 zone line should move north or south.

| Proposed zone line between... | I do not hunt <br> these zones | Significantly <br> Farther <br> North | Slightly <br> Farther <br> North | The line <br> should stay as <br> proposed | Slightly <br> Farther <br> South | Significantly <br> Farther <br> South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone 3 (South Central) and Zone 4 <br> (South Zone) | 0 | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

The boundary between Zone 3 and Zone 4 follows Interstate 70 to Route 45 to Route 14 to Route 148 to Route 154 to Route 4 to Route 150. (North or West of line is Zone 3 and South or East of line is Zone 4.


Proposed zone line
Current zone line

Zone 3 - Approximate duck season dates:
Nov 10 - Jan 10

Section 7. Background Information. The following questions allow us to understand more about the people involved in waterfowl hunting in Illinois. All responses are kept confidential.

1. How many years have you hunted waterfowl in Illinois?

Years
2. At what age did you first hunt waterfowl? $\qquad$ Years-old
3. What is your county of residence? $\qquad$ County (If nonresident, please include state)
4. Please give your age. $\qquad$ Years
5. What is your gender? ___ Male ___ Female
6.What is your military status? (Please check one)
___ I am a veteran of the U.S. Armed Forces.
___ I am currently on active duty in the U.S. military.
$\qquad$ I am currently serving in the U.S. military but not on active duty.
$\qquad$ I have never served in the U.S. military

## Comments



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

## Appendix B

ILLinois Natural History Survey
Prairie Research Institute
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Dear Waterfowl Hunter,

Your name was randomly selected from a list of 2018 Illinois Harvest Information Program (HIP) registrants. We are asking you to provide information about your activities during the 2018-19 waterfowl hunting seasons in Illinois. Even if you did not hunt ducks or geese in Illinois during the 2018-19 seasons, we need to hear from you and we ask that you take a few minutes to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire.

We have included the Illinois waterfowl zone map on the back of this letter if you need it to determine the zone(s) you hunted.

This study, jointly conducted by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources and the Illinois Natural History Survey, is an effort to learn about waterfowl hunting activities in Illinois. Results of this study will help waterfowl managers make decisions to improve hunting opportunities and to better manage Illinois' duck and goose populations. Your responses are voluntary and completely confidential. By responding you will help us more effectively manage waterfowl and hunting in Illinois.

If you do not wish to participate, please return the blank questionnaire so we can remove you from our mailing list.

You may access the results of this and other studies of hunters and hunting in Illinois at http://www.inhs.illinois.edu/programs/hd/. You may also find information about Illinois Department of Natural Resources wildlife management programs and wildlife in Illinois at http://dnr.state.il.us/orc/wildliferesources/.

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


Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program


Please refer to the graphics on this page to answer questions about Illinois waterfowl zones.


## Appendix C



Dear Waterfowl Hunter,
Recently you were mailed a questionnaire about your waterfowl hunting activities in Illinois. We have not yet received your response. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. Your input is very important!

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

## Appendix D

Illinois Natural History Survey
Prairie Research Institute
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Dear Waterfowl Hunter,
Your name was randomly selected from the list of 2018 Illinois Harvest Information Program (HIP) registrants. We recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your hunting experiences in Illinois during the 2018-19 waterfowl season. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you.

If you have not returned your completed questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible.
We have enclosed another copy for your use. The information you and other selected hunters provide will help waterfowl managers make decisions to improve hunting opportunities and to better manage Illinois' duck and goose populations. Your responses are voluntary and completely confidential.

Even if you did not hunt ducks or geese in Illinois during the 2018-19 seasons, we need to hear from you and we ask that you take a few minutes to complete and return the enclosed questionnaire. A postage paid envelope is provided for you to return the questionnaire to us.

If you do not wish to participate, please return the blank questionnaire so we can remove your name from our mailing list.

You may access the results of this and other studies of hunters and hunting in Illinois at http://www.inhs.illinois.edu/programs/hd/. You may also find information about Illinois Department of Natural Resources wildlife management programs and wildlife in Illinois at http://dnr.state.il.us/orc/wildliferesources/.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.
Thank you for helping with this important study.


Craig A. Miller
Human Dimensions Research Program


Please refer to the graphics on this page to answer questions about Illinois waterfowl zones.


## Appendix E

## Illinois Natural History Survey

Prairie Research Institute
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

Dear Waterfowl Hunter,

Your name was randomly selected from the list of 2018 Illinois Harvest Information Program (HIP) registrants. We recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your hunting experiences in Illinois during the 2018-19 waterfowl season. If you have already returned the questionnaire, we thank you.

If you have not returned your completed questionnaire, please do so as soon as possible. We have enclosed another copy for your use. The information you and other selected hunters provide will help waterfowl managers make decisions to improve hunting opportunities and to better manage Illinois' duck and goose populations. Your responses are voluntary and completely confidential. A postage paid envelope is provided for you to return the questionnaire to us.

You may access the results of this and other studies of hunters and hunting in Illinois at http://www.inhs.illinois.edu/programs/hd/. You may also find information about Illinois Department of Natural Resources wildlife management programs and wildlife in Illinois at http://dnr.state.il.us/orc/wildliferesources/.

If you have questions regarding this study, please call us at (217) 244-5121.
Thank you for helping with this important study.


Craig A. Miller<br>Human Dimensions Research Program

Human Dimensions Research Program


Paul B Johnson ©

Please refer to the graphics on this page to answer questions about Illinois waterfowl zones.


Table F-1. Summary of Illinois Migratory Waterfowl Stamps purchased, hunter activity, and waterfowl harvest in Illinois from 1981 through 2018 hunting seasons.

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Stamps Purchased | Estimated Hunters | Estimated Days Hunted | Estimated <br> Waterfowl Harvested ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1981 | 61,929 | 63,652 | 874,730 | 413,264 |
| 1982 | 57,691 | 58,766 | 795,807 | 392,897 |
| 1983 | 56,162 | 58,240 | 815,523 | 475,601 |
| 1984 | 55,250 | 56,533 | 748,390 | 420,357 |
| 1985 | 55,670 | 56,899 | 699,113 | 392,253 |
| 1986 | 59,734 | 61,876 | 887,446 | 467,164 |
| 1987 | 58,803 (5,550) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | 60,371 | 814,918 | 354,194 |
| $1988{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 53,498(4,350) | 53,450 | 644,056 | 264,316 |
| $1989{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 55,693 (3,570) | 55,709 | 749,033 | 322,359 |
| $1990^{\text {c }}$ | 55,009 (2,390) | 55,152 | 708,391 | 270,796 |
| $1991^{\text {c }}$ | 58,421 (2,130) | 59,038 | 855,279 | 406,854 |
| 1992 | 51,261 (1,395) | 51,274 | 714,550 | 292,535 |
| 1993 | 50,976 (995) | 51,340 | 682,498 | 326,446 |
| 1994 | 57,543 (955) | 53,226 | 816,185 | 332,803 |
| 1995 | 60,564 (665) | 55,454 | 884,328 | 498,854 |
| 1996 | 62,417 (545) | 56,956 | 836,793 | 376,248 |
| 1997 | 59,961 (480) | 54,715 | 881,030 | 401,236 |
| 1998 | 54,550 (450) | 50,288 | 795,561 | 471,072 |
| 1999 | 63,782 (350) | 58,003 | 1,472,301 | 783,195 |
| 2000 | 62,701 (330) | 56,954 | 1,115,076 | 708,092 |
| 2001 | 63,745 (300) | 59,029 | 1,337,297 | 695,790 |
| 2002 | 61,345 (1,520) | 53,428 | 1,054,047 | 504,616 |
| 2003 | 61,991 (260) | 57,985 | 1,251,974 | 650,906 |
| 2004 | 60,264 | 54,803 | 1,083,910 | 494,775 |
| 2005 | 55,734 | 48,772 | 868,299 | 526,221 |
| 2006 | 63,965 | 58,302 | 1,194,801 | 700,571 |
| 2007 | 66,765 | 57,454 | 1,150,304 | 678,623 |
| 2008 | 69,590 | 59,379 | 1,175,243 | 660,306 |
| 2009 | 68,549 | 59,987 | 1,222,980 | 613,335 |
| 2010 | 64,828 | 50,936 | 985,075 | 513,882 |
| 2011 | 66,581 | 52,660 | 1,147,037 | 577,654 |
| 2012 | 64,896 | 50,740 | 1,155,346 | 580,557 |
| 2013 | 66,394 | 49,170 | 1,052,728 | 605,720 |
| 2014 | 70,391 | 50,698 | 982,193 | 550,946 |
| 2015 | 58,247 | 40,104 | 795,289 | 488,321 |
| 2016 | 54,920 | 41,242 | 870,721 | 490,463 |
| 2017 | 52,069 | 37,215 | 732,166 | 421,384 |
| 2018 | 55,303 | 40,047 | 831,043 | 412,402 |

[^13]Table F-2. The percentage of regular season waterfowl hunters who hunted exclusively ducks, exclusively geese, or both ducks and geese in Illinois from 1981 through 2018 seasons.

| Season (Year) | Hunted Ducks Only | Hunted Geese Only | Hunted Both Ducks and Geese | Duck <br> Hunters | Goose <br> Hunters |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1981 | 63.0\% | 14.1\% | 22.9\% | 85.9\% | 37.0\% |
| 1982 | 59.1\% | 11.1\% | 29.8\% | 88.9\% | 40.9\% |
| 1983 | 55.0\% | 13.4\% | 31.6\% | 86.6\% | 45.0\% |
| 1984 | 60.3\% | 12.1\% | 27.6\% | 87.9\% | 39.7\% |
| 1985 | 61.1\% | 9.7\% | 29.2\% | 90.3\% | 38.9\% |
| 1986 | 51.0\% | 13.4\% | 35.6\% | 86.6\% | 49.0\% |
| 1987 | 46.6\% | 14.3\% | 39.1\% | 85.7\% | 53.4\% |
| 1988 | 35.5\% | 19.1\% | 45.4\% | 80.9\% | 64.5\% |
| 1989 | 29.2\% | 21.3\% | 49.5\% | 78.7\% | 70.8\% |
| 1990 | 26.7\% | 29.7\% | 43.6\% | 70.3\% | 73.4\% |
| 1991 | 26.0\% | 27.3\% | 46.7\% | 72.7\% | 74.0\% |
| 1992 | 31.3\% | 23.4\% | 45.3\% | 76.6\% | 68.7\% |
| 1993 | 30.9\% | 20.2\% | 48.9\% | 79.8\% | 69.1\% |
| 1994 | 30.3\% | 16.5\% | 53.2\% | 83.5\% | 69.7\% |
| 1995 | 33.2\% | 23.4\% | 43.4\% | 76.6\% | 66.8\% |
| 1996 | 35.8\% | 22.3\% | 41.9\% | 77.7\% | 64.2\% |
| 1997 | 38.8\% | 22.2\% | 39.0\% | 77.8\% | 61.2\% |
| 1998 | 47.6\% | 17.0\% | 35.4\% | 83.0\% | 52.4\% |
| 1999 | 27.2\% | 10.6\% | 62.2\% | 89.4\% | 72.8\% |
| 2000 | 34.0\% | 23.1\% | 42.9\% | 76.9\% | 66.0\% |
| 2001 | 33.0\% | 9.9\% | 57.1\% | 90.1\% | 67.0\% |
| 2002 | 33.8\% | 10.2\% | 56.0\% | 89.8\% | 66.2\% |
| 2003 | 32.3\% | 12.6\% | 55.1\% | 87.4\% | 67.7\% |
| 2004 | 32.1\% | 10.5\% | 57.4\% | 89.5\% | 67.9\% |
| 2005 | 37.2\% | 11.5\% | 51.3\% | 88.5\% | 62.8\% |
| 2006 | 28.8\% | 13.5\% | 57.7\% | 86.5\% | 71.2\% |
| 2007 | 27.7\% | 12.2\% | 60.1\% | 87.8\% | 72.3\% |
| 2008 | 25.9\% | 10.6\% | 63.5\% | $89.4 \%^{\text {a }}$ | 74.1\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 2009 | 27.5\% | 8.4\% | 64.1\% | 91.6\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 72.5\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 2010 | 25.0\% | 13.1\% | 61.9\% | $86.9 \%^{\text {a }}$ | 75.0\% ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| 2011 | 20.7\% | 18.3\% | 61.0\% | 81.7\% | 79.3\% |
| 2012 | 29.4\% | 9.8\% | 60.8\% | 90.2\% | 70.6\% |
| 2013 | 30.2\% | 9.8\% | 60.0\% | 90.2\% | 69.8\% |
| 2014 | 30.8\% | 10.9\% | 58.3\% | 89.1\% | 69.2\% |
| 2015 | 28.3\% | 8.6\% | 63.0\% | 91.3\% | 71.6\% |
| 2016 | 29.3\% | 8.2\% | 62.5\% | 91.8\% | 70.7\% |
| 2017 | 29.8\% | 12.3\% | 57.8\% | 85.9\% | 68.8\% |
| 2018 | 31.9\% | 9.2\% | 58.9\% | 90.8\% | 68.1\% |

${ }^{\text {a }} 2008$-2010 numbers changed to reflect responses in the sample.

Table F-3. Summary of Teal harvest and hunter activity during September Teal season (Illinois, 1981-2018).

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Estimated Hunters | Estimated Days Hunted | Estimated Teal Harvest |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1981 | 14,802 | 38,586 | 22,946 |
| 1982 | 14,863 | 41,856 | 28,785 |
| 1983 | 13,295 | 39,475 | 29,355 |
| 1984 | 14,158 | 39,481 | 32,730 |
| 1985 | 13,852 | 36,521 | 29,260 |
| 1986 | 15,449 | 40,241 | 30,375 |
| 1987 | 12,297 | 32,582 | 23,193 |
| $1988{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| $1989{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| $1990^{\text {a }}$ | ------ | ------ | ------ |
| $1991{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ------ | -- | ---- |
| 1992 | 7,696 | 18,265 | 12,069 |
| 1993 | 6,474 | 16,722 | 8,562 |
| 1994 | 8,062 | 20,341 | 12,436 |
| 1995 | 9,123 | 24,865 | 19,731 |
| 1996 | 8,964 | 22,825 | 11,565 |
| 1997 | 11,819 | 32,179 | 22,005 |
| 1998 | 10,307 | 33,049 | 21,270 |
| 1999 | 20,036 | 74,170 | 55,199 |
| 2000 | 14,733 | 52,229 | 38,597 |
| 2001 | 17,222 | 61,199 | 36,013 |
| 2002 | 10,171 | 29,381 | 12,542 |
| 2003 | 10,522 | 34,505 | 20,453 |
| 2004 | 8,097 | 23,928 | 8,463 |
| 2005 | 6,686 | 17,708 | 10,953 |
| 2006 | 12,378 | 43,223 | 28,016 |
| 2007 | 13,478 | 48,115 | 29,800 |
| 2008 | 14,652 | 52,365 | 19,981 |
| 2009 | 15,436 | 55,139 | $19,222 \pm 7,372$ |
| 2010 | 13,038 | 49,038 | $20,127 \pm 9,322$ |
| 2011 | 11,221 | 42,811 | $21,227 \pm 7,993$ |
| 2012 | 10,944 | 46,719 | $31,942 \pm 11,740$ |
| 2013 | 10,378 | 37,431 | $21,967 \pm 7,169$ |
| 2014 | 11,282 | 42,635 | $29,058 \pm 10,909$ |
| 2015 | 9,615 | 37,574 | $28,031 \pm 9.911$ |
| 2016 | 8,969 | 38,610 | 25,346 $\pm 9,296$ |
| 2017 | 7,526 | 28,306 | $15,062 \pm 5,480$ |
| 2018 | 9,263 | 35,334 | $23,326 \pm 8,817$ |

[^14]Table F-4. Rates of Teal harvest and hunter activity during September Teal season (Illinois, 1981-2018).

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Season Length/ Bag Limit | Days Hunted Per Hunter | Teal Harvest Per Hunter |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Per Day | Per Season |
| 1981 | 9/4 | 2.61 | 0.59 | 1.55 |
| 1982 | 9/4 | 2.82 | 0.69 | 1.94 |
| 1983 | 9/4 | 2.97 | 0.74 | 2.21 |
| 1984 | 9/4 | 2.79 | 0.83 | 2.31 |
| 1985 | 9/4 | 2.64 | 0.80 | 2.11 |
| 1986 | 9/4 | 2.60 | 0.75 | 1.97 |
| 1987 | 9/4 | 2.65 | 0.71 | 1.89 |
| $1988{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| $1989{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| $1990^{\text {a }}$ | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| $1991{ }^{\text {a }}$ | ---- | ---- | ---- | ---- |
| 1992 | 9/4 | 2.37 | 0.66 | 1.57 |
| 1993 | 9/4 | 2.58 | 0.51 | 1.32 |
| 1994 | 9/4 | 2.52 | 0.61 | 1.54 |
| 1995 | 9/4 | 2.73 | 0.79 | 2.16 |
| 1996 | 9/4 | 2.55 | 0.51 | 1.29 |
| 1997 | 9/4 | 2.72 | 0.68 | 1.86 |
| 1998 | 16/4 | 3.21 | 0.64 | 2.06 |
| 1999 | 16/4 | 3.70 | 0.74 | 2.75 |
| 2000 | 16/4 | 3.55 | 0.74 | 2.62 |
| 2001 | 16/4 | 3.55 | 0.59 | 2.09 |
| 2002 | 9/4 | 2.89 | 0.43 | 1.23 |
| 2003 | 16/4 | 3.28 | 0.59 | 1.94 |
| 2004 | 9/4 | 2.96 | 0.35 | 1.05 |
| 2005 | 9/4 | 2.65 | 0.62 | 1.64 |
| 2006 | 16/4 | 3.49 | 0.65 | 2.26 |
| 2007 | 16/4 | 3.60 | 0.62 | 2.21 |
| 2008 | 16/4 | 3.57 | 0.38 | 1.36 |
| 2009 | 16/4 | 3.57 | 0.35 | 1.25 |
| 2010 | 16/4 | 3.76 | 0.41 | 1.54 |
| 2011 | 16/4 | 3.82 | 0.50 | 1.90 |
| 2012 | 16/4 | 4.27 | 0.68 | 2.92 |
| 2013 | 16/6 | 3.61 | 0.59 | 2.12 |
| 2014 | 16/6 | 3.78 | 0.68 | 2.58 |
| 2015 | 16/6 | 3.91 | 0.75 | 2.92 |
| 2016 | 16/6 | 4.31 | 0.66 | 2.83 |
| 2017 | 16/6 | 3.76 | 0.53 | 2.00 |
| 2018 | 16/6 | 3.81 | 0.66 | 2.52 |

[^15]Table F-5. Waterfowl harvest and hunter activity during Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days, 1996-2018.

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Season }^{\mathrm{a}} \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Adult <br> Participation | Youth Participation | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { Hunting } \end{gathered}$ | Mean Youths/ Hunting Party | Total Ducks | Ducks/ Youth/Day | Total Coots | Coots/ Youth/ Day | Total Geese | Geese/ Youth/ Day |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1996 | 2,749 | 4,353 | 4,353 | 1.58 | 3,171 | 0.73 | 230 | 0.05 | ---- ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | --- |
| 1997 | 3,163 | 4,322 | 4,322 | 1.37 | 3,451 | 0.80 | 387 | 0.09 | ---- ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | --- |
| 1998 | 3,343 | 5,142 | 5,142 | 1.54 | 4,159 | 0.81 | 208 | 0.04 | 289 | 0.06 |
| 1999 | 5,505 | 8,113 | 8,113 | 1.47 | 5,835 | 0.72 | 629 | 0.08 | 571 | 0.07 |
| 2000 | 6,815 | 10,107 | 14,079 | 1.48 | 8,388 | 0.60 | 38 | $<0.01$ | 882 | 0.06 |
| 2001 | 9,140 | 15,148 | 22,525 | 1.67 | 11,727 | 0.52 | 480 | 0.02 | 971 | 0.04 |
| 2002 | 8,498 | 13,325 | 19,548 | 1.57 | 9,085 | 0.46 | 271 | 0.01 | 887 | 0.05 |
| 2003 | 7,415 | 11,419 | 17,985 | 1.54 | 9,184 | 0.51 | 178 | 0.01 | 1,116 | 0.06 |
| 2004 | 5,603 | 7,891 | 12,997 | 1.41 | 7,477 | 0.58 | 48 | <0.01 | 561 | 0.04 |
| 2005 | 4,540 | 6,489 | 10,268 | 1.58 | 5,644 | 0.55 | 583 | 0.06 | 965 | 0.09 |
| 2006 | 5,447 | 8,024 | 11,903 | 1.48 | 9,863 | 0.83 | 133 | 0.01 | 732 | 0.06 |
| 2007 | 6,259 | 8,981 | 14,356 | 1.60 | 9,141 | 0.64 | 850 | 0.06 | 1,701 | 0.12 |
| 2008 | 6,402 | 9,878 | 14,799 | 1.50 | 10,380 | 0.70 | 241 | 0.02 | 1,466 | 0.10 |
| 2009 | 7,073 | 9,772 | 15,922 | 1.63 | 11,229 | 0.71 | 599 | 0.04 | 2,396 | 0.15 |
| 2010 | 5,471 | 7,452 | 11,828 | 1.59 | 9,156 | 0.77 | 419 | 0.04 | 1,420 | 0.12 |
| 2011 | 6,325 | 8,642 | 14,059 | 1.63 | 9,569 | 0.68 | 1,333 | 0.09 | 1,318 | 0.09 |
| 2012 | 7,825 | 10,001 | $52,448{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 1.27 | 8,147 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.41 | $503{ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.03 | 1,064 ${ }^{\text {c }}$ | 0.05 |
| 2013 | 8,438 | 8,639 | 19,136 | 1.02 | 12,715 | 1.33 | 359 | 0.04 | 2,065 | 0.23 |
| 2014 | 6,405 | 8,572 | 13,798 | 1.33 | 9,004 | 1.30 | 192 | 0.03 | 929 | 0.14 |
| 2015 | 4,718 | 6,291 | 9,873 | 1.33 | 8,171 | 1.65 | 117 | 0.02 | 571 | 0.12 |
| 2016 | 4,398 | 5,921 | 8,553 | 1.34 | 6,731 | 1.57 | 139 | 0.03 | 927 | 0.23 |
| 2017 | 4,780 | 6,459 | 9,956 | 1.35 | 8,283 | 1.66 | 89 | 0.02 | 1,464 | 0.32 |
| 2018 | 4,822 | 5,775 | 8,663 | 1.20 | 7,452 | 1.72 | 205 | 0.05 | 729 | 0.18 |

1996 - 1999 were one day seasons and 2000 - present were 2-day seasons.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Could not hunt geese during the Youth Waterfowl Hunting Day in 1996 and 1997.
${ }^{\text {b }}$ Results include youth hunts during the regular season and the 2-day Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.
${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Results are a 2-day estimate based on the mean number harvested by youth from the entire season

Table F-6. Summary of duck and coot harvest and hunter activity during the regular duck season (Illinois 19812018).

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Hunters | Days Afield | Number of Ducks |  |  |  | Coots |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mallards | Wood Ducks | Other Ducks ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Total |  |
| 1981 | 54,744 | 703,534 | 170,972 | 72,065 | 94,947 | 337,984 | 4,950 |
| 1982 | 52,220 | 646,394 | 163,439 | 61,706 | 101,989 | 327,134 | 5,905 |
| 1983 | 50,440 | 651,409 | 220,317 | 72,237 | 110,862 | 403,416 | 10,472 |
| 1984 | 49,715 | 606,325 | 182,132 | 52,955 | 120,016 | 355,103 | 7,702 |
| 1985 | 51,362 | 556,800 | 168,549 | 51,216 | 97,155 | 316,920 | 5,773 |
| 1986 | 53,588 | 638,090 | 201,676 | 65,414 | 112,490 | 379,580 | 7,372 |
| 1987 | 51,704 | 558,172 | 155,783 | 58,488 | 74,748 | 289,019 | 2,694 |
| $1988{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 43,233 | 381,985 | 119,149 | 23,743 | 42,836 | 185,728 | 1,936 |
| $1989^{\text {a }}$ | 43,841 | 407,478 | 133,128 | 28,065 | 63,073 | 224,266 | 2,049 |
| $1990^{\text {a }}$ | 38,759 | 350,119 | 112,370 | 33,253 | 51,562 | 197,185 | 2,287 |
| $1991{ }^{\text {a }}$ | 42,911 | 393,247 | 177,221 | 49,556 | 80,793 | 307,570 | 1,101 |
| 1992 | 39,272 | 362,275 | 124,112 | 34,280 | 58,035 | 216,427 | 3,275 |
| 1993 | 40,941 | 366,656 | 134,334 | 39,906 | 43,360 | 217,600 | 1,445 |
| 1994 | 44,447 | 475,264 | 137,263 | 44,683 | 64,998 (3,760) | 246,944 | 3,880 |
| 1995 | 42,499 | 482,620 | 230,505 | 47,155 | 99,632 (5,393) | 377,292 | 3,386 |
| 1996 | 44,219 | 460,517 | 163,311 | 38,783 | 82,431 (4,348) | 284,525 | 3,286 |
| 1997 | 42,587 | 514,934 | 145,533 | 44,678 | 100,950 (5,800) | 291,161 | 3,935 |
| 1998 | 41,755 | 517,372 | 200,030 | 57,393 | 129,439 (3,948) | 386,862 | 2,920 |
| 1999 | 51,850 | 860,368 | 311,325 | 69,930 | 181,650 (4,977) | 562,905 | 3,654 |
| 2000 | 43,810 | 621,542 | 271,903 | 58,604 | 166,834 (4,231) | 497,341 | 2,206 |
| 2001 | 53,194 | 797,884 | 305,180 | 61,515 | 167,883 (1,968) | 534,578 | 2,904 |
| 2002 | 47,964 | 642,542 | 197,392 | 46,238 | 106,213 (851) | 349,843 | 1,743 |
| 2003 | 50,658 | 738,914 | 285,011 | 48,023 | 153,165 (1,789) | 486,199 | 1,693 |
| 2004 | 49,046 | 652,960 | 207,982 | 44,725 | 116,951 (2,100) | 369,658 | 1,607 |
| 2005 | 43,185 | 539,672 | 240,897 | 37,942 | 133,509 (3,918) | 412,348 | 2,186 |
| 2006 | 50,437 | 658,881 | 308,000 | 38,366 | 161,098 (5,927) | 507,464 | 3,065 |
| 2007 | 49,114 | 600,614 | 265,369 | 34,628 | 164,369 (5,925) | 464,366 | 3,771 |
| 2008 | 50,683 | 600,574 | 247,895 | 43,051 | 156,849 | 447,795 | 2,266 |
| 2009 | 49,648 | 626,832 | 228,211 | 41,549 | 129,795 | $399,555 \pm 69,698$ | $3,904 \pm 3,342$ |
| 2010 | 43,450 | 499,758 | 193,758 | 39,611 | 121,375 | $354,859 \pm 60,571$ | $1,770 \pm 2,435$ |
| 2011 | 46,619 | 632,712 | 222,405 | 54,294 | 150,786 | $427,484 \pm 66,551$ | $4,327 \pm 2,663$ |
| 2012 | 43,444 | 630,233 | 244,988 | 47,623 | 185,776 | $478,387 \pm 50,294$ | $4,133 \pm 3,536$ |
| 2013 | 43,653 | 563,961 | 225,873 | 49,001 | 155,306 | $430,179 \pm 29,431$ | $2,143 \pm 4,031$ |
| 2014 | 44,019 | 525,114 | 197,997 | 48,216 | 138,615 (4,820) | $384,828 \pm 39,741$ | $4,681 \pm 3,311$ |
| 2015 | 36,499 | 496,656 | 166,506 | 43,655 | 119,619 (4,437) | $329,780 \pm 34,835$ | $3,185 \pm 1,960$ |
| 2016 | 34,386 | 459,029 | 154,698 | 47,986 | 130,722 (6,794) | $333,406 \pm 37,408$ | $4,424 \pm 1,338$ |
| 2017 | 30,025 | 394,034 | 136,381 | 29,372 | 111,937 ( 3,624 ) | $277,689 \pm 24,826$ | $1,544 \pm 921$ |
| 2018 | 33,836 | 464,327 | 147,733 | 29,003 | 96,087 $(5,200)$ | $272,823 \pm 28,512$ | $2,088 \pm 1,764$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Estimates of duck hunters, days afield, ducks and coots harvested for these years have been reduced to $92.48 \%-96.48 \%$ of the original estimates. See Anderson and Williamson (1994) for explanation.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Numbers in parentheses represent harvest of Canvasback.

Table F-7. Rates of duck harvest and hunter activity during the regular duck season (Illinois 1981-2018).

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Season Length/ Bag Limit ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Days Afield Per Hunter | Duck Harvest Per Hunter ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Per Day | Per Season |
| 1981 | 50/10(4,2) | 12.85 | 0.48 | 6.17 |
| 1982 | 50/10(4,2) | 12.38 | 0.51 | 6.26 |
| 1983 | 50/10(4,2) | 12.91 | 0.62 | 8.00 |
| 1984 | 50/10(4,2) | 12.20 | 0.59 | 7.14 |
| 1985 | 40/5(3,1) | 10.84 | 0.57 | 6.17 |
| 1986 | 40/5 $(3,1)$ | 11.91 | 0.59 | 7.08 |
| 1987 | 40/5 $(3,1)$ | 10.80 | 0.52 | 5.59 |
| 1988 | 30/3(2,1) | 8.84 | 0.49 | 4.30 |
| 1989 | 30/3(2,1) | 9.29 | 0.55 | 5.12 |
| 1990 | 30/3(2,1) | 9.03 | 0.54 | 4.90 |
| 1991 | 30/3(2,1) | 9.16 | 0.72 | 6.57 |
| 1992 | 30/3(2,1) | 9.22 | 0.57 | 5.22 |
| 1993 | 30/3(2,1) | 8.96 | 0.58 | 5.21 |
| 1994 | 40/3(2,1) | 10.96 | 0.51 | 5.47 |
| 1995 | 50/5(4,1) | 11.36 | 0.74 | 8.40 |
| 1996 | 50/5(4,1) | 10.41 | 0.58 | 6.03 |
| 1997 | 60/6(4,2) | 12.09 | 0.57 | 6.84 |
| 1998 | 60/6(4,2) | 12.39 | 0.75 | 9.27 |
| 1999 | 60/6(4,2) | 16.59 | 0.65 | 10.86 |
| 2000 | 60/6(4,2) | 14.19 | 0.80 | 11.36 |
| 2001 | 60/6(4,2) | 15.00 | 0.67 | 10.05 |
| 2002 | 60/6(4,1) | 13.40 | 0.54 | 7.29 |
| 2003 | 60/6(4,1) | 14.59 | 0.66 | 9.60 |
| 2004 | 60/6(4,2) | 13.31 | 0.57 | 7.54 |
| 2005 | 60/6(4,2) | 12.50 | 0.76 | 9.55 |
| 2006 | 60/6(4,2) | 13.06 | 0.77 | 10.06 |
| 2007 | 60/6(4,2) | 12.23 | 0.77 | 9.45 |
| 2008 | 60/6(4,2) | 11.85 | 0.75 | 8.84 |
| 2009 | 60/6(4,2) | 12.63 | 0.64 | 8.05 |
| 2010 | 60/6(4,2) | 11.50 | 0.71 | 8.17 |
| 2011 | 60/6(4,2) | 13.57 | 0.68 | 9.17 |
| 2012 | 60/6(4,2) | 14.51 | 0.76 | 11.01 |
| 2013 | 60/6(4,2) | 12.92 | 0.76 | 9.85 |
| 2014 | 60/6(4,2) | 11.93 | 0.73 | 8.74 |
| 2015 | 60/6(4,2) | 13.61 | 0.66 | 9.01 |
| 2016 | 60/6(4,2) | 13.35 | 0.73 | 9.70 |
| 2017 | 60/6(4,2) | 13.12 | 0.70 | 9.25 |
| 2018 | 60/6(4,2) | 13.72 | 0.59 | 8.06 |

[^16]Table F-8. Number of hunters who participated in the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 1997-2018).

|  |  |  | Waterfowl Zone |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Statewide | North | Central | South <br> Central | South | Unknown |
| Hunters $^{\text {b }}$ | 1997 | 11,765 | 5,577 | 5,768 | ----- | ----- | 420 |
|  | 1998 | 11,981 | 4,837 | 5,915 | ---- | 677 | 552 |
|  | 1999 | 16,945 | 6,005 | 9,869 | ---- | 693 | 378 |
|  | 2000 | 13,289 | 5,410 | 6,908 | ---- | 971 | 0 |
|  | 2001 | 20,359 | 7,318 | 10,807 | ---- | 2,085 | 149 |
|  | 2002 | 12,459 | 4,517 | 6,665 | ---- | 1,135 | 142 |
|  | 2003 | 14,973 | 5,532 | 7,761 | ---- | 1,348 | 332 |
|  | 2004 | 11,170 | 4,250 | 6,220 | ---- | 984 | 0 |
|  | 2005 | 9,448 | 3,949 | 5,034 | ---- | 1,085 | 0 |
|  | 2006 | 12,609 | 4,848 | 6,607 | ---- | 1,154 | 0 |
|  | 2007 | 12,788 | 4,723 | 6,413 | ---- | 1,652 | 0 |
| 2008 | 13,157 | 4,934 | 6,690 | ---- | 1,533 | 0 |  |
|  | 2009 | 15,102 | 5,232 | 8,089 | ---- | 1,781 | 0 |
| 2010 | 11,015 | 3,918 | 5,813 | ---- | 1,285 | 0 |  |
|  | 2011 | 14,214 | 4,625 | 7,889 | ---- | 1,700 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | $11,192^{\text {a }}$ | 4,601 | 5,928 | 1,161 | 249 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | $10,865^{\text {a }}$ | 3,646 | 6,076 | 681 | 462 | 0 |
| 2014 | $12,147^{\text {a }}$ | 4,153 | 6,679 | 934 | 554 | 0 |  |
| 2015 | $10,659^{\text {a }}$ | 3,226 | 6,104 | 1,075 | 443 | 0 |  |
| 2016 | $9,973^{\text {a }}$ | 3,324 | 5,125 | 1,316 | 381 | 0 |  |
| 2017 | 9,225 | 2,746 | 5,472 | 849 | 296 | 0 |  |
| 2018 | 9,916 | 3,187 | 5,503 | 899 | 599 | 0 |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ Less than the sum of hunters in individual zones because some hunters hunted more than 1 zone.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Less than the sum of hunters in individual zones because some hunters hunted more than 1 zone.

Table F-9. Number of Canada geese harvested during the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 1997-2018).

|  | Year | Statewide | North | Central | South <br> Central | South | Unknown |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Canada Geese | 1997 | 11,443 | 7,621 | 3,774 | ---- | ----- | 48 |
|  | 1998 | 7,852 | 4,184 | 3,046 | ---- | 384 | 238 |
|  | 1999 | 20,223 | 9,124 | 10,491 | ---- | 491 | 117 |
|  | 2000 | 15,897 | 6,191 | 8,774 | ---- | 932 | 0 |
|  | 2001 | 26,021 | 10,979 | 13,170 | ---- | 1,580 | 290 |
|  | 2002 | 21,534 | 8,971 | 11,130 | ---- | 1,433 | 0 |
|  | 2003 | 15,267 | 5,907 | 7,103 | ---- | 2,221 | 36 |
|  | 2004 | 13,587 | 6,319 | 5,915 | ---- | 767 | 0 |
|  | 2005 | 9,896 | 4,862 | 4,047 | ---- | 987 | 0 |
|  | 2006 | 14,578 | 6,771 | 6,717 | ---- | 1,090 | 0 |
|  | 2007 | 16,207 | 6,057 | 8,645 | ---- | 1,505 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 17,419 | 7,343 | 8,951 | ---- | 1,125 | 0 |
|  | 2009 | 16,212 | 6,101 | 8,336 | ---- | 1,774 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 17,115 | 7,967 | 7,859 | ---- | 1,289 | 0 |
|  | 2011 | 18,790 | 6,339 | 10,874 | ---- | 1,577 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 18,028 | 8,557 | 7,664 | 1,599 | 228 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 15,644 | 5,165 | 9,271 | 523 | 685 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 19,089 | 7,527 | 9,015 | 1,770 | 777 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 15,693 | 4,233 | 8,587 | 2,147 | 726 | 0 |
| 2016 | 17,711 | 7,895 | 7,780 | 1,539 | 497 | 0 |  |
|  | 2017 | 16,155 | 4,154 | 10,282 | 1,199 | 510 | 20 |
| 2018 | 35,361 | 12,777 | 18,035 | 2,779 | 1,771 | 0 |  |

Table F-10. Number of Days Afield during the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 1997-2018).

|  | Year | Statewide | North | Central | South <br> Central | South | Unknown |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Days Afield | 1997 | 34,988 | 17,991 | 15,890 | ----- | ----- | 1,107 |
|  | 1998 | 37,322 | 15,891 | 18,247 | ---- | 1,880 | 1,304 |
|  | 1999 | 64,881 | 21,795 | 39,768 | ---- | 2,625 | 693 |
|  | 2000 | 47,831 | 17,396 | 27,078 | ---- | 3,357 | 0 |
|  | 2001 | 73,587 | 26,359 | 40,208 | ---- | 6,318 | 702 |
|  | 2002 | 39,485 | 14,303 | 21,049 | ----- | 4,092 | 41 |
|  | 2003 | 51,083 | 18,799 | 26,532 | ---- | 5,422 | 330 |
|  | 2004 | 37,941 | 14,279 | 19,670 | ---- | 2,592 | 0 |
|  | 2005 | 29,143 | 12,184 | 14,352 | ---- | 2,607 | 0 |
|  | 2006 | 42,444 | 16,735 | 22,621 | ---- | 3,088 | 0 |
|  | 2007 | 41,549 | 14,169 | 22,080 | ----- | 5,300 | 0 |
|  | 2008 | 45,637 | 17,305 | 23,174 | ---- | 5,158 | 0 |
|  | 2009 | 51,318 | 19,591 | 26,048 | ----- | 5,678 | 0 |
|  | 2010 | 39,019 | 15,929 | 19,236 | ---- | 3,854 | 0 |
|  | 2011 | 49,306 | 16,832 | 27,441 | ---- | 5,033 | 0 |
|  | 2012 | 39,589 | 17,079 | 18,613 | 3,524 | 373 | 0 |
|  | 2013 | 40,955 | 12,323 | 24,816 | 2,042 | 1,774 | 0 |
|  | 2014 | 44,919 | 16,300 | 23,844 | 3,288 | 1,488 | 0 |
|  | 2015 | 38,744 | 13,505 | 21,191 | 2,404 | 1,645 | 0 |
| 2016 | 41,935 | 14,925 | 20,950 | 4,883 | 1,177 | 0 |  |
| 2017 | 33,817 | 9,442 | 19,714 | 3,595 | 1,067 | 0 |  |
| 2018 | 13,165 | 4,909 | 6,928 | 925 | 404 | 0 |  |

Table F-11. Summary of goose harvest and hunter activity during the regular goose season (Illinois 1981-2018).

| Season (Year) | Hunters | Days Afield | Number of Geese |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Canada Geese | Other Geese | Total |
| 1981 | 23,610 | 132,610 | 44,302 (6,312 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 3,082 (1,719 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) | 47,384 (8,031 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ ) |
| 1982 | 24,058 | 107,557 | 29,574 (4,968) | 1,499 (710) | $31,073(5,678)$ |
| 1983 | 26,199 | 124,639 | 31,395 (4,325) | 962 (577) | 32,357 (4,902) |
| 1984 | 22,426 | 102,583 | 23,147 (2,859) | 1,675 (593) | 24,822 ( 3,452 ) |
| 1985 | 22,160 | 105,792 | 37,976 (5,248) | 2,324 (753) | 40,300 (6,001) |
| 1986 | 30,327 | 200,291 | 45,535 (11,348) | 2,625 (832) | 48,160 (12,180) |
| 1987 | 32,246 | 224,164 | 36,103 (3,563) | 1,525 (499) | 37,628 (4,062) |
| $1988{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 34,456 | 251,176 | $72,550(3,871)$ | 1,832 (350) | 74,382 (4,221) |
| $1989{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 39,459 | 329,369 | 91,379 (2,988) | 1,715 (182) | 93,094 (3,170) |
| $1990^{\text {b }}$ | 40,459 | 346,036 | 67,127 (1,515) | 1,319 (97) | 68,446 (1,612) |
| $1991{ }^{\text {b }}$ | 43,692 | 450,807 | 92,239 (1,245) | 2,434 (70) | 94,673 (1,315) |
| 1992 | 35,253 | 334,010 | 59,352 (2,679) | 1,412 (170) | 60,764 ( 2,849 ) |
| 1993 | 35,489 | 299,120 | 93,361 (1,260) | 1,314 (82) | 94,675 (1,342) |
| 1994 | 37,090 | 320,580 | 67,790 (1,895) | 1,753 (77) | 69,543 (1,972) |
| 1995 | 37,060 | 367,341 | 92,478 (4,034) | 3,183 (245) | 95,661 (4,279) |
| 1996 | 36,582 | 339,253 | 65,864 (2,527) | 4,939 (114) | 70,803 (2,641) |
| 1997 | 33,498 | 295,107 | 61,282 (4,772) | 7,572 (438) | 68,854 (5,210) |
| 1998 | 26,343 | 202,676 | 43,222 (2,463) | 4,290 (305) | 47,512 (2,968) |
| 1999 | 42,246 | 464,769 | 119,611 (1,846) | 14,568 (152) | 134,179 (1,998) |
| 2000 | 37,593 | 383,367 | 128,387 (1,406) | 16,356 (0) | 144,743 (1,406) |
| 2001 | 39,570 | 382,102 | 64,907 (1,761) | 18,189 (263) | 83,096 (2,024) |
| 2002 | 35,352 | 323,091 | 89,297 (3,259) | 19,414 (1,433) | 108,711 (4,692) |
| 2003 | 39,275 | 409,487 | 83,207 (1,526) | $10,458^{\text {c }}$ (342) | 93,665 ${ }^{\text {c }}(1,868)$ |
| 2004 | 37,189 | 345,279 | 81,859 ( 3,418 ) | 8,231 (349) | 90,090 (3,767) |
| 2005 | 30,614 | 271,708 | 74,293 (1,653) | 9,353 (62) | 83,646 (1,715) |
| 2006 | 41,521 | 438,350 | 122,294 (1,338) | 14,426 (869) | 136,720 (2,207) |
| 2007 | 43,046 | 445,670 | 141,205 (404) | 11,582 (55) | 152,787 (459) |
| 2008 | 44,404 | 461,868 | 142,806 (590) | 17,956 (0) | 160,762 (590) |
| 2009 | 44,601 | 473,769 | 142,836 (585) | 17,382 (355) | 160,218 $\pm 36,569$ (940) |
| 2010 | 36,803 | 385,432 | 99,422 (534) | 9,594 (46) | $109,016 \pm 22,523$ (580) |
| 2011 | 36,996 | 411,380 | 75,061(618) | 19,862 (33) | 94,923 $\pm 22,387$ (651) |
| 2012 | 34,034 | 386,356 | 72,682 (0) | 19,597 (0) | $92,280 \pm 19,570$ (0) |
| 2013 | 33,809 | 391,246 | 104,887 (0) | 15,859 (0) | $120,746 \pm 12,775$ (0) |
| 2014 | 34,226 | 369,179 | 87,672 (50) | 20,313 (0) | 107,985 $\pm 15,517(50)$ |
| 2015 | 31,280 | 330,482 | 75,198 | 27,576 | $102,774 \pm 17,608(0)$ |
| 2016 | 26,490 | 312,725 | 77,216 (0) | 24,563 (0) | $101,779(0) \pm 18,215$ |
| 2017 | 24,039 | 276,009 | 78,850 (0) | 27,637 (0) | 106,486 (0) $\pm 14,607$ |
| 2018 | 25,363 | 296,021 | 71,035 (0) | 21,578 (0) | 92,613 (0) $\pm 16,720$ |

[^17]Table F-12. Summary of the number of ducks and geese crippled (Illinois 1981-2018 seasons).

| Season (Year) | Estimated Ducks |  | Estimated Geese |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Total | Per 100 Bagged | Total | Per 100 Bagged |
| 1981 | 104,216 | 30.8 | 12,573 | 26.5 |
| 1982 | 82,287 | 25.2 | 5,868 | 18.9 |
| 1983 | 96,907 | 24.0 | 7,627 | 23.6 |
| 1984 | 84,665 | 23.8 | 5,711 | 23.0 |
| 1985 | 100,191 | 31.6 | 15,918 | 39.5 |
| 1986 | 145,283 | 38.3 | 20,699 | 41.5 |
| 1987 | 98,155 | 34.0 | 18,375 | 48.8 |
| 1988 | 65,856 | 35.5 | 22,730 | 30.6 |
| 1989 | 66,150 | 29.5 | 21,696 | 23.3 |
| $1990^{\text {a }}$ | 59,007 | 29.9 | 23,895 | 34.9 |
| 1991 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | 74,932 | 24.4 | 27,164 | 28.7 |
| 1992 | 68,027 | 31.4 | 18,631 | 32.1 |
| 1993 | 62,250 | 28.6 | 21,067 | 22.3 |
| 1994 | 65,266 | 26.4 | 16,234 | 23.3 |
| 1995 | 86,834 | 23.0 | 18,391 | 19.2 |
| 1996 | 64,324 | 22.6 | 16,641 | 23.5 |
| 1997 | 67,979 | 23.3 | 12,490 | 18.1 |
| 1998 | 74,679 | 19.3 | 5,514 | 11.6 |
| 1999 | 95,961 | 17.0 | 12,934 | 9.6 |
| 2000 | 70,423 | 14.2 | 10,071 | 7.0 |
| 2001 | 88,019 | 16.5 | 7,148 | 8.6 |
| 2002 | 59,005 | 16.9 | 6,382 | 5.9 |
| 2003 | 77,361 | 15.9 | 12,661 | 10.8 |
| 2004 | 63,765 | 17.2 | 9,433 | 10.5 |
| 2005 | 68,121 | 16.5 | 7,666 | 9.2 |
| 2006 | 83,648 | 16.5 | 14,110 | 10.3 |
| 2007 | 77,914 | 16.8 | 16,627 | 10.9 |
| 2008 | 74,044 | 16.5 | 14,166 | 8.8 |
| 2009 | 67,718 | 16.9 | 12,245 | 7.6 |
| 2010 | 57,388 | 16.2 | 9,217 | 8.5 |
| 2011 | 64,268 | 15.0 | 6,937 | 7.3 |
| 2012 | 71,054* | 14.9* | 10,452* | 11.3* |
| 2013 | 59,064 | 13.7 | 8,847 | 7.3 |
| 2014 | 51,909 | 13.5 | 7,856 | 7.3 |
| 2015 | 47,442 | 14.4 | 7,622 | 7.4 |
| 2016 | 43,666 | 13.1 | 6,149 | 5.6 |
| 2017 | 37,491 | 13.5 | 6,657 | 6.3 |
| 2018 | 36,996 | 13.6 | 5,558 | 6.0 |

${ }^{\text {a The estimates of ducks and geese crippled for these years have been reduced to } 92.48 \%-96.48 \%}$ of the original estimates. The estimates for the number of geese crippled per 100 bagged have been similarly reduced. See Anderson and Williamson (1994) for explanation.
*Amended from 2012-13 report.

Appendix G



| WATERFOWL SEASON DATES AND LIMITS |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPECIES | Zone | DATES <br> (inclusive) | HOURS | DAILY LIMIT | POSSESSION LIMIT | ADDITIONAL REGULATIONS |
| Light Geese (Snow/Blue/Ross' Geese) | North | 20 Oct 2018- <br> 17 Jan 2019 | 1/2 hour before sunrise to sunset | 20 | Unlimited | Daily bag limit is for both species combined (in the aggregate). |
|  | Central | 27 Oct 201831 Jan 2019 |  |  |  |  |
|  | South-central | 10 Nov 2018- <br> 31 Jan 2019 |  |  |  |  |
|  | South | 22 Nov 201831 Jan 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Brant | Same as light geese | Same as light geese |  | 1 | 3 |  |
| White-fronted Geese <br> (Specklebellies) | North | $\begin{aligned} & 22 \text { Oct } 2018- \\ & 17 \text { Jan } 2019 \end{aligned}$ |  | 2 | 6 |  |
|  | Central | 5 Nov 2018- <br> 31 Jan 2019 |  |  |  |  |
|  | South-central | 10 Nov 201831 Jan 2019 |  |  |  |  |
|  | South | 22 Nov 201831 Jan 2019 |  |  |  |  |
| Conservation Order Light Geese <br> (Snow/Blue/Ross' Geese) | North <br> Central, South-central, South | 18 Jan31 Mar 2019 <br> 1 Feb31 Mar 2019 | 1/2 hour before sunrise to $1 / 2$ hour after sunset | Unlimited | Unlimited | The following apply to the Conservation Order only: 1) unplugged shotguns may be used and there is no limit to the number of shells that may be placed in a shotgun, 2) electronic calling devices may be used, 3) federal duck stamp not required, 4) Illinois duck stamp and hunting license is required. |
| Youth waterfowl | North <br> Central <br> South-central <br> South | 13-14 Oct 2018 20-21 Oct 2018 3-4 Nov 2018 10-11 Nov 2018 | 1/2 hour before sunrise to sunset | Same as during regular duck, goose, and coot seasons | Same as during regular duck, goose, and coot seasons | The following apply to the Youth season only: 1) youth hunters must be 17 years of age or younger and must have a hunting license and HIP registration/ certification unless hunting on property where they reside, 2) no stamps are required for youths under 16,3 ) state and federal waterfowl stamps are required for all hunters age 16 and older, even those hunting with a Youth License, unless exempt, 4) hunters aged 18 years and older may not hunt waterfowl and coots during the Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days, even if hunting with a Youth License. |


[^0]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2018 information can be located in Appendix F.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 2008-2010 numbers changed to reflect responses in the sample.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The number of individual teal hunters in the state is less than the sum of duck hunters from the categories above because some hunted in more than one zone.

[^2]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1996$ - 2017 information can be located in Appendix F.
    ${ }^{\text {b }}$ Results include youth hunts during the regular season and the 2-day Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Results are a 2-day estimate based on the mean number harvested by youth from the entire season

[^3]:    *Number of ducks harvested was calculated by taking responses and applying the correction factor (Anderson 1985).

[^4]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1981-2018$ information can be located in Appendix F.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Less than the sum of hunters in individual zones because some hunters hunted more than 1 zone.

[^5]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Total is less than 100 due to rounding.

[^6]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{a}} 1=$ Very Dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied
    *Cases selected for those who hunted $\geq 1$ day for ducks during the 2018-19 regular duck season.

[^7]:    ${ }^{a} 1=$ Very Dissatisfied, 5= Very Satisfied
    *Cases selected for those who hunted $\geq 1$ day for geese during the 2018-19 regular goose season.

[^8]:    1= Very Dissatisfied to 5= Very Satisfied,
    *Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for Waterfowl.

[^9]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Those who indicated this county is where they hunt waterfowl most often

[^10]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Those who indicated this county is where they hunt waterfowl most often

[^11]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Those who indicated this county is where they hunt waterfowl most often

[^12]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Those who indicated this county is where they hunt waterfowl most often

[^13]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Teal, ducks, coots, and geese combined, and including September Teal and Canada goose seasons and youth hunt. The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service suspended the September Teal season in 1988 through 1991.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Stamps purchased for commercial art purposes. These stamps were not included in the numbers to the left.
    ${ }^{\text {}}$ Estimates of waterfowl hunters and days afield for these years reduced to $92.48 \%-96.48 \%$ of the original estimates. Estimates of waterfowl (Teal, ducks, Coots, and geese combined) harvested reduced to $94.54 \%$ - 97.74 of original estimates. See Anderson and Williamson (1994) for explanation.

[^14]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The September Teal season was suspended by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service during these years

[^15]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ September Teal season was suspended by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service during these years.

[^16]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Excludes ducks harvested coincidentally while goose hunting.
    ${ }^{\text {b }}$ The Point System was used in 1981-1987 (Havera 1999: 17-18). A maximum of 10 ducks ( 4 mallards, 2 hens) was allowed in 1981-1984, and a maximum of 5 ducks (3 Mallards, 1 hen) was allowed in 1985-1987.

[^17]:    ${ }^{a}$ Number of geese harvested while duck hunting.
    ${ }^{b}$ The estimates of goose hunters and days hunted for these years have been reduced to $92.48 \%-96.48 \%$ of the original estimates. The estimates for geese harvested have not been reduced (Anderson and Williamson 1994).
    ${ }^{\mathrm{c}}$ Reduced by 23,151 from estimate given in 2002 report to exclude Conservation Order snow goose harvest.

