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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 3,190 (44\% response rate) Illinois waterfowl hunters returned usable questionnaires to the 2017-18 Illinois Waterfowl Hunter Survey. An estimated 37,215 adult waterfowl hunters spent 1 day or more afield during 2017-18, a decrease of $9.7 \%$ from the 41,242 hunters in 2016-17. Waterfowl hunters spent 732,166 days afield, a decrease of $15.9 \%$ from the 870,721 days devoted during the 2016-17 license year. Total waterfowl harvest decreased $0.4 \%$, from 490,463 during 2016-17 to 421,384 during 2017-18. Duck harvest estimates for the regular duck season were as follows: 136,381 mallards (Anas platyrhynchos), 29,372 wood ducks (Aix sponsa), and 111,937 other ducks. A total of 15,062 teal (Anas spp.) were harvested during the September teal season. Goose hunters harvested 78,850 Canada geese (Branta canadensis) during the regular Canada goose season, a $2.1 \%$ increase from the 77,216 Canada geese harvested during the 2016-17 regular goose season. Hunters harvested 16,155 Canada geese during the September Canada goose season, an $8.8 \%$ decrease from the previous year. During the Youth Waterfowl Hunting Season, 4,780 adults took 6,459 youths waterfowl hunting, an $8.7 \%$ increase in adult participation and a $9.1 \%$ increase in youth participation from the 2016-17 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 2017-18 license year. An additional 2,000 hunters were selected from areas of concern in the central and south zones. No pre-season diary for recording hunting activity and waterfowl harvest was sent during the fall of 2017. On 20 March 2018, hunters were mailed an 8-page questionnaire
(Appendix A), cover letter (Appendix B), and a postage-paid return envelope. The effective sample was reduced to 7,696 questionnaires due to 304 being returned as undeliverable. A thank you/reminder postcard (Appendix C) was sent to hunters on 11 April 2018. Non-respondents were mailed a second questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix D) on 24 April 2018, followed by a second postcard mailing on 14 May 2018. A third and final questionnaire and cover letter (Appendix E) were mailed to non-respondents on 29 May 2018. Coded data were entered and analyzed using SPSS 25.0 (SPSS Inc. 2017). Confidence intervals are presented where appropriate.

## Statewide Estimates

Estimates of number of hunters, days afield, and waterfowl harvested were based on confirmed sales of 52,069 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 and stamp exempt hunters were removed beginning with the estimates of 2016-17. The original formulas are presented for understanding how previous years 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 (Hunt $t_{s p}$ ), days afield (Days spp ), birds crippled but not retrieved (Crip ${ }_{s p}$ ) and harvest ( $\operatorname{Harv}_{s p}$ ) were calculated as follows:

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

Where:
Hunt $t_{r}=$ number of respondents to the 2017-18 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 2017-18,
$A_{1}=$ 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 2017-18 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,
$H a r v_{r}=$ 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:

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

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 2017-18. 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). All species had a possession limit of 3 times the daily bag.

## RESULTS

## Waterfowl Harvest and Days Afield

We received 3,975 questionnaires from waterfowl hunters, of which $3,190(80.3 \%)$ were considered usable, for an overall response rate of $44 \%$. Of the 3,190 usable questionnaires, 2,636 (82.6\%) respondents indicated they purchased an Illinois State Waterfowl Stamp for the 2017-18 season (Figure 1) and 1,884 (66.3\%) of license purchasers reported hunting 1 day or more for waterfowl (Figure 2). The number of waterfowl hunters decreased from 41,242 during the 2016-17 season to 37,215 during the 2017-18 season, a $9.8 \%$ decrease in the number of hunters (Figure 3 and Table 1). Hunters reported spending 732,166 days afield, a decrease of $16.1 \%$ from the 870,721 days devoted during the 2016-17 license year. Total waterfowl harvest decreased $14.1 \%$, from 490,463 during 2016-17 to 421,384 during the 2017-18 season (Table 1). Twenty-nine percent of hunters hunted ducks only, $12.3 \%$ hunted geese only, and $57.8 \%$ hunted both ducks and geese (Figure 4 and Table 2).


Figure 1. Percentage of hunters who purchased an Illinois State Waterfowl Stamp for the 2017-18 seasons ( $n=3,190$ ).


Figure 2. Percentage of license purchasers who hunted waterfowl (ducks, geese, or coots) in Illinois during the 2017-18 waterfowl hunting season ( $n=2,842$ ).


Figure 3. Number of stamps sold, waterfowl hunters, and waterfowl harvested in Illinois, 2000-2017.


Figure 4. Percentage of hunters who hunted ducks, geese, or both during the 2017-18 Illinois waterfowl season.

## September Teal Season

The number of early (September) teal season hunters decreased $16.1 \%$ from 8,969 during 2016 to 7,526 during 2017 (Figure 5 and Table 3). Days afield decreased 26.7\% from 38,610 during 2016 to 28,306 during 017. Fewer numbers of teal hunters and decreased days afield coincided with a decreased teal harvest of 15,062 $\pm 5,480$ during the 2017 September teal season, a $40.6 \%$ decrease from the 2016 harvest $(25,346)$. The Central zone accounted for over one-half of teal hunters (53.6\%), most of the teal harvested (50.2\%), and half of teal
hunter days afield (54.3\%). The North Zone recorded the second-most days afield and hunters, but the secondmost total teal were harvested in the South Central Zone (Table 4). Statewide, September season teal hunters averaged 3.76 days afield, and harvested an average of 0.53 teal per hunter per day and 2.00 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 2000-17.


Figure 6. Rates of teal harvest and hunter activity during the Illinois September teal season from 2000-2017.

## Youth Waterfowl Hunting

US Fish and Wildlife Services set the age for participating in Youth Waterfowl Hunts at age 17 and under. As of January 1, 2016, any Illinois resident age 18 and under can purchase a youth hunting license. Therefore, even though hunters age 18 may possess a youth hunting license they are not allowed to participate in Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days. Moreover, waterfowl hunters age 16 and older need both federal and state water stamps, whereas those age 15 and under do not. The Youth Waterfowl Season dates changed in all 4 zones, but number of days remained unchanged from 2016 to 2017. 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. Ten percent of those who purchased an Illinois waterfowl stamp took a youth hunting during the Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days (Figure 7). The number of adults who participated in the 2017 youth waterfowl hunt increased $8.7 \%$ from 4,398 to 4,780 participants, and number of youth participants increased 9.1\% from 5,921 during 2016 to 6,459 youths during 2017 (Table 6).


Figure 7. Percentage of hunters who took a youth (less than 17 years old) hunting during the 2017 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days ( $n=3,190$ ).


Figure 8. Percentage of hunters* who took at least one youth (less than 17 years old) hunting for the first time ( $n=262$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they took a youth hunting during the 2017 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.

Almost half (44.6\%) of the hunting groups that participated in the 2017 youth waterfowl season had at least one youth who had never hunted ducks or geese before (Figure 8), and $22.3 \%$ of hunters indicated this was their
first time accompanying a youth during the hunt. Harvest (ducks, geese, and coots combined) during the youth season increased 26.2\%, from 7,797 during 2016 to 9,836 during 2017.

Twenty percent of respondents (20.9\%) took a youth hunting during the regular duck or goose season; an additional $2.5 \%$ had a youth accompany them but did not hunt (Figure 9). Hunters were more likely to take youths hunting during the regular duck season than goose season (Figure 10). The most popular responses for why hunters take youth waterfowl hunting was to "teach responsible and safe hunting practices" and "protect the sport for future generations" (Figure 11). Fifty six percent of waterfowl hunters have introduced a non-youth hunter to waterfowl hunting.


Figure 9. Percentage of respondent who took a youth ( $<17$ years of age) hunting during the 2017-18 regular duck or goose season in Illinois $(n=2,583)$.


Figure 10. Seasons hunters* took a youth ( $<17$ years of age) hunting during 2017-18 ( $n=378$ ).
*Cases selected for those who took youth hunting or had youth accompany them while hunting.


Figure 11. Reasons why hunters* take youth hunting ( $n=1,087$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted 1 day or more during any 2017-18 waterfowl season.

Number of duck hunters decreased by 4,361 (12.7\%) from 34,386 during the 2016-17 season during the 2017-18 season (Table 7). Duck hunters spent 394,034 days afield ( $M=13.12$ ) during the 2017-18 season, a decrease of $14.2 \%$ from the 459,029 days reported during the 2016-17 season. Over half (50.5\%) 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).


Figure 12. Zones hunters* hunted in most often during the 2017-18 duck season ( $n=1,520$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day during the 2017-18 duck seasons.


Figure 13. Percent of hunters* by zone that used Spinning wing decoys in duck season ( $n=1,512$ ). *Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day during the 2017-18 duck seasons.

Total duck harvest during 2017-18 was 277,689, down 16.7\% from the 333,406 reported for 2016-17 (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 decreased by 18,317 birds (11.8\%) from 154,698 during the 2016-17 season to 136,381 during the 2017-18 season (Figure 15 and Table 7). Wood duck harvest decreased 18,614 (38.8\%) from 47,986 during 2016-17 to 29,372 during 2017-18. The harvest of other ducks decreased 18,785 (14.4\%) from 130,722 during 2016-17 to 111,937 during 2017-18, and statewide coot (Fulica americana) harvest decreased from 4,424 during 2016-17 to 1,544 coots during 2017-18.


Mallards
Wood Ducks
Other Ducks

Figure 14. Proportion of Mallards, Wood, \& Other Ducks harvested during the 2017-18 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 - 2017.

The 2017-18 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 0.89 ducks per day, whereas the South Central zone had the highest season success rate (harvest/hunter/season) at 10.55 ducks per season. Statewide, duck hunter daily success decreased to 0.70 ducks/day and hunter season success decreased from 9.70 in 2016-17 to 9.25 during 2017-18 (Table 9). Of duck hunters who reported hunting $\geq 1$ day ( $n=1,520$ ), $38.0 \%$ hunted 5 days or less (Figure 16 and Table 10); 14.7\% of duck hunters reported not harvesting any ducks, whereas $18.4 \%$ harvested more than 30 ducks.


Figure 16. Distribution of days afield per hunter and ducks harvested per hunter for Illinois' during the 2017-18 regular duck season.

## Early September Goose Season

An estimated 9,225 hunters participated in the early (September) Canada goose season in Illinois during the 2017 season, a decrease of $7.5 \%$ from the 9,973 who participated during 2016 (Figure 17 and Table 11).

Statewide, early goose season hunters spent 33,817 days afield in 2017, $19.4 \%$ fewer than in $2016(41,935)$, and harvested approximately 16,155 Canada geese, a decrease from the 2016 (17,711) harvest by $8.8 \%$. The Central zone accounted for the most hunters and days afield, $59.3 \%$ and $63.6 \%$, respectively (Figure 20, Table 11).


Figure 17. Early September Canada goose harvest and hunter activity, 2000-2017.


Figure 18. Early September Canada goose harvest and hunter activity by zone in Illinois during 2017.

## Regular Canada Goose Season

Canada goose harvest during the 2017-18 regular goose season increased 2.1\% from 2016-17 (Table 12, Figure 19). An estimated 24,039 hunters spent 276,009 days afield and harvested 78,850 Canada geese during 2017-18. Number of goose hunters in Illinois decreased 9.3\% during 2017-18 compared to 2016-17, and number of days afield decreased $11.7 \%$. Hunters also harvested 27,637 other geese, of which 17,902 were light geese (snow, blue or Ross' geese) (Chen caerulescens) and 9,735 were white-fronted geese (Anser albifrons), for a total combined harvest of 106,489 geese (Table 12, Figure 20).


Figure 19. Goose harvest during Illinois' regular goose season from 2000-2017.


## Canada Geese <br> Light Geese <br> White-fronted

Figure 20. 2017-18 Illinois' regular Canada goose season harvest.

Goose hunters reported a mean of 11.48 days afield and mean harvest of 3.28 Canada geese and 1.15 other geese per hunter per season; $40.8 \%$ 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 (58.1\%), days afield (54.2\%), and Canada geese harvested (57.4\%); the most white-fronted (51.9\%) and light geese (37.2\%) were also harvested in the Central Zone (Table 14). Harvest of Canada geese is summarized by zone and year (2015-16 through 2017-18) in Table 15.


Figure 21. Distribution of days afield per hunter and geese harvested per hunter for Illinois' 2017-18 regular goose season.

## Crippling Losses

Crippling losses (birds downed but not retrieved) during the 2017-18 regular season were estimated at 37,491 ducks and 6,657 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 13.5 ducks and 6.3 geese lost per 100 harvested.

## White-fronted/Specklebelly Harvest

Eighteen percent of those who hunted one day or more for geese during 2017-18 harvested whitefronted (specklebelly) geese (Figure 22). Forty-seven percent of regular goose hunters saw more or much more white fronted geese as compared to five years ago (Figure 23). Over 80\% of the 229 hunters (84.2 \%) who harvested specklebelly geese indicated they saw more during the 2017-18 season than in the previous 5 years, while $11.4 \%$ saw the same amount and $4.3 \%$ saw fewer. Although most regular goose hunters (81.1\%) did not harvest specklebelly geese; only $49.8 \%$ 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 22. Proportion of hunters* who harvested white-fronted (specklebelly) geese during the 2017-18 waterfowl hunting seasons ( $n=1,217$ ). *Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day during the 2017-18 goose seasons.


Figure 23. Comparison between the number of white-fronted geese hunters* seen in 2017-18 compared to the last 5 years ( $n=1,156$ ).
*Cases selected for those who hunted for at least one day during the 2017-18 regular goose season.


Figure 24. Proportion of hunters* who targeted white-fronted (specklebelly) geese during the Regular Goose Season ( $n=1,217$ ).
*Cases selected for those who hunted for at least one day during regular goose season.

## Satisfaction with 2017-18 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 highest average number of ducks per hunter per
season ( $M=10.55$ ), an average of $2.58 \& 4.47$ ducks per hunter per season more than hunters in the Central and North zones (respectively), and 1.95 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 two aspects of the season. South zone hunters were the most satisfied with the "amount of shooting you got in" and the least satisfied with "the number of ducks you harvested" (Table 17). South and South Central zone goose hunters harvested the fewest geese per hunter per season ( $M=2.40$ and $M=2.81$, respectively). North zone goose hunters had the highest level of satisfaction with every measured aspect of the 2017-18 regular goose season, while South Central zone hunters had the lowest level of satisfaction with all but two aspects "amount of time you spent goose hunting" and "weather during goose season" (Table 18).

## Satisfaction with Season Timing and Zone Configuration

When asked about season timing, a majority of duck hunters in the Central (55.5\%) and South Central (51.7\%) zones and almost half (41.2) of hunters in the North Zone reported that the 2017-18 duck season was timed "too early" (Figure 25 and Table 19). Most teal hunters (63.0\%) reported that teal season was timed "about right." A majority of goose hunters, across the North, Central and South Central zones reported timing for the 2017-18 goose season was "about right."


Figure 25. Duck and goose hunter* opinions about the timing of the 2017-18 waterfowl seasons. *Cases selected for those who hunted for at least one day in the corresponding season and zone.

When asked about zone option preferences for 2021-2025 Illinois duck hunters indicated no clear majority. The most popular response among north hunters was "I do not have a preference." In the Central zone almost equal percentages (33\%) of respondents preferred "three duck zones with 2 season segments (2-way split) in one, two or all zones" and "I do not have a preference." The 2-way split option was the most among South Central zone hunters (44.7\%) followed by "I do not have a preference." Similarly, a three-zone structure was most preferred from South Central zone hunters when asked about zone structure preferences. North, Central, and South zone hunters were most likely to prefer "No change," but South Central hunters were more interested in a 3 zone structure that combined the South (Table 21).

When asked about the current location of zone lines most Illinois hunters (>80\%) were neutral or satisfied with the current zone line. The line between the Central and South Central zones caused the highest level of dissatisfaction (17.8\%, Table 22). When asked how zone lines should change, there was no preference for moving the lines north or south, and $70 \%$ of respondents (regardless of line in question) felt the "line should not move" (Table 23). Hunters in the South Central region also were more likely to indicate that changing their zone would increase every aspects of duck hunting such as "number of ducks you harvest" (Table 24). Whereas, hunters in the other zones were more likely to feel that "would not change."

Goose hunters were slightly more in favor of keeping harvest bag limits at two. Forty-seven percent were in favor of increasing "the daily bag limit from 2 to 3 even though there may be fewer geese available to harvest in future years."

Duck hunters in the South Zone prefer to maximize days hunted in January and open later than Thanksgiving. When asked to choose between opening on Thanksgiving or maximizing days in January, 76.8\% preferred the latter.

The majority of waterfowl hunters felt that their county was located in the proper zone (Figure 26). Will, Grundy, Perry, Randolph, Franklin, Jackson, and LaSalle were the counties hunters identified most as being in the wrong zones, but most hunters (70\%) in these counties believed their county was 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 26. Percentage of waterfowl hunters that feel the county they hunt most often is in the correct zone ( $n=1,795$ ).


Figure 27. Percentage of waterfowl hunters that hunted public lands for waterfowl in 2017-18 ( $n=1,718$ ).

## Public Land Use and Hunting Preferences

Duck hunters were more likely to use public lands for hunting than goose hunters (Figure 27). Of those that hunted public land, $3.9 \%$ had ever been denied an access permit for not reporting harvest by a due date. Most of those hunts occurred in the Central zone (Figure 28). Over half of the hunters on public lands had 1 hunt in a blind awarded through a lottery (Figure 29).


Figure 28. Zone in which public land hunted was located ( $n=809$ ).


Figure 29. Percentage of waterfowl hunters whose public land use was in a blind awarded by lottery ( $n=793$ ).

## Central and South Central Zone Hunter Satisfaction

Concern with the current boundary lines for central zone and location of south zone was expressed to Illinois Department of Natural Resources. To better understand satisfaction and concerns about the current zone line, attitudes of hunters in this area were used for analyses specific to this issue. Those who spent at least one day afield in Champaign, Christian, Coles, Dewitt, Douglass, Edgar, Ford, Grundy, Iroquois, Kankakee, LaSalle, Livingston, Logan, McLean, Macoupin, Menard, Moultrie, Piatt, Sangamon, Shelby, Vermilion, and Will were designated as "Central Zone hunters of concern". Those who spent at least one day afield in Franklin, Hamilton, Jackson, Perry, Randolph, Saline, and 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, respectively. 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 zone (Figure 30, Figure 31). To better understand the satisfaction with zone timing, hunters' opinions of zone timing were examined by the county they hunted most often (Table 26). Central zone hunters in Kankakee (78.7\%), Grundy (77.6\%), Champaign (76.9\%), and DeWitt (72.7\%) felt that the season timing was too early. Similarly in the South zone Perry (65.5\%) and Randolph (56.5\%) felt that the season had been timed too early.


Figure 30. Zone hunted most often by central zone hunters.


Figure 32. Percent of hunters satisfied with the current line between the North zone and the Central zone ( $n=779$ ).


Figure 31. Zone hunted most often by south central zone hunters.


Figure 33. Percent of unsatisfied hunters who want North/Central zone line moved in the indicated direction ( $n=129$ ).

Hunters of concern in the Central zone were less satisfied with the current zone line between the north and central zones (Figure 32) than other central zone hunters. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare level of satisfaction with the current zone line between the North zone and Central zone among Central zone hunters. There was a statistically significant difference in reported satisfaction with the current zone line [F $(1,777)=24.327, p<.001]$. When asked which direction the zone line should move,
hunters of concern wanted the line to move north and other hunters were slightly preferential to "this line not move" (Figure 33). A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between hunter group and directional movement of the line. The relationship was insignificant, $\chi^{2}(2, \mathrm{~N}=129)=4.921, p=.085$, indicating no statistical difference in opinion among the central zone hunters dissatisfied with the current line.

Hunters of concern in the Central zone were less satisfied with the current zone line between the South and Central zones (Figure 34) than other central zone hunters. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare level of satisfaction with the current zone line between the South zone and Central zone among Central zone hunters and hunters in the targeted counties. There was a statistically significant difference in reported satisfaction with the current zone line $[F(1,675)=3.872, p=.049]$. When asked which direction the zone line should move unsatisfied hunters were split almost evenly among the three options (Figure 35). A chisquare test was performed to examine the relationship between zone hunted and directional movement of the line. The relationship was insignificant, $\chi^{2}(2, \mathrm{~N}=85)=0.431, p=.806$, indicating no statistical difference in opinion among the 2 groups.


Figure 34. Percent of hunters satisfied with the current line between the South zone and the Central zone ( $n=677$ ).


Figure 35. Percent of unsatisfied hunters who want South/Central zone line moved in the indicated direction $(n=85)$.


Figure 36. Hunters satisfaction with the current line between the South Central Zone and the Central zone.

Hunters of concern in the South Central zone were significantly less satisfied with the current zone line between the Central and South Central zones (Figure 36) than other central zone hunters. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare level of satisfaction among hunters. There was a statistically significant difference in reported satisfaction with the current zone line $[F(3,935)=6.771, \mathrm{p}<.001]$. The satisfaction of South Central hunters of concern was statistically lower than other Central and South Central hunters. However, their opinions were not statistically lower than Central hunters of concern. Regarding the movement of this line, slightly more South Central zone hunters of concern preferred moving the line north as compared to the other groups (Figure 37). A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between zone hunted and directional movement of the line. The relationship was insignificant, $\chi^{2}(6, \mathrm{~N}=168)=1.871, p$ $=.931$, indicating no statistical difference in opinion among the 4 groups.


Figure 37. Percent of hunters who want the current South Central/Central zone line moved in the indicated direction.

Hunters of concern in the South Central zone were less satisfied with the current zone line between the South Central and South zones (Figure 38) than other South Central zone hunters. A one-way analysis of variance (ANOVA) was conducted to compare level of satisfaction with the current zone line between the South Central zone and South zone among South Central zone hunters and hunters in the targeted counties. There was a statistically significant difference in reported satisfaction with the current zone line $[F(1,286)=6.775, p$ =.010]. When asked which direction the zone line should move most hunters, regardless of zone hunted, preferred the move North (Figure 39). A chi-square test was performed to examine the relationship between zone hunted and directional movement of the line. The relationship was insignificant, $\chi^{2}(2, \mathrm{~N}=110)=0.326, p$ $=.850$, indicating no statistical difference in opinion among the 2 groups.


Figure 38. Percent of hunters satisfied with the current line between the South zone and the South Central zone ( $n=288$ ).


Figure 40. Percent of Central zone hunters who believe their county is in the correct zone ( $n=288$ ).


Figure 39. Percent of unsatisfied hunters who want South/South Central zone line moved in the indicated direction ( $n=110$ ).


Figure 41. Percent of South Central zone hunters who believe their county is in the correct zone ( $n=307$ ).

When asked if the county they hunt most often is in the correct zone, most Central zone hunters felt the county they hunted most often was in the correct zone (Figure 40). However, an Analysis of Variance (One-way ANOVA) test indicated there was a significant difference in the percentage of hunters who felt the county they hunt in was in the correct zone $[F(1,845)=11.994, p=0.001]$. Hunters of concern in the Central zone were less likely to agree with the statement than other Central zone hunters. Similarly, most South Central zone
hunters felt the county they hunted was in the correct zone (Figure 41). However, an Analysis of Variance (One-way ANOVA) test indicated there was a significant difference in the percentage of hunters who felt the county they hunt in was in the correct zone $[F(1,306)=7.374, p=0.007]$. Fewer hunters of concern in the South Central zone were less likely to agree their county is in the correct zone. Ninety-one percent of the 66 South Central zone hunters dissatisfied with their counties current zone wanted to be part of the South zone. Whereas $47.4 \%$ of Central zone hunters of concern were not happy with their counties zone location but still felt the Central zone was the best option.

Overall, less than $10 \%$ of hunters felt changing the zone would decrease satisfaction. Most of the "other hunters" in the Central zone indicated changing zone for their most hunted counties "would not change" any of the measured aspects of their hunts (Table 27). Central zone hunters of concern were similar in response, except for "Season start date allows the season to match migration". Most Central zone hunters of concern felt changing the zone would increase matching. South Central zone hunters of concern by comparison were much more optimistic about what a change in zone would accomplish. Similar amounts of "other South Central zone hunters" ( $40-45 \%$ ) indicated a zone change would either "increase" or "not change" measured aspects of duck season. However, most South central zone hunters of concern (46\%-57\%) felt a zone change would increase their outlook, except for "amount of time you spend duck hunting". Fifty-three percent of these hunters felt a zone change would "increase the number of ducks harvested".

When asked about zoning options, "other central zone hunters" were more likely to have no preference than any other group (Table 28). Hunters of concern in both zones and other South Central zone hunters were more interested in three duck zones with 2 season splits. A plurality exists regarding zone structure preference and "no change" has the highest percentage of votes among all groups but South Central hunters of concern (Table 29). These hunters prefer combining the South and South Central zones. Chi-square tests confirmed statistical differences among user groups, but those differences were weak and of minimal effect size (Vaske, 2008).

Most hunters in the full 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 but have no consensus on zone structure. South Central hunters prefer a 2-way split and to be merged with the South zone. 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 2017-18 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 Characteristics

Participants were asked a series of questions about the importance of waterfowl hunting. Waterfowl hunting was more central to the lives of those that hunted this year than those that did not (Table 30). A statistical difference was noted among all but three variables: I am disappointed when I have no waterfowl to show for my efforts, Some of my best days of waterfowl hunting have been when I come home empty-handed, and I am disappointed if I do not get any shots at waterfowl while hunting. The greatest difference in opinions was with "waterfowl hunting is one of the most important activities in my life". Sixty-six percent of 2017-18 hunters agreed with this statement as compared to $25 \%$ of those who did not hunt.

Those who hunted this year agreed with Among those who hunted this year waterfowl was more central among all respondents $56 \%$ have introduced an adult to waterfowl hunting. Of those who hunted in 2017-18, 64.2\% had introduced an adult to waterfowl hunting, as compared to $40 \%$ of those who did not hunt. Friends that were not co-workers were the people taught most often, followed by immediate family, and coworkers (Table 31). The most common reason for doing so was "to share my love for the outdoors" followed by introducing new people to the sport (Table 32).

Half (52.8\%) of Illinois duck hunters reported that they intend to hunt in the Central zone for ducks during the 2018-19 duck season, followed by $20.5 \%$ that intend to hunt ducks in the North zone, $17.4 \%$ in the South Central, and 9.3\% in the South zone.


Figure 42. Gender distribution of respondents who hunted* waterfowl during one of the 2017-18 waterfowl seasons ( $n=1,884$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted for at least one day or more during the 2017-18 waterfowl seasons.

| 100\% |  | 95.2\% |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 80\% |  |  |
| 60\% |  |  |
| 40\% |  |  |
| 20\% | 3.8\% 1.0\% |  |
|  | Yes, I'm a new Yes, I'm a new <br> Illinois nonresident <br> resident waterfowl <br> waterfowl hunter <br> hunter  | No |

Figure 43. Number of hunters* whose first time hunting waterfowl in Illinois was during one of the 2017-18 waterfowl seasons ( $n=1,870$ ).
*Cases selected for those who indicated they hunted at least one day during the 2017-18 waterfowl seasons.


Figure 44. How often respondents hunt waterfowl in Illinois ( $n=3,161$ ).

Respondents who hunted waterfowl during the 2017-18 waterfowl season hunted waterfowl in Illinois for a mean of 23.79 years. These hunters averaged 47.3 years of age, and started at the age of 20.9. The counties with most respondents were Will (3.6\%), Madison (3.1\%), Cook (3.0\%), Sangamon (3.0\%), LaSalle (2.6\%), and St. Clair (2.4\%). Females comprised $3.6 \%$ of survey respondents and $2.1 \%$ of those who hunted during the

2017-18 waterfowl hunting seasons (Figure 42). Most respondents (95\%) hunted waterfowl in Illinois before this season (Figure 43). Almost half (42.0\%) of respondents reported they hunt waterfowl every year in Illinois, whereas $10.5 \%$ reported that they never hunted waterfowl in Illinois (Figure 44).
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Table 1. Summary of Illinois Migratory Waterfowl Stamps purchased, hunter activity, and waterfowl harvest in Illinois from 2005 through 2017 hunting seasons.

| $S_{\text {Season }}{ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> (Year) | Stamps <br> Purchased | Estimated <br> Hunters | Estimated <br> Days Hunted | Estimated <br> Harvest $^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 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 2004 through 2017 seasons.

| Season $^{\mathrm{a}}$ <br> (Year) | Hunted <br> Ducks Only | Hunted <br> Geese Only | Hunted Both <br> Ducks and Geese | Duck <br> Hunters | Goose <br> Hunters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| 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 | $25.9 \%$ | $10.6 \%$ | $63.5 \%$ | $89.4 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $74.1 \%^{\mathrm{b}}$ |
| 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 | $29.8 \%$ | $12.3 \%$ | $57.8 \%$ | $85.9 \%$ | $68.8 \%$ |

[^1]Table 3. Summary of Teal harvest and hunter activity during September Teal season (Illinois, 2004-2017).

| Season <br> (Year) | Estimated <br> Hunters | Estimated <br> Days Hunted | Estimated <br> Teal Harvest |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 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 | $20,127 \pm 9,332$ |
| 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 | $15,062 \pm 5,480$ |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2017 information can be located in Appendix F.

Table 4. Teal harvest and hunter activity by zones during September Teal season (Illinois, 2017).

|  |  | Estimated <br> Hunters $^{\mathrm{a}}$ | Estimated Days <br> Hunted | Estimated Teal <br> Harvested |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | :---: |
| North Zone | 89 | 1,758 | 6,084 | 2,514 |
| Central Zone | 207 | 4,089 | 15,388 | 8,580 |
| South Central Zone | 75 | 1,481 | 5,788 | 3,553 |
| South Zone | 15 | 296 | 1,047 | 416 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |

[^2]Table 5. Rates of Teal harvest and hunter activity during September Teal season (Illinois, 2004-2017).

|  |  |  | Teal Harvest per Hunter |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season <br> a <br> (Year) | Season Length/ <br> Bag Limit | Days Hunted <br> Per Hunter | Per Day | Per Season |
| 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 |
| ${ }^{\text {a }} 1981-2017$ | information |  |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2017 information can be located in Appendix F.

Table 6. Waterfowl harvest and hunter activity during Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days, 2004-2017.

|  |  |  |  | Mean |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season }^{\text {a }} \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Adult <br> Participation | Youth <br> Participation | Days <br> Hunting |  | Total Ducks | Ducks/ <br> Youth/Day | Total Coots | Coots/ Youth/ Day | Total Geese | Geese/ Youth/ Day |
| 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 | 1464 | 0.32 |

[^3]Table 7. Summary of duck and coot harvest and hunter activity during the regular duck season (Illinois 2004-2017).

|  |  |  | Number of Ducks |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season <br> (Year) | Hunters | Days | Afield | Mallards | Wood |  |  |  |  |  | Ducks | Other |
| Ducks | Total | Coots |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2004 | 49,046 | 652,960 | 207,982 | 44,725 | $116,951^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 369,658 | 1,607 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2005 | 43,185 | 539,672 | 240,897 | 37,942 | $133,509^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 412,348 | 2,186 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2006 | 50,437 | 658,881 | 308,000 | 38,366 | $161,098^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 507,464 | 3,065 |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2007 | 49,114 | 600,614 | 265,369 | 34,628 | $164,369^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 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 | $138,615^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $384,828 \pm 39,741$ | $4,681 \pm 3,311$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2015 | 36,499 | 496,656 | 166,506 | 43,655 | $119,619^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $329,780 \pm 34,835$ | $3,185 \pm 1,960$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2016 | 34,386 | 459,029 | 154,698 | 47,986 | $130,722^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $333,406 \pm 37,408$ | $4,424 \pm 1,338$ |  |  |  |  |  |
| 2017 | 30,025 | 394,034 | 136,381 | 29,372 | $111,937^{\mathrm{b}}$ | $277,689 \pm 24,826$ | $1,544 \pm 921$ |  |  |  |  |  |

[^4]Table 8. Duck harvest and hunter activity by waterfowl zones and selected areas during the regular duck season (Illinois 2017-18).

| Zone | $n$ | Hunters ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Estimated <br> Days <br> Hunted | Estimated Ducks Harvested | $\begin{gathered} \text { Days } \\ \text { Hunted/ } \\ \text { Hunter } \end{gathered}$ | Ducks/ <br> Hunter/ <br> Day | Ducks/ <br> Hunter/ <br> Season |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | 347 | 6,854 | 74,706 | 41,653 | 10.90 | 0.56 | 6.08 |
| Central | 833 | 16,454 | 200,355 | 131,215 | 12.18 | 0.65 | 7.97 |
| South Central | 322 | 6,360 | 76,780 | 67,117 | 12.07 | 0.87 | 10.55 |
| South | 222 | 4,385 | 42,192 | 37,705 | 9.62 | 0.89 | 8.60 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Statewide | 1,520 | 30,025 | 394,034 | 277,689 | 13.12 | 0.70 | 9.25 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 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 2004-2017).

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season }^{a} \\ & \text { (Year) } \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | Season Length/ <br> Bag Limit | Days Afield/ <br> Hunter | Duck Harvest/Hunter ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Per Day | Per Season |
| 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 |

[^5]Table 10. Distribution of the number of days afield and number of ducks harvested in 2017-18.

|  | Days Hunting Ducks <br> $(\%)$ | Number of Ducks Harvested <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | ---- | 14.7 |
| $1-5$ | 38.0 | 27.2 |
| $6-10$ | 18.9 | 13.6 |
| $11-15$ | 13.1 | 10.8 |
| $16-20$ | 10.7 | 6.2 |
| $21-25$ | 5.2 | 5.0 |
| $26-30$ | 4.9 | 4.3 |
| $>30$ | 9.1 | 18.4 |

[^6]Table 11. Canada goose harvest and hunter activity during the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 2005-2017).

|  | Year ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | Statewide | Waterfowl Zone |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | North | Central | South Central | South | Unknown |
| Hunters | 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 | $11,192^{\text {b }}$ | 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 |
| Days Afield | 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 |
| Canada Geese | 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 |

[^7]Table 12. Summary of goose harvest and hunter activity during the regular goose season (Illinois 2005 through 2017).

| Season <br> (Year) | Hunters | Days Afield | Number of Geese |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Canada Geese | Other Geese | Total |  |  |
| 2005 | 30,614 | 271,708 |  | $74,293(1,653)$ | $9,353(62)$ |
| 2006 | 41,521 | 438,350 |  | $122,294(1,338)$ | $14,426(869)$ |
| 2007 | 43,046 | 445,670 | $141,205(404)$ | $11,582(55)$ | $152,720(2,207)$ |
| 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 | $78,850(0)$ | $27,637(0)$ | $106,486(0) \pm 14,607$ |

Numbers in parentheses represent the number of geese harvested while duck hunting. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2016 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 ${ }^{\text {a }}$ <br> $(\%)$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| 0 | ---- | 22.6 |
| $1-5$ | 44.3 | 36.6 |
| $6-10$ | 19.6 | 16.7 |
| $11-15$ | 13.0 | 6.6 |
| $16-20$ | 8.1 | 5.3 |
| $21-25$ | 3.8 | 23.9 |
| $26-30$ | 4.4 | 2.5 |
| $>30$ | 6.9 | 5.9 |

[^8]Table 14. Goose harvest and hunter activity by zones, regular season (Illinois 2017-18).

| Zone | Hunters | Days <br> Afield | Estimated Goose Harvest |  |  |  | Total Days <br> Hunted <br> Hunter | Total Geese/ Hunter/ Day | Total Geese/ Hunter/ Season |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Canada <br> Geese | WhiteFronted Geese | Snow/ <br> Blue Geese ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Total Geese |  |  |  |
| North | 5,965 | 64,573 | 17,723 | 66 | 9 | 17,798 | 10.82 | 0.27 | 2.97 |
| Central <br> South | 13,965 | 149,590 | 45,302 | 5,051 | 6,657 | 57,010 | 10.71 | 0.30 | 3.24 |
| Central | 3,615 | 40,632 | 10,141 | 2,304 | 6,137 | 18,582 | 11.24 | 0.25 | 2.81 |
| South | 2,370 | 21,215 | 5,684 | 2,313 | 5,099 | 13,096 | 8.95 | 0.27 | 2.40 |
| Unknown | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Statewide | 24,039 | 276,009 | 78,850 | 9,735 | 17,902 | 106,486 | 11.48 | 0.29 | 3.28 |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 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 (Illinois 2014-15 through 2017-18).

| Zone | $2015-2016$ | $2016-17$ | $2017-2018$ | 3-Year Mean | S.D. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North | 24,144 | 29,347 | 17,723 | 23,738 | 5,823 |
| Central | 41,106 | 38,699 | 45,302 | 41,702 | 3,342 |
| South Central | 6,864 | 5,413 | 10,141 | 7,473 | 2,422 |
| South | 3,084 | 3,757 | 5,684 | 4,175 | 1,349 |
| Unknown | - | - | - | - | - |
| Statewide | 75,198 | 77,216 | 78,850 | 66,032 | 1,829 |

Table 16. Summary of the number of ducks and geese crippled (Illinois 2004-2017 regular seasons).

| Season $^{\mathrm{a}}$ <br> (Year) | Estimated Ducks |  |  | Estimated Geese |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
|  | Total | Per 100 Bagged |  | Total | Per 100 Bagged |
| 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 | $71,054^{*}$ | $14.9^{*}$ | 13.7 | $10,452^{*}$ | $11.3^{*}$ |
| 2013 | 59,064 | 13.5 | 8,847 | 7.3 |  |
| 2014 | 51,909 | 14.4 | 7,856 | 7.3 |  |
| 2015 | 47,442 | 13.1 | 7,622 | 7.4 |  |
| 2016 | 43,666 | 13.5 | 6,149 | 5.6 |  |
| 2017 | 37,491 | 6,657 | 6.3 |  |  |

${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2016 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 2017-18 duck seasons.
$\left.\begin{array}{llcccccc}\hline & \text { Zone } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Very } \\ \text { Dissatisfied } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Dissatisfied } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Unsure } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Satisfied } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \begin{array}{c}\text { Satisfied } \\ (\%)\end{array} & \overline{\mathrm{x}}(\text { S.D. })^{\text {a }}\end{array}\right]$

[^9]Table 18. Illinois goose hunters' levels of satisfaction with various aspects of the 2017-18 goose seasons.

|  |  | Very Dissatisfied (\%) | $\begin{gathered} \text { Dissatisfied } \\ (\%) \end{gathered}$ | Unsure <br> (\%) | Satisfied <br> (\%) | Very Satisfied (\%) | $\overline{\mathrm{x}}$ (S.D. $)^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of geese you saw | North $\mathrm{n}=258$ | 4.7\% | 10.9\% | 20.9\% | 46.5\% | 17.1\% | 3.60(1.04) |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=645$ | 6.8\% | 22.2\% | 23.4\% | 38.3\% | 9.3\% | 3.21(1.10) |
|  | South Central $\mathrm{n}=163$ | 17.2\% | 30.7\% | 24.5\% | 23.9\% | 3.7\% | 2.66(1.13) |
|  | South $\mathrm{n}=101$ | 13.9\% | 24.8\% | 23.8\% | 31.7\% | 5.9\% | 2.91(1.17) |
| Mid-season matched peak of migration | North $\mathrm{n}=251$ | 7.2\% | 15.5\% | 38.6\% | 29.1\% | 9.6\% | 3.18(1.04) |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=636$ | 10.5\% | 26.6\% | 35.4\% | 23.6\% | 3.9\% | 2.84(1.03) |
|  | South Central n = 162 | 19.8\% | 32.1\% | 34.0\% | 11.7\% | 2.5\% | 2.45(1.02) |
|  | South $\mathrm{n}=98$ | 18.4\% | 29.6\% | 31.6\% | 14.3\% | 6.1\% | 2.60(1.13) |
| Amount of shooting you got in | North $\mathrm{n}=258$ | 10.1\% | 23.6\% | 31.0\% | 27.1\% | 8.1\% | 3.00(1.11) |
|  | Central n = 641 | 14.0\% | 30.3\% | 26.1\% | 24.6\% | 5.0\% | 2.76(1.12) |
|  | South Central n = 163 | 22.1\% | 29.4\% | 25.2\% | 20.9\% | 2.5\% | 2.52(1.12) |
|  | South n = 99 | 16.2\% | 27.3\% | 23.2\% | 31.3\% | 2.0\% | 2.76(1.13) |
| Number of geese that migrated through areas you hunted | North n $=256$ | 4.7\% | 15.2\% | 32.8\% | 37.5\% | 9.8\% | 3.32(1.00) |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=641$ | 10.8\% | 23.1\% | 30.6\% | 27.5\% | 8.1\% | 2.99(1.12) |
|  | South Central n = 162 | 21.0\% | 30.9\% | 23.5\% | 19.1\% | 5.6\% | 2.57(1.18) |
|  | South n = 100 | 16.0\% | 28.0\% | 23.0\% | 28.0\% | 5.0\% | 2.78(1.17) |
| Amount of time you spent goose hunting | North $\mathrm{n}=256$ | 4.3\% | 21.5\% | 35.2\% | 31.3\% | 7.8\% | 3.17(0.99) |
|  | Central n = 640 | 8.1\% | 25.8\% | 33.3\% | 25.9\% | 6.9\% | 2.98(1.06) |
|  | South Central n = 164 | 8.5\% | 22.6\% | 41.5\% | 19.5\% | 7.9\% | 2.96(1.04) |
|  | South n = 100 | 10.0\% | 33.0\% | 33.0\% | 20.0\% | 4.0\% | 2.75(1.02) |
| Number of geese you harvested | North $\mathrm{n}=256$ | 17.6\% | 23.0\% | 27.0\% | 27.3\% | 5.1\% | 2.79(1.17) |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=641$ | 18.4\% | 27.5\% | 28.1\% | 21.1\% | 5.0\% | 2.67(1.15) |
|  | South Central $\mathrm{n}=164$ | 25.0\% | 25.6\% | 28.7\% | 17.1\% | 3.7\% | 2.49(1.15) |
|  | South n = 99 | 16.2\% | 30.3\% | 31.3\% | 20.2\% | 2.0\% | 2.62(1.05) |
| Weather during goose season | North n = 253 | 5.5\% | 17.4\% | 38.3\% | 34.4\% | 4.3\% | 3.15(0.95) |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=636$ | 8.5\% | 18.2\% | 42.3\% | 27.7\% | 3.3\% | 2.99(0.97) |
|  | South Central n = 164 | 11.6\% | 14.6\% | 45.1\% | 25.0\% | 3.7\% | 2.95(1.00) |
|  | South n = 99 | 13.1\% | 17.2\% | 41.4\% | 22.2\% | 6.1\% | 2.91(1.08) |

[^10]Table 19. Hunter* opinions of the timing of 2017-18 waterfowl seasons**.

| Season | $n$ | Too Early <br> $(\%)$ | About Right <br> $(\%)$ | Too Late <br> $(\%)$ | Not Sure <br> $(\%)$ |
| ---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Teal | 346 | 23.7 | 63.0 | 7.2 | 6.1 |
| North duck | 296 | 41.2 | 44.9 | 7.1 | 6.8 |
| Central duck | 733 | 55.5 | 34.4 | 4.9 | 5.2 |
| South Central duck | 263 | 51.7 | 37.6 | 7.2 | 3.4 |
| South duck | 149 | 35.6 | 47.7 | 10.1 | 6.7 |
| North goose | 253 | 20.6 | 67.6 | 4.7 | 7.1 |
| Central goose | 644 | 33.2 | 60.9 | 2.3 | 3.6 |
| South Central goose | 158 | 41.8 | 52.5 | 2.5 | 3.2 |
| South goose | 95 | 36.8 | 50.5 | 6.3 | 6.3 |

*Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted at least 1 day during the corresponding zone/season in 2017-18.
**Zone determined by zone hunted in most often for species in 2017-18 season.

Table 20. Duck hunter zoning option preferences for 2021 through 2025

|  | North <br> Zone <br> $n=294$ | Central <br> Zone <br> $n=743$ | South <br> Central <br> $n=257$ | South <br> Zone <br> $n=147$ | Total <br> $n=1441$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Three duck zones with no split seasons. | $16.3 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ | $14.8 \%$ | $17.0 \%$ | $16.6 \%$ |
| Three duck zones with 2 season segments <br> (2-way split) in one, two, or all zones | $26.5 \%$ | $33.8 \%$ | $44.7 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ | $33.7 \%$ |
| Four duck zones with no split seasons. | $15.3 \%$ | $15.7 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $27.2 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ |
| I do not have a preference. | $41.8 \%$ | $33.2 \%$ | $20.2 \%$ | $27.9 \%$ | $32.1 \%$ |

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

Table 21. Duck hunter zone structure preference for 2021 through 2025 seasons.

|  | North <br> Zone <br> $n=283$ | Central <br> Zone <br> $n=729$ | South <br> Central <br> $n=252$ | South <br> Zone <br> $n=147$ | Total <br> $n=1411$ |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change it back to the 3-zone structure used 2006-2010. | $15.9 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $14.6 \%$ |
| Use a 3-zone structure, but combine the North and <br> Central zones and leave the South Central zone and <br> South zones the way they are. | $19.1 \%$ | $6.6 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ | $4.8 \%$ | $8.4 \%$ |
| Use a 3-zone structure, but combine the Central and <br> South Central Zones and leave the North and South <br> zones the way they are. | $6.7 \%$ | $17.6 \%$ | $9.5 \%$ | $3.4 \%$ | $12.5 \%$ |
| Use a 3-zone structure but combine the South Central <br> and South Zones, and leave the North and Central zones <br> the way they are. | $10.6 \%$ | $15.9 \%$ | $36.5 \%$ | $25.9 \%$ | $19.6 \%$ |
| Keep a 4-zone structure, but reconfigure the current zone <br> configuration. | $4.2 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $10.9 \%$ | $8.0 \%$ |

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

Table 22. Illinois waterfowl hunter satisfaction with current zone lines

| Zone line between: | Very <br> Dissatisfied | Dissatisfied | Neither | Satisfied | Very <br> Satisfied |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| North and Central $n=1353$ | $6.6 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ | $29.3 \%$ | $45.7 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| Central and South Central $n=1249$ | $7.0 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $32.3 \%$ | $41.6 \%$ | $8.2 \%$ |
| Central and South $n=1191$ | $7.0 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $35.3 \%$ | $40.3 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ |
| South and South Central $n=1144$ | $10.7 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $33.6 \%$ | $37.2 \%$ | $7.9 \%$ |

[^11]Table 23. How should current Illinois Waterfowl Zone lines move?

|  | Significantly <br> farther <br> North | Slightly <br> farther <br> North | This line <br> should not <br> move | Slightly <br> farther <br> South | Significantly <br> farther <br> South |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Zone line between: | $3.5 \%$ | $8.6 \%$ | $73.4 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ |
| North and Central $n=1257$ | $3.7 \%$ | $11.1 \%$ | $71.6 \%$ | $10.4 \%$ | $3.1 \%$ |
| Central and South Central $n=1148$ | $3.5 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $74.3 \%$ | $10.2 \%$ | $3.3 \%$ |
| Central and South $n=1072$ | $6.0 \%$ | $9.8 \%$ | $72.2 \%$ | $8.3 \%$ | $3.7 \%$ |
| South and South Central $n=988$ |  |  |  |  |  |

[^12]Table 24. Predicted effect of a zone change on various aspects of duck hunting season.

|  | Zone | Greatly Decrease | Decrease | Would not change | Increase | Greatly Increase |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of ducks you see | North n $=263$ | 4.2\% | 6.5\% | 64.3\% | 22.4\% | 2.7\% |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=665$ | 3.3\% | 6.0\% | 60.3\% | 26.5\% | 3.9\% |
|  | South Central n = 233 | 1.7\% | 10.7\% | 39.9\% | 37.8\% | 9.9\% |
|  | South $\mathrm{n}=133$ | 3.8\% | 3.0\% | 65.4\% | 21.8\% | 6.0\% |
| Mid-season match peak of migration | North n $=264$ | 3.8\% | 6.1\% | 61.4\% | 23.5\% | 5.3\% |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=659$ | 3.2\% | 7.7\% | 58.1\% | 26.1\% | 4.9\% |
|  | South Central n = 229 | 0.9\% | 7.9\% | 42.4\% | 38.0\% | 10.9\% |
|  | South $\mathrm{n}=129$ | 2.3\% | 4.7\% | 65.1\% | 22.5\% | 5.4\% |
| Amount of shooting you get in | North $\mathrm{n}=265$ | 2.6\% | 8.7\% | 61.9\% | 23.4\% | 3.4\% |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=660$ | 2.4\% | 6.5\% | 59.2\% | 26.8\% | 5.0\% |
|  | South Central n = 229 | 1.7\% | 7.9\% | 40.2\% | 38.4\% | 11.8\% |
|  | South $\mathrm{n}=129$ | 2.3\% | 5.4\% | 65.1\% | 21.7\% | 5.4\% |
| Amount of time you spend duck hunting | North n $=265$ | 2.6\% | 4.9\% | 66.0\% | 22.6\% | 3.8\% |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=666$ | 1.7\% | 4.8\% | 64.7\% | 23.6\% | 5.3\% |
|  | South Central $\mathrm{n}=229$ | 2.2\% | 5.2\% | 48.5\% | 31.0\% | 13.1\% |
|  | South $\mathrm{n}=129$ | 2.3\% | 4.7\% | 68.2\% | 19.4\% | 5.4\% |
| Number of ducks you harvest | North n $=265$ | 3.0\% | 7.2\% | 58.9\% | 27.2\% | 3.8\% |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=665$ | 2.9\% | 6.9\% | 54.9\% | 30.1\% | 5.3\% |
|  | South Central n = 227 | 2.6\% | 7.0\% | 37.9\% | 39.6\% | 12.8\% |
|  | South $\mathrm{n}=129$ | 3.9\% | 4.7\% | 62.8\% | 21.7\% | 7.0\% |
| Season start date allowed the season to match migration | North n $=265$ | 1.1\% | 6.0\% | 54.7\% | 28.7\% | 9.4\% |
|  | Central $\mathrm{n}=664$ | 3.3\% | 5.0\% | 46.4\% | 33.4\% | 11.9\% |
|  | South Central n = 229 | 1.7\% | 7.0\% | 35.8\% | 38.9\% | 16.6\% |
|  | South n = 129 | 3.1\% | 6.2\% | 59.7\% | 20.9\% | 10.1\% |

[^13]Table 25. Preferred zone placement for hunters who feel their county is in the wrong zone.
$\begin{array}{lcccccc}\hline & \begin{array}{c}\text { \# of } \\ \text { hunters } \\ \text { dissatisfied } \\ \text { with zone }\end{array} & \text { North } & \text { Central } & \begin{array}{c}\text { South } \\ \text { Central }\end{array} & \text { South } & \begin{array}{c}\text { Preferred zone location } \\ \text { County hunters } \\ \text { who hunt this }\end{array} \\$\cline { 3 - 6 } often\end{array}$]$

Table 26. Opinion of zone timing by county hunted most often.

| County Hunted most often | \# of hunters | Too early | About right | Too late | I am not sure |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Champaign | 13 | $76.9 \%$ | $23.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Christian | 16 | $56.3 \%$ | $37.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Coles | 14 | $64.3 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $14.3 \%$ |
| DeWitt | 33 | $72.7 \%$ | $24.2 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Douglas | 14 | $57.1 \%$ | $35.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ |
| Edgar | 31 | $71.0 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Ford | 5 | $60.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Grundy | 67 | $77.6 \%$ | $14.9 \%$ | $3.0 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ |
| Iroquois | 23 | $43.5 \%$ | $34.8 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $13.0 \%$ |
| Kankakee | 47 | $78.7 \%$ | $19.1 \%$ | $2.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| LaSalle | 44 | $45.5 \%$ | $36.4 \%$ | $4.5 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Livingston | 28 | $35.7 \%$ | $53.6 \%$ | $7.1 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| Logan | 16 | $37.5 \%$ | $43.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ |
| McLean | 10 | $30.0 \%$ | $60.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $10.0 \%$ |
| Macoupin | 11 | $63.6 \%$ | $27.3 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Menard | 6 | $50.0 \%$ | $33.3 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ |
| Moultrie | 40 | $42.5 \%$ | $47.5 \%$ | $2.5 \%$ | $7.5 \%$ |
| Piatt | 10 | $30.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $30.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Sangamon | 26 | $42.3 \%$ | $42.3 \%$ | $3.8 \%$ | $11.5 \%$ |
| Shelby | 29 | $55.2 \%$ | $34.5 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ | $10.3 \%$ |
| Vermilion | 20 | $55.0 \%$ | $40.0 \%$ | $5.0 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Will | 46 | $68.1 \%$ | $23.4 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ | $4.3 \%$ |
| Franklin | 44 | $45.5 \%$ | $31.8 \%$ | $9.1 \%$ | $13.6 \%$ |
| Hamilton | 44 | $33.3 \%$ | $50.0 \%$ | $16.7 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |
| Jackson | 12 | $43.8 \%$ | $31.3 \%$ | $18.8 \%$ | $6.3 \%$ |
| Perry | 35 | $56.5 \%$ | $29.1 \%$ | $1.8 \%$ | $3.6 \%$ |
| Randolph | $28.3 \%$ | $8.7 \%$ | $6.5 \%$ |  |  |
| Saline | $36.8 \%$ | $47.4 \%$ | $15.8 \%$ | $0.0 \%$ |  |
| Williamson | $42.9 \%$ | $48.6 \%$ | $5.7 \%$ | $2.9 \%$ |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |

Table 27. Predicted effect of a zone change on various aspects of duck hunting season.

|  | Zone | Greatly <br> Decrease | Decrease | Would not change | Increase | Greatly Increase | $\overline{\mathrm{x}}$ (S.D. ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of ducks you see | CZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=383$ <br> Other CZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=379$ <br> SCZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=190$ <br> Other SCZ hunters $n=87$ | 3.4\% | 5.2\% | 53.0\% | 33.2\% | 5.2\% | 3.32(0.79) |
|  |  | 2.9\% | 6.6\% | 63.3\% | 23.2\% | 4.0\% | 3.19(0.73) |
|  |  | 3.7\% | 8.4\% | 41.6\% | 33.2\% | 13.2\% | 3.44(0.95) |
|  |  | 1.1\% | 10.3\% | 44.8\% | 41.4\% | 2.3\% | 3.33(0.74) |
| Mid-season match peak of migration | CZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=381$ <br> Other CZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=375$ <br> SCZ of concern $n=190$ <br> Other SCZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=82$ | 3.7\% | 6.6\% | 50.9\% | 30.2\% | 8.7\% | $3.34(0.87)$ |
|  |  | 2.7\% | 7.5\% | 61.3\% | 24.3\% | 4.3\% | $3.2(0.75)$ |
|  |  | 1.6\% | 7.9\% | 41.1\% | 37.4\% | 12.1\% | 3.51(0.87) |
|  |  | 1.2\% | 6.1\% | 51.2\% | 37.8\% | 3.7\% | $3.37(0.71)$ |
| Amount of shooting you get in | CZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=384$ <br> Other CZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=374$ <br> SCZ of concern $n=188$ <br> Other SCZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=83$ | 3.1\% | 4.7\% | 53.6\% | 31.0\% | 7.6\% | $3.35(0.81)$ |
|  |  | 1.3\% | 7.8\% | 60.7\% | 25.7\% | 4.5\% | 3.24(0.72) |
|  |  | 3.2\% | 6.4\% | 42.0\% | 35.6\% | 12.8\% | 3.48(0.91) |
|  |  | 1.2\% | 8.4\% | 43.4\% | 42.2\% | 4.8\% | 3.41(0.77) |
| Amount of time you spend duck hunting | CZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=384$ <br> Other CZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=380$ <br> SCZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=188$ <br> Other SCZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=83$ | 1.6\% | 4.2\% | 58.1\% | 28.1\% | 8.1\% | $3.37(0.76)$ |
|  |  | 1.6\% | 5.5\% | 67.4\% | 21.1\% | 4.5\% | 3.21(0.68) |
|  |  | 3.2\% | 3.7\% | 50.5\% | 29.3\% | 13.3\% | 3.46(0.89) |
|  |  | 2.4\% | 7.2\% | 49.4\% | 32.5\% | 8.4\% | 3.37(0.84) |
| Number of ducks you harvest | CZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=385$ <br> Other CZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=378$ <br> SCZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=186$ <br> Other SCZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=83$ | 3.6\% | 4.9\% | 49.4\% | 35.1\% | 7.0\% | $3.37(0.83)$ |
|  |  | 2.1\% | 7.9\% | 56.6\% | 28.6\% | 4.8\% | 3.26(0.76) |
|  |  | 3.8\% | 5.4\% | 37.6\% | 38.7\% | 14.5\% | 3.55(0.94) |
|  |  | 1.2\% | 9.6\% | 44.6\% | 37.3\% | 7.2\% | $3.4(0.81)$ |
| Season start date allowed the season to match migration | CZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=384$ <br> Other CZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=378$ <br> SCZ of concern $\mathrm{n}=186$ <br> Other SCZ hunters $\mathrm{n}=84$ | 3.1\% | 5.7\% | 38.5\% | 37.8\% | 14.8\% | $3.55(0.92)$ |
|  |  | 3.2\% | 5.3\% | 50.8\% | 31.0\% | 9.8\% | 3.39(0.86) |
|  |  | 2.7\% | 5.9\% | 34.9\% | 38.2\% | 18.3\% | 3.63(0.94) |
|  |  | 2.4\% | 7.1\% | 47.6\% | 32.1\% | 10.7\% | 3.42(0.87) |

[^14]Table 28. Duck hunters ${ }^{*}$ of concern zoning option preferences for 2021 through 2025

|  | CZ of <br> concern <br> $\mathrm{n}=412$ | Other CZ <br> hunters <br> $\mathrm{n}=420$ | SCZ of <br> concern <br> $\mathrm{n}=204$ | Other <br> SCZ <br> hunters <br> $\mathrm{n}=93$ | Chi- <br> Square | Cramer's <br> V |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Three duck zones with no split seasons. | $14.8 \%$ | $17.9 \%$ | $20.3 \%$ | $14.0 \%$ | $41.525^{\text {a }}$ | .110 |
| Three duck zones with 2 season <br> segments (2-way split) in one, two, or <br> all zones. | $39.7 \%$ | $30.9 \%$ | $42.9 \%$ | $41.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Four duck zones with no split seasons. | $16.7 \%$ | $13.7 \%$ | $17.9 \%$ | $26.9 \%$ |  |  |
| I do not have a preference. | $28.8 \%$ | $37.4 \%$ | $18.9 \%$ | $17.2 \%$ |  |  |

*Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for DUCKS in the corresponding zone.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Significance of $<.001$

Table 29. Duck hunters ${ }^{*}$ of concern zone structure preference for 2021 through 2025 seasons.

|  | CZ of <br> concern <br> $\mathrm{n}=412$ | Other CZ <br> hunters <br> $\mathrm{n}=420$ | SCZ of <br> concern <br> $\mathrm{n}=204$ | Other <br> SCZ <br> huners <br> $\mathrm{n}=93$ | Chi- <br> Square | Cramer's <br> V |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Change it back to the 3-zone structure <br> used 2006-2010. | $13.6 \%$ | $17.1 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $10.8 \%$ | $108.626^{\mathrm{a}}$ | .179 |
| Use a 3-zone structure, but combine the <br> North and Central zones and leave the <br> South Central zone and South zones the <br> way they are. | $13.1 \%$ | $5.5 \%$ | $4.9 \%$ | $2.2 \%$ |  |  |
| Use a 3-zone structure, but combine the <br> Central and South Central Zones and <br> leave the North and South zones the <br> way they are. | $18.0 \%$ | $16.2 \%$ | $5.9 \%$ | $12.9 \%$ |  |  |
| Use a 3-zone structure but combine the <br> South Central and South Zones, and <br> leave the North and Central zones the <br> way they are. | $15.8 \%$ | $14.5 \%$ | $42.2 \%$ | $29.0 \%$ |  |  |
| Keep a 4-zone structure, but <br> reconfigure the current zone <br> configuration. | $9.2 \%$ | $8.8 \%$ | $6.9 \%$ | $9.7 \%$ |  |  |
| No change: leave the 4-zone structure <br> the way it is now. | $30.3 \%$ | $37.9 \%$ | $29.4 \%$ | $35.5 \%$ |  |  |

*Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for DUCKS in the corresponding zone.
${ }^{\text {a }}$ Significance of $<.001$

Table 30. Importance of waterfowl hunting to those who hunted this year, and those that did not.

|  | Did not hunt ( $\mathrm{n}=958$ ) |  |  | Hunted ( $\mathrm{n}=1884$ ) ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |  |  | Did not hunt | Hunted ${ }^{\text {b }}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Disagree | Neither | Agree | Disagree | Neither | Agree | $\overline{\mathrm{x}}$ (S.D.) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ | $\overline{\mathrm{x}}$ (S.D.) ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |
| Waterfowl hunting is one of the most important activities in my life. | 41.7\% | 32.9\% | 25.4\% | 15.9\% | 17.7\% | 66.4\% | 3.53(1.58) | 5.00(1.61) |
| I spend a lot of time in the offseason planning for waterfowl hunting. | 49.9\% | 29.3\% | 20.8\% | 20.3\% | 16.4\% | 63.3\% | 3.25(1.56) | 4.77(1.64) |
| I am disappointed when I have no waterfowl to show for my efforts. | 31.5\% | 25.8\% | 42.7\% | 17.6\% | 15.8\% | 66.6\% | 4.13(1.79) | 5.00(1.65) |
| I plan vacation time around waterfowl seasons. | 49.3\% | 32.6\% | 18.2\% | 21.1\% | 21.9\% | 57.0\% | 3.20(1.69) | 4.76(1.84) |
| Some of my best days of waterfowl hunting have been when I come home emptyhanded. | 34.9\% | 25.7\% | 39.4\% | 35.5\% | 21.0\% | 43.4\% | 3.98(1.70) | 4.05(1.71) |
| Hunting with friends and family is an important part of my hunting. | 4.3\% | 9.7\% | 86.0\% | 1.3\% | 3.7\% | 95.0\% | 5.85(1.29) | 6.29(0.91) |
| Waterfowl hunting determines much of my lifestyle. | 49.3\% | 34.5\% | 16.1\% | 22.9\% | 24.1\% | 53.0\% | 3.17(1.54) | 4.55(1.67) |
| Waterfowl hunting is a test of skill. | 8.2\% | 16.4\% | 75.3\% | 3.3\% | 9.2\% | 87.5\% | 5.27(1.33) | 5.71(1.11) |
| My closest friends are waterfowl hunters. | 22.4\% | 24.5\% | 53.2\% | 8.8\% | 12.6\% | 78.6\% | 4.47(1.62) | 5.49(1.41) |
| I spend a lot of time before the season scouting the area I will hunt. | 41.7\% | 33.2\% | 25.1\% | 21.2\% | 20.8\% | 58.1\% | 3.50(1.55) | 4.64(1.60) |
| I enjoy introducing new people to waterfowl hunting. | 19.7\% | 38.5\% | 41.9\% | 7.0\% | 20.7\% | 72.3\% | 4.28(1.53) | 5.27(1.37) |
| Seeing waterfowl is important for a satisfying hunt. | 7.7\% | 16.4\% | 75.9\% | 2.9\% | 6.6\% | 90.6\% | 5.37(1.41) | 5.91(1.08) |
| I would rather go waterfowl hunting than do any other recreation. | 57.0\% | 25.1\% | 18.0\% | 25.9\% | 20.2\% | 53.8\% | 3.08(1.63) | 4.63(1.82) |
| I am disappointed if I do not get any shots at waterfowl while hunting. | 29.7\% | 25.4\% | 44.9\% | 20.2\% | 19.3\% | 60.6\% | 4.18(1.66) | 4.69(1.58) |
| I hunt waterfowl for the challenge. | 16.5\% | 29.4\% | 54.1\% | 8.0\% | 16.0\% | 76.0\% | 4.59(1.46) | 5.29(1.29) |
| It takes skill to consistently harvest waterfowl. | 8.2\% | 14.9\% | 77.0\% | 4.4\% | 6.8\% | 88.7\% | 5.37(1.39) | 5.78(1.16) |

[^15]Table 31. Relationship to adults that were mentored in waterfowl hunting.

| Species | Number of hunters | Percent of hunters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Friend (not coworker) | 748 | $51.2 \%$ |
| Immediate Family | 343 | $23.5 \%$ |
| Coworker | 223 | $15.3 \%$ |
| Distant Family | 62 | $4.2 \%$ |
| Neighbor | 62 | $4.2 \%$ |
| Friend of my child | 20 | $1.4 \%$ |
| Business Colleague | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Significant other | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Unknowledgeable hunter | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |

Table 32. Reason for introducing an adult to waterfowl hunting.

| Species | Number of hunters | Percent of hunters |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| To share my love for the outdoors | 869 | $56.6 \%$ |
| To introduce new people to the sport | 866 | $56.4 \%$ |
| To share the outdoors | 782 | $50.9 \%$ |
| They had no one to teach them | 453 | $29.5 \%$ |
| To teach responsible and safe hunting practices | 421 | $27.4 \%$ |
| To help them learn to hunt for food | 180 | $11.7 \%$ |
| Person asked | 18 | $1.2 \%$ |
| To spend quality time | 5 | $0.3 \%$ |
| Recruit new hunting partner | 3 | $0.2 \%$ |
| To save the sport | 3 | $0.2 \%$ |
| Business | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| To give kids and parents opportunity to learn | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Fun activity | 2 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Relative | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Love helping people | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |
| Lost a bet | 1 | $0.1 \%$ |

## Appendix A

## Illinois Waterfowl Hunter Survey 2017-18 Season

|  | Illinois Department of Natural Resources Division of Wildlife Resources |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| + | \& | ILLINOIS NATURAL |
| DEEARTMENT | The Illinois Natural History Survey | HISTORY SURVEY PRARIE RESEARCH INSTITUTE |

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 2017-18 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 2017-18 waterfowl hunting seasons?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No (If "No," please go to Section 3)

3a. Was the 2017-18 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 3d.
3d. 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 2017-18 season?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No
5. Did you hunt waterfowl on Illinois state public land during the 2017-2018 seasons?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No

5a. If "Yes," in what zone(s) did you hunt waterfowl on public land? (Please check all that apply)
___ North Zone ___ Central Zone ___South Central Zone Zone
5b. 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? ___ Much less ___ Less ___ Mbout the same ___More 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 in Illinois. This information will help IDNR conserve waterfowl populations and provide hunting opportunities in Illinois.
If you did not hunt waterfowl in Illinois during the $\mathbf{2 0 1 7 - 1 8}$ seasons, please go to Section 3.

1. Please report your hunting effort and harvest in Illinois between September 2017 and January 31 ${ }^{\text {st }}, 2018$ 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 ducks harvested | Canvas- <br> backs <br> harvested | Other <br> ducks <br> 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 $\mathbf{1 7}$ years of age or younger.

1. Did you take a youth (17 years old or younger) hunting during the $\mathbf{2 0 1 7}$ 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 $\qquad$ No

1c. Please report information for each youth that hunted during the 2017 Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days. (North Zone: Oct. 14-15, Central Zone: Oct. 21-22, South Central Zone: Nov. 4-5, South Zone: Nov. 11-12) 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 2017-18 regular duck or goose seasons in Illinois?
___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
3. If you have ever taken a youth hunting, which one of the following is the most important reason for doing so? (Please check only one.)
$\qquad$ To protect the sport for future generations $\qquad$ To build character
$\qquad$ To teach responsible and safe hunting practices $\qquad$ To make memories
$\qquad$ To demonstrate a love for the outdoors
___ Other (please identify):
$\qquad$
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).
4. Do you feel the dates of the 2017-18 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 early | About right | Too late | I am not <br> sure | I did not hunt <br> this season. |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Teal season (September only) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Duck Season | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Canada Goose Season | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

2. 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 2017-18, please go to question 3.

| 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 |

3. 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 2017-18, please go to question 4.

| 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 |

4. In which zone do you intend to hunt DUCKS most often during the 2018-19 duck hunting season?
$\qquad$ North Zone $\qquad$ Central Zone $\qquad$ South Central Zone $\qquad$ South Zone

4a. Do you intend to hunt in the South zone at least one day? $\qquad$ Yes (Go to 4b) $\qquad$ No (Skip to \#5)

4b. 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. Which structure do you prefer?
$\qquad$ Opening on Thanksgiving OR $\qquad$ Opening to maximize number January hunting days
5. Currently Illinois has a continuous duck season with 4 duck hunting zones. The next opportunity to change zone options will be for the period $\mathbf{2 0 2 1}$ 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 with no split seasons.
$\qquad$ I do not have a preference.
6. If a continuous duck season is established in Illinois during the period 2021 through 2025, which of the following zoning options would you prefer? Please choose ONE response.
___ Change it back to the 3-zone structure that was used from 2006 through 2010.
___ Use a 3-zone structure, but combine the North and Central zones into one zone, and leave the South Central and South Zones the way they are.
$\qquad$ Use a 3 zone structure, but combine the Central and South Central Zones into one zone, and leave the North and South Zones the way they are.
$\qquad$ Use a 3 zone structure, but combine the South Central and South Zones into one zone, and leave the North and Central Zones the way they are.
$\qquad$ Keep a 4 zone structure, but reconfigure the current zone configuration.
$\qquad$ No change: leave the 4-zone structure the way it is now.
7. Illinois and Wisconsin harvest a greater portion of geese from the Hudson Bay than other states. Illinois has the option to increase the daily bag from 2 to 3 geese. Increased bag may result in a decline of this population. With that in mind, please give your preference by checking ONE of the following options:
$\qquad$ Increase the daily bag limit from 2 to 3 even though there may be fewer geese available to harvest in future years.
Retain the current 2 goose bag limit to conserve the goose population for future years.

## Please refer to the zone map on the back of the included cover letter to answer questions 8-11.

8. 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 |

9. Using the table below, please indicate how you feel the current Illinois Waterfowl Zone lines should move.

| Zone line between... | Significantly <br> Farther <br> North | Slightly <br> Farther <br> North | This line <br> should <br> NOT Move | Slightly <br> Farther <br> South | Significantly <br> Farther <br> South | I 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 |

10. In which county do you hunt waterfowl most often? $\qquad$ County

10a. Do you feel this county is located in the correct zone? $\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No

10b. If no, in which zone do you feel this county should be placed?
$\qquad$ North Zone $\qquad$ Central Zone $\qquad$ South Central Zone $\qquad$ South Zone
11. Please indicate how changing the zone of the area you hunt most often would impact the following by circling the number that best matches your response.

|  | Greatly <br> Decrease | Decrease | Would not <br> change | Increase | Greatly <br> Increase |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Number of ducks you see | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Mid-season matched peak of duck migration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Amount of shooting you get in | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Amount of time you spend duck hunting | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Number of ducks you harvest | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| Season start date allowed the season to match migration | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |

Section 5. Attitudes Toward Waterfowl Hunting. The following questions tell us about yourself as a hunter.

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

| 硅 | Strongly Disagree | Disagree | Slightly <br> Disagree | Neither | Slightly Agree | Agree | Strongly Agree |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Waterfowl hunting is one of the most important activities in my life. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I spend a lot of time in the off-season planning for waterfowl hunting. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I am disappointed when I have no waterfowl to show for my efforts. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I plan vacation time around waterfowl seasons. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Some of my best days of waterfowl hunting have been when I come home empty-handed. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Hunting with friends and family is an important part of my hunting. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Waterfowl hunting determines much of my lifestyle. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Waterfowl hunting is a test of skill. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| My closest friends are waterfowl hunters. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I spend a lot of time before the season scouting the area I will hunt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I enjoy introducing new people to waterfowl hunting. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| Seeing waterfowl is important for a satisfying hunt. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I would rather go waterfowl hunting than do any other recreation. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I am disappointed if I do not get any shots at waterfowl while hunting. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| I hunt waterfowl for the challenge. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |
| It takes skill to consistently harvest waterfowl. | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 | 7 |

Section 6. Mentoring Adult Hunters. Please help us know more about hunters introducing new waterfowl hunters.

1. Have you ever introduced an adult hunter (18 years old or older) to waterfowl hunting?
$\qquad$ Yes $\qquad$ No (Please go to Section 7)

1a. Please describe your relationship with the adult you mentored by choosing one of the options below.
$\qquad$ immediate family
$\qquad$ neighbor
$\qquad$ distant family ___ friend (not coworker) ___ Other (please identify): $\qquad$
1b. If you have ever introduced an adult to waterfowl hunting, which of the following are reasons for doing so? (Please check all that apply.)
$\qquad$ To introduce new people to the sport
$\qquad$ To teach responsible and safe hunting practices
$\qquad$ To help them learn to hunt for food
_To share my love for the outdoors
$\qquad$ To share the outdoors
$\qquad$ Other (please identify): $\qquad$

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? $\qquad$ 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? $\qquad$ Male Female

## Comments



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

[^16]
## 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 2016 Illinois Harvest Information Program (HIP) registrants. We are asking you to provide information about your activities during the 2017-18 waterfowl hunting seasons in Illinois. Even if you did not hunt ducks or geese in Illinois during the 2017-18 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 2016 Illinois Harvest Information Program (HIP) registrants. We recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your hunting experiences in Illinois during the 2017-18 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 2106-17 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 2016 Illinois Harvest Information Program (HIP) registrants. We recently mailed you a questionnaire regarding your hunting experiences in Illinois during the 2017-18 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


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 2016 hunting seasons.

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | Stamps Purchased | Estimated Hunters | Estimated Days Hunted | Estimated 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 |

[^17]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 2016 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\% |

${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ 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, 1981-2016).

| $\begin{aligned} & \hline \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | 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 $\pm 5,480$ |

[^18]Table F-4. Rates of Teal harvest and hunter activity during September Teal season (Illinois, 1981-2016).

| Season <br> (Year) | 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 |

[^19]Table F-5. Waterfowl harvest and hunter activity during Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days, 1996-2016.

| Season <br> (Year) | Adult <br> Participation | Youth <br> Participation | Days <br> Hunting | Mean Youths/ <br> Hunting Party | Total <br> Ducks | Ducks/ <br> Youth/Day | Total <br> Coots | Coots/ <br> Youth/ Day | Total <br> Geese | Geese/ <br> 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 | $52,448^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 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 |

[^20]Table F-6. Summary of duck and coot harvest and hunter activity during the regular duck season (Illinois 19812016).

|  |  |  | Number of Ducks |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Season <br> (Year) | Hunters | Days Afield | Mallards | Wood | Ducks | Other Ducks ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Total |  |

[^21]Table F-7. Rates of duck harvest and hunter activity during the regular duck season (Illinois 1981-2016).

|  |  |  | Duck Harvest Per Hunter ${ }^{\text {a }}$ |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| (Year) | Bag Limit ${ }^{\text {b }}$ | Hunter | 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 |

[^22]Table F-8. Number of hunters who participated in the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 1997-2016).

|  |  |  | Waterfowl Zone |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Year | Statewide | North | Central | South <br> Central | South | Unknown |
| Hunters | 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 |  |

[^23]Table F-9. Number of Canada geese harvested during the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 1997-2016).

|  | 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 |  |

Table F-10. Number of Days Afield during the early September Canada goose season (Illinois 1997-2016).

|  | 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 |

Table F-11. Summary of goose harvest and hunter activity during the regular goose season (Illinois 1981-2016).

| Season <br> (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) $\pm 14,607$ |

[^24]Table F-12. Summary of the number of ducks and geese crippled (Illinois 1981-2016 seasons).

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Season } \\ & \text { (Year) } \end{aligned}$ | 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 |

[^25]Appendix G


## DUCKS \& EARLY CANADA GEESE

| SPECIES | DATES (Inclusive) | HOURS | BAG LIMIT | LIMIT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Teal | Sep. 9 -Sep. 24 (Statewide) | Sunrise to Sunset | 6 | 18 |
| Ducks | North Zone Oct. 21 - Dec. 19 <br> Central Zone Oct. 28 - Dec. 26 <br> South Central Zon Nov. 11 - Jan. 9 <br> South Zone Nov. 23 - Jan. 21 | 1/2 hour before sunrise to sunset | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ \text { (See section on } \\ \text { Bag Limits) } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} 18 \\ \text { (See section } \\ \text { on Bag Limits) } \end{gathered}$ |
| Mergansers |  |  | 5 <br> (See section on Bag Limits) | 15 <br> (See section on Bag Limits) |
| Coots |  |  | 15 | 45 |
| Early Canada Geese | Sep. 1 - Sep. 15 <br> (North and Central Zones) |  | 5 | 15 |
| Early Canada Geese | Sep. 1 - Sep. 15 <br> (South Central and South Zones) |  | 2 | 6 |

Bag Limit - DUCKS - Bag limits on ducks are as follows: The basic daily bag limit shall be 6 ducks of any species including all teal species, (except mergansers); however, no more than 4 shall be mallards (no more than 2 hen mailards) and not more than 3 wood ducks, 3 scaup, 2 redheads, 2 canvasbacks, 2 black ducks, and not more than 1 pintail and 1 mottled duck. In addition to the daily bag limit for ducks, the daily bag limit for all mergansers is 5 , only 2 of which may be hooded mergansers. The possession limit for ducks and mergansers is three (3) times the daily bag limit by species and sex.

| YOUTH WATERFOWL HUNTING DAYS* |  |  | DAILY BAG LIMIT |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| SPECIES | DATES | HOURS |  |
| Ducks | North Zone |  | $\begin{gathered} 6 \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { (See section on } \\ \text { Bag Limits) } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
| Mergansers | Central Zone | 1/2 hour | $\begin{gathered} 5 \\ \begin{array}{c} \text { (See section on } \\ \text { Bag Limits) } \end{array} \end{gathered}$ |
| Coots | Oct. 21 - Oct. 22 | before | 15 |
| Canada Geese | South Central Zone | to sunset | 2 |
| Snow Geese |  |  | 20 |
| White-fronted Geese | South Zone |  | 2 |
| Brant |  |  | 1 |

## Youth Waterfowl Hunting Day Regulations

1. Youth hunters must be 17 years of age or younger and must have a hunting license and HIP regis tration/certification unless hunting on property where they reside. No stamps are required for youth under 16. State and federal waterfowl stamps are required for all hunters age 16 and older, eve those hunting with a Youth License, unless exempt (see page 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
2. Only geese, ducks, mergansers and coots may be taken in addition to other game in season.
3. An adult at least 18 years of age must accompany the youth hunter into the field. This adult cannot hunt geese, ducks, coots or mergansers but can participate in other open seasons.
4. Zone lines for Youth Waterfowl Hunt follow duck zone lines.


PUBLIC WATERFOWL PERMIT APPLICATION DATES

| What | Who May Apply | Application Period |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| First Lottery | Online only - Residents only | Aug. 16-31, 2017 |
| Second Lottery | Online only - Unsuccessful residents, residents <br> that did not apply in first lottery, non-residents | Sept. 1-14, 2017 |
| Third Lottery | Online only - All applicants | Sept. 15-28, 2017 |
| First-Come, First-Serve | Online only - All applicants, permits remaining <br> after lotteries | Begins Oct. 1, 2017 |
| Youth Waterfowl | Paper application - Hunters age 10-17 | Aug. 31 - Oct. 1, 2017 |

For more information and applications: https://www.dnr.illinois.gov/hunting/waterfow/Pages/OnlinePermit Application aspx


[^0]:    Equal opportunity to participate in programs of the Illinois Department of Natural Resources (IDNR) and those funded by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and other agencies is available to all individuals regardless of race, sex, national origin, disability, age, religion or other non-merit factors. If you believe you have been discriminated against, contact the funding source's civil rights office and/or the Equal Employment Opportunity Officer, IDNR, One Natural Resources Way, Springfield, IL 62702-1271; 217/785/0067; TTY 217/782/9175.

[^1]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ 1981-2017 information can be located in Appendix F.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 2008-2010 numbers changed to reflect responses in the sample.

[^2]:    ${ }^{\mathrm{a}}$ 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.

[^3]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1996$ - 2017 information can be located in Appendix F.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Results include youth hunts during the regular season and the 2 day Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.
    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Results are a 2 day estimate based on the mean number harvested by youth from the entire season

[^4]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2017 information can be located in Appendix F.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Canvasback in 2003, 2,100 in 2004, 3,918 in 2005, 5,927 in 2006, and 5,925 in 2007, 6,974 in 2016, and 3,642 in 2017 .

[^5]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2017 information can be located in Appendix F.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Excludes ducks harvested coincidentally while goose hunting.

[^6]:    *Number of ducks harvested was calculated by taking responses and applying the correction factor (Anderson 1985).

[^7]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 1981-2016 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.

[^8]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Total is less than 100 due to rounding.

[^9]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1=$ Very Dissatisfied, $5=$ Very Satisfied
    *Cases selected for those who hunted $\geq 1$ day for ducks during the 2017-18 regular duck season.

[^10]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1=$ Very Dissatisfied, 5= Very Satisfied
    *Cases selected for those who hunted $\geq 1$ day for geese during the 2017-18 regular goose season.

[^11]:    1= Very Dissatisfied to 5= Very Satisfied,
    *Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for Waterfowl.

[^12]:    *Cases selected for those that indicated they hunted 1 day or more for Waterfowl.

[^13]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1=$ Greatly Decrease, $5=$ Greatly Increase
    *Cases selected for those who hunted $\geq 1$ day for ducks during the 2017-18 regular duck season.

[^14]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1=$ Greatly Decrease, 5= Greatly Increase
    *Cases selected for those who hunted $\geq 1$ day for ducks during the 2017-18 regular duck season.

[^15]:    ${ }^{\text {a }} 1=$ Strongly Disagree, 7= Strongly Agree
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Cases selected for those who hunted $\geq 1$ day for waterfowl during the 2017-18 regular goose season.

[^16]:    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.

[^17]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 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.
    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ 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.

[^18]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ The September Teal season was suspended by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service during these years

[^19]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ September Teal season was suspended by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service during these years.

[^20]:    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.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Results include youth hunts during the regular season and the 2 day Youth Waterfowl Hunting Days.
    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Results are a 2 day estimate based on the mean number harvested by youth from the entire season

[^21]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 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.

[^22]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Excludes ducks harvested coincidentally while goose hunting.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 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.

[^23]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Less than the sum of hunters in individual zones because some hunters hunted more than 1 zone.

[^24]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ Number of geese harvested while duck hunting.
    ${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ 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).
    ${ }^{\text {c }}$ Reduced by 23,151 from estimate given in 2002 report to exclude Conservation Order snow goose harvest.

[^25]:    ${ }^{\text {a }}$ 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.

