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ABSTRACT

In January and February 2010, 265 licensed outfitters were sent a mail-back questionnaire to learn about their activities in Illinois. A total of 168 respondents returned questionnaires, for a 63% response rate. Outfitters practiced most often in Pike, Adams and Brown counties. Outfitters guide an average of 42 hunters each year, of which only 4% are residents of Illinois. Outfitters offer services to hunt white-tailed deer and wild turkeys most often. Nearly all of the land on which outfitting occurs in Illinois is private. Most land is owned by the outfitter or is accessed through an exclusive, paid lease. Leases give outfitters access to an average of 2,440 acres of land. Most outfitters rate the Illinois outfitter licensing system as average, though few had problems obtaining licenses. Most outfitters felt that the fee charged for the outfitter license was too high. A majority of respondents did not feel the number of outfitter licenses in Illinois should be limited or that training or an exam should be required to obtain a license. A majority of outfitters provided services to youth hunters. On average, they guide five youths each year, few of which are residents. Nearly all respondents guided hunting for white-tailed deer in Illinois. They guided an average of 33 deer hunters, and 75% of those hunters hunted during the archery season. A majority of outfitters set an annual quota for the number of does to be harvested off of the lands on which they guided. Most outfitters did not require their clients to harvest does; however, 42% did provide incentives to harvest does. Half of outfitters set an annual quota for the number of antlered deer their clients harvest. Most set restrictions on the types of antlered deer their clients are allowed to harvest. A plurality did not allow the harvest of bucks with antlers below a certain Boone and Crocket or Pope and Young point value. Most outfitters have a plan to guide deer management on the property on which they outfit. Of the outfitters who do have plans, most prepared the plans alone, without the assistance of anyone else. Respondents who did not have a plan would prepare a future plan alone, with the assistance of IDNR employees, landowners, guide employees or private wildlife conservation organizations.
OBJECTIVE

To survey licensed outfitters in Illinois to determine their land access strategies, actions affecting and opinions of wildlife management strategies, hunter activities and species targeted.

METHODS

All outfitters registered with the Illinois Department of Natural Resources Law Enforcement Division (n=265) were included in the sample for this study. Names and addresses were obtained from Law Enforcement Division staff. Methods for survey questionnaire mailings and follow-up reminders followed those of Miller et al. (1999). Recipients were mailed a self-administered, 12-page questionnaire (Appendix A), a cover letter (Appendix B) and a postage-paid return envelope on 7 January 2010. A thank you/reminder postcard was sent to non-respondents on 22 January 2010 (Appendix C). On 8 February 2010 a second questionnaire, cover letter (Appendix D), and return envelope were mailed to non-respondents. The second questionnaire was followed by a postcard thank you/reminder on 23 February 2010. Data were coded, entered, and analyzed using SPSS 17.0 (SPSS Inc., Chicago, IL, USA). A summary of survey results is included in Appendix A.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Survey Response

Of the original 265 surveys sent, 0 were undeliverable, leaving a usable sample of 265 addresses. A total of 168 respondents returned questionnaires, for a 63% response rate. Nearly all respondents were male (99%). Respondents had a mean age of 48 years (n = 160, range: 25-85) as of 2010. A plurality of respondents (27%) reported a bachelor’s degree to be their highest level of education, followed by some college (22%), and high school diploma (23%). A majority of
respondents (40%) earned between $40,000 and $79,999 per year in income and most (61%) lived on a farm.

**Outfitting Activities in Illinois**

Outfitters who responded to our survey had been outfitting in Illinois for an average of 7.3 years (n=164, range: 1-40 years), with an average of 4.9 (n = 163, range: 1-8 years) of those years under an IDNR-issued license. The county in which the greatest number of outfitters practice is Pike (n=41), followed by Adams, Brown, Schuyler and Fulton counties (Table 1). No outfitting occurred in 39 of the 102 counties in Illinois (Table 1). Outfitters who were licensed in Illinois also outfitted in 10 other states (Table 2), with Missouri and Iowa being most common.

Illinois outfitters reported guiding an average of 42 hunters (n = 154, range: 3-400 hunters) each year to hunt all species in Illinois. The majority of these clients were non-residents. Outfitters reported that an average of 4% of their clients were residents of Illinois. A majority (58%) of respondent outfitters offered outfitting services for white-tailed deer; and 26% offered services for wild turkeys (Table 3). Outfitting clients hunted waterfowl for an average of 14 days in a year, white-tailed deer 9 days in a year, doves and upland birds 5 days in a year, and wild turkeys 4 days in a year.

Outfitters who responded to our survey reported providing access to hunting land for their clients (27%), providing lodging or meals to clients (22%), providing hunting equipment (20%) and guiding hunting activities (20%). Nearly all land (99%) on which outfitters provided service was private. A majority was either land owned by the outfitter (40%) or accessed through an exclusive, paid lease (44%). Of those 197 outfitters who did lease land in Illinois, 70% paid the landowner for access to the land. An additional 14% worked on the landowner’s property or for the landowner. A majority (72%) of leasers knew the landowner before leasing the land. Leases gave access to an
average of 2,440 acres of land ($n=156$, range: 100-15,000 acres). Of leased acres, an average of 2,260 acres ($n=152$, range: 0-15,000 acres) were private. Most of the leases granted exclusive access to the outfitter (average acres with exclusive access = 2,280 acres, $n=154$, range: 0-13,000 acres).

Satisfaction with the Illinois Outfitter License System

Nearly half (45%) of respondents felt that the outfitter licensing system in Illinois was average, with an additional 31% rating it above average and 23% below average. Just over one third of respondents (39%) were satisfied with the administration of the outfitter licensing system in Illinois, and 41% were satisfied with the requirements of the license. One quarter of respondents were neutral about administration and requirements of the license and another third were dissatisfied. Most (59%) felt that the fee charged to outfitters was too high. Only 35% felt it was the right amount and 4% felt it was too low. Few respondents (4%) had a problem obtaining a license in Illinois and most were related to an inability to get assistance from IDNR staff or late licenses (Table 4). Nearly one-fifth (18%) of outfitters knew someone who had been subject to penalties for breaking outfitter regulations and a plurality (34%) of those who had felt the penalties for the infractions were too lenient. A majority of respondents did not feel the number of outfitter licenses in Illinois should be limited (63%) or that training (72%) or an exam (73%) should be required to obtain a license.

Youth Hunting in Illinois

A majority (63%) of Illinois outfitters provided services to youth hunters. On average, they guide 5 youths each year ($n=107$, range: 0-75), of which an average of 4% are residents ($n=103$, range: 0-70%). Most youth hunters either hunt free, with or without a paying adult (31%), pay a reduced rate per youth (29%), or hunt free with a paying adult (26%). Youth hunters most often hunted white-tailed deer (62%) and wild turkeys (21%, Table 5). Most outfitters (64%) felt that
youth-only deer and turkey seasons should be opened to residents and non-resident youth hunters. Most (47%) respondents felt that this change would increase the number of youth hunters they provided services to in Illinois.

**Deer Management and Illinois Outfitters**

Nearly all (98%) of respondents provided services to aid in the hunting of white-tailed deer in Illinois. Outfitters guided an average of 33 white-tailed deer hunters \((n=154\), range: 3-250) each year. Three-quarters of hunters hunted during the archery season, but few (8%) were residents.

A majority (71%) of outfitters set an annual quota for the number of does to be harvested off of the lands on which they guided. These quotas ranged from 2 to 100 does harvested in 2008-2009, with an average of 23 does \((n=108)\). Despite these ambitious goals, outfitters harvested only an average of 14 does \((n=134\), range: 0-75 does) in 2008-2009. Most outfitters (77%) did not require their clients to harvest does in Illinois; however, 42% did provide incentives to their clients to harvest does. The most common incentives were entries in drawings for a free or reduced price hunt or vouchers for a free or reduced price hunt (Table 6). Few outfitters (27%) took clients for paid antlerless-only hunts, but more than half (57%) of respondents allowed free antlerless deer hunting on the property on which they guide. In addition, few outfitters (8%) guided during the late winter antlerless season in Illinois. It appears that outfitters prefer or are more easily able to recruit hunters to harvest does if fees are not charged. An increase in participation in the late-winter season or on antlerless-only hunts may help outfitters in achieving their doe harvest goals and in managing herd size in accordance with IDNR objectives. It is not likely that hunters would be willing to pay for these hunts, particularly non-resident hunters, so programs that subsidize or encourage reduced or no-fee antlerless hunts would be most successful.
Nearly half (46%) of respondent outfitters set an annual quota for the number of antlered deer their clients harvest. The mean number of antlered deer in an annual quota was 17 ($n=63$, range: 2-80 deer). Outfitters reported that their clients harvested an average of 10 deer in 2008-2009 ($n=139$, range: 0-70 deer). Most (86%) outfitters set restrictions on the types of antlered deer their clients are allowed to harvest. Of those who did set restrictions, 39% did not allow the harvest of bucks with antlers below a certain Boone and Crocket or Pope and Young point value. An additional 26% would not allow the harvest of buck fawns and 11% would not allow the harvest of fawns of either sex. Few respondents (3%) required the harvest of a doe before clients were allowed to harvest a buck, but few (1%) also prevented their clients from harvesting does.

Most (72%) of the outfitters who responded to the survey reported having a plan to guide deer management on the property on which they outfit. Of the outfitters who do have plans, most prepared the plans alone, without the assistance of anyone else. Nearly 1/5 of respondents enlisted their guide employees to help write the deer management plan. An additional 12% contacted landowners and 10% contacted friends and family. Few were assisted by IDNR staff (2%), private conservation organizations (5%), private landowner organizations (2%) or Department of Agriculture employees (3%). Respondents who did not already have a plan were most likely to write a future plan alone (19%), with the assistance of IDNR employees (17%), landowners (17%), guide employees (14%) or private wildlife conservation organizations (13%). The discrepancy between the number of respondents who would seek IDNR assistance in writing a deer plan and those who used it to produce plans in practice indicates a need for more direct outreach to outfitters from IDNR wildlife staff. This direct outreach may aid in integrating IDNR deer management goals into outfitter deer management plans, alleviating tension between user groups and better achieving management objectives. Though resources are scarce, time and effort spent guiding outfitters in the practice of deer and wildlife management may have far reaching effects.
### Table 1. Counties outfitting services were provided in by respondents to the 2010 Outfitter Licensing in Illinois Survey (January – March 2010, \( n = 284 \)).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Adams</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
<td>Hardin</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Morgan</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexander</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Henderson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Moultrie</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bond</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Ogle</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boone</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Iroquois</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Peoria</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
<td>Jackson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bureau</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Jasper</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Piatt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Calhoun</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Pike</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Jersey</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Pope</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cass</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>JoDaviess</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Pulaski</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Johnson</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Christian</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Kane</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Randolph</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Kankakee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clay</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Kendall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Rock Island</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
<td>St. Clair</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coles</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Saline</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cook</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>LaSalle</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Sangamon</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Lawrence</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Schuyler</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cumberland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Lee</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Scott</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeKalb</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Livingston</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DeWitt</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>McDonough</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Stephenson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DuPage</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>McHenry</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Tazewell</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edgar</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>McLean</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Union</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Edwards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>Macon</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Vermilion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Effingham</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>Macoupin</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Wabash</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Marshall</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
<td>Mason</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.4%</td>
<td>White</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>2.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallatin</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2.1%</td>
<td>Massac</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Whiteside</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2.8%</td>
<td>Menard</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Will</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grundy</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Williamson</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3.2%</td>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>Winnebago</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.1%</td>
<td>Woodford</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Other states where respondents to the 2010 Outfitter Licensing in Illinois Survey (January – March 2010) provided outfitting services (n=16).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alaska</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arkansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Florida</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Georgia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Iowa</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kansas</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missouri</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>18.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ohio</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Virginia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3. Species targeted by outfitting clients, as a percent of all respondents. Data collected in the 2010 Outfitter Licensing in Illinois Survey (January – March 2010, n=242).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-tailed deer</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>57.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small game</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland birds</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild turkeys</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doves</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl (ducks and geese)</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>6.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furbearers</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4. Problems obtaining outfitter licenses reported by respondents to the 2010 Outfitter Licensing in Illinois Survey (January – March 2010, n=6).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't get answer on the phone as to why license wasn't received</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn't get questions answered because calls were not returned</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Didn't get permit until season had started</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Couldn’t get all the paper work together</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Species targeted by youth outfitting clients, as a percent of all respondents. Data collected in the 2010 Outfitter Licensing in Illinois Survey (January – March 2010, n=165).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>White-tailed deer</td>
<td>102</td>
<td>61.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Small game</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upland birds</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wild turkeys</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>20.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Doves</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waterfowl (ducks and geese)</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Furbearers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6. Incentives for doe harvest provided by respondents to the 2010 Outfitter Licensing in Illinois Survey (January – March 2010) to their clients (n=59).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Incentive</th>
<th>n</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Free or reduced hunt</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>raffle for free or reduced hunt</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>44.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>free doe hunting or processing</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>13.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Donate meat to families in need</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discuss herd management and the role of doe harvest</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Free hat</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix A. Results Summary for Outfitting in Illinois survey.

Outfitter Licensing in Illinois

RESULTS SUMMARY

THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!
All of your responses will be kept confidential.
Please return this survey in the postage-paid envelope provided.

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

The Department of Natural Resources is requesting disclosure of information that is necessary to accomplish the statutory purpose as outlined under the Illinois Compiled Statutes, The Wildlife Code, Chapter 520. Disclosure of information is voluntary. This study is funded by the federal Wildlife Restoration Fund through your purchase of hunting arms and ammunition.
1. Are you a licensed outfitter in the state of Illinois? (Please check one.) n=168
   100.0% Yes
   0.0% No
   0.0% I am not sure.

2. For how many years have you been a licensed outfitter in Illinois? (Please indicate.) n=163
   Mean = 4.9, Range = 1-8 years

3. For how many years have you been providing guiding or outfitting services in Illinois (whether licensed or not)? (Please indicate.) n=164
   Mean = 7.3, Range = 1-40 years

4. In what county(ies) do you conduct guiding or outfitting activities in Illinois? (Please indicate.)
   See table 1

5. In what additional states do you conduct guiding or outfitting activities? Please leave this question blank if you only guide or outfit in Illinois. (Please indicate.)
   See table 2

6. Which of the following services do you provide to your clients in Illinois? (Please check all that apply.) n=600
   26.7% Access to hunting land
   10.0% Assistance gaining hunting permits
   19.5% Guided hunting activities
   20.3% Equipment (such as decoys or stands)
   22.2% Lodging or meals
   1.3% Other (Please indicate. ______________________________)
   0.0% I do not provide any of the above services.

7. On average, to how many clients do you provide guiding or outfitting services during all hunting seasons? (Please indicate.) n=154
   Mean = 42.6, Range = 3-400 hunters

8. What percent of the clients you reported in question 7 are residents of Illinois? n=140
   Mean = 4.3%, Range = 0-100% Illinois resident hunters
9. Approximately what percent of your business in Illinois does guiding or outfitting for each of the following species make up? Please leave all species for which you do not offer guiding or outfitting services blank. (Please indicate.)

- \( n=140, \text{ Mean } = 88.7\% \) White-tailed deer
- \( n=2, \text{ Mean } = 12.5\% \) Small game (squirrel, rabbit, etc.)
- \( n=10, \text{ Mean } = 48\% \) Upland birds (pheasant, partridge, quail, etc.)
- \( n=64, \text{ Mean } = 13.2\% \) Wild turkeys
- \( n=8, \text{ Mean } = 22.8\% \) Doves
- \( n=15, \text{ Mean } = 20.2\% \) Waterfowl (ducks and geese)
- \( n=3, \text{ Mean } = 16.7\% \) Furbearers (fox, raccoon, etc.)

10. On average, for how many days do your clients hunt for the following species in a year? Please leave all species for which you do not offer guiding or outfitting services blank. (Please indicate.)

- \( n=158, \text{ Mean } = 8.8 \) days hunting white-tailed deer
- \( n=3, \text{ Mean } = 1.0 \) days hunting small game (squirrel, rabbit, etc.)
- \( n=9, \text{ Mean } = 5.1 \) days hunting upland birds (pheasant, partridge, quail, etc.)
- \( n=59, \text{ Mean } = 4.2 \) days hunting wild turkeys
- \( n=7, \text{ Mean } = 5.4 \) days hunting doves
- \( n=11, \text{ Mean } = 14.0 \) days hunting waterfowl (ducks and geese)
- \( n=3, \text{ Mean } = 4.0 \) days hunting furbearers (fox, raccoon, etc.)

11. On which of the following types of land do you provide guiding or outfitting services in Illinois? (Please check all that apply.) \( n=318 \)

- 40.3% Private land which you own
- 10.4% Private land on which you have exclusive access, but do not pay for access
- 44.0% Private land on which you have exclusive access through a paid lease
- 4.7% Private land on which you share access with other hunters (not your clients)
- 0.3% Public land
- 0.3% I do not provide access to hunting land.

12. If you did lease land for your guiding or outfitting services in Illinois, what type of compensation did you give the landowner in exchange for permission to hunt on the land? (Please check all that apply.) \( n=197 \)

- 7.6% I do not lease any land in Illinois.
- 1.0% I did not pay for my lease in any way.
- 70.1% I paid the landowner money.
- 13.7% I worked on the land or for the landowner.
- 3.0% I gave the landowner game meat.
- 1.5% I provided the landowner with my guiding services.
- 3.0% Other (Please indicate.___________________________________________)

13
13. If you did lease land for your guiding or outfitting services in Illinois, did you know the landowner before approaching him or her for access to the land? (Please check one.) \( n=151 \)
   - 11.3% I do not lease any land in Illinois.
   - 71.5% Yes
   - 17.2% No

14. In total, how many acres of land do you have access to for your guiding or outfitting business? (Please indicate.) \( n=156 \)
   \[ \text{Mean} = 2,443.4, \text{Range} = 100-15,000 \] acres

15. How many acres of private land do you have access to for your guiding or outfitting business? (Please indicate.) \( n=152 \)
   \[ \text{Mean} = 2,256.4, \text{Range} = 0-15,000 \] acres

16. Of the acres you listed in question 14, on how many do you have exclusive access (that is, no one else is allowed to hunt on the land during the season in which you’re offering guiding or outfitting services)? (Please indicate.) \( n=154 \)
   \[ \text{Mean} = 2,281.3, \text{Range} = 0-13,000 \] acres

**Illinois’ outfitter licensing system and requirements.** The Illinois DNR requires that outfitters obtain a license to operate in the state. We are interested in learning how you feel about this system and its requirements.

17. How satisfied are you with the administration of the outfitter licensing system in Illinois? (Please circle one.) \( n=164 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>I am not sure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20.1%</td>
<td>18.9%</td>
<td>25.0%</td>
<td>19.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

18. How satisfied are you with the requirements of the outfitter licensing system in Illinois? (Please circle one.) \( n=165 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very satisfied</th>
<th>Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied</th>
<th>Very unsatisfied</th>
<th>I am not sure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>17.6%</td>
<td>23.0%</td>
<td>26.1%</td>
<td>15.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

19. Is the fee charged to obtain an outfitter license in Illinois too high, about right or too low? (Please circle one.) \( n=165 \)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Too high</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too low</th>
<th>I am not sure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>44.8%</td>
<td>13.9%</td>
<td>35.8%</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

20. Have you had problems obtaining an outfitter license in Illinois? (Please check one.) \( n=164 \)
   - 3.7% Yes
   - 95.7% No (Please skip to question 22.)
   - 0.6% I am not sure.
21. Please describe the problems you have faced obtaining an outfitter license in Illinois. Please be specific and indicate the year in which the problem occurred. 

See Table 3.

22. Do you know anyone who has been subject to penalties for breaking any of the laws regulating outfitter actions in Illinois? (Please check one.) n=159

- Yes: 18.2%
- No: 78.0%
- I am not sure: 0.6%

(Please skip to question 24.)

23. Do you feel the penalties individuals are subject to for breaking outfitting laws are too harsh, about right or too lenient? (Please circle one.) n=71

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Too harsh</th>
<th>About right</th>
<th>Too lenient</th>
<th>I am not sure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percentage</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>31.0%</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
<td>15.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

24. Do you believe the Illinois DNR should limit the number of outfitter licenses issued in the state each year? (Please check one.) n=164

- Yes: 20.7%
- No: 62.8%
- I am not sure: 16.5%

25. Do you believe the Illinois DNR should require all licensed guides/outfitters to attend a 1-day training course in wildlife management and hunting ethics? (Please check one.) n=166

- Yes: 19.3%
- No: 71.7%
- I am not sure: 9.0%

26. Do you believe the Illinois DNR should require all guides/outfitters to pass a test about Illinois hunting rules, hunting ethics and wildlife management practices to qualify for an outfitter license? (Please check one.) n=167

- Yes: 18.6%
- No: 72.5%
- I am not sure: 9.0%

27. Overall, how would you rate the IDNR outfitter regulations and licensing system? (Please circle one.) n=165

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rating</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>8.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average</td>
<td>22.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>12.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am not sure.</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Youth participation in your outfitting business. The recruitment of new hunters into the ranks of Illinois hunters is a priority of the IDNR. Please answer the following questions to help us assess how outfitting can serve as a tool to achieving this goal. In these questions, please consider hunters in any season who are under 18 years of age to be youth hunters.

28. Have you ever provided guide or outfitting services for youth hunters (under 18 years of age) in Illinois? *(Please check one)* n=165
- 63.3% Yes
- 35.8% No *(Please skip to question 33.)*
- 0.6% I am not sure.

29. On average, for how many youth hunters (under 18 years of age) do you provide guiding or outfitting services annually? *(Please indicate)* n=107
Mean = 5.1, Range = 0-75 youth hunters

30. What percent of the clients you reported in question 29 are residents of Illinois? *(Please indicate)* n=103
Mean=3.8%, Range = 0-70% Illinois resident youth hunters

31. Which of the following best describes the rate you charge youth hunters? *(Please check one)* n=108
- 4.6% Youth hunters pay the full, adult rate.
- 28.7% Youth hunters pay a reduced rate, charged per youth.
- 4.6% Youth hunters hunting with other adults are covered by a group rate.
- 25.9% Youth hunters hunt free, with a paying adult hunter.
- 30.6% Youth hunters hunt free, with or without a paying adult hunter.
- 5.6% I am not sure.

32. Approximately what percentage of your business does guiding or outfitting youth hunters (under 18 years of age) for each of the following species make up? Please leave all species for which you do not offer guiding or outfitting services blank. *(Please indicate)*
- n=102, Mean = 80.7% White-tailed deer
- n=2, Mean = 15.0% Small game (squirrel, rabbit, etc.)
- n=8, Mean = 64.4% Upland birds (pheasant, partridge, quail, etc.)
- n=34, Mean = 35.3% Wild turkeys
- n=6, Mean = 42.0% Doves
- n=11, Mean = 31.6% Waterfowl (ducks and geese)
- n=2, Mean = 15.0% Furbearers (fox, raccoon, etc.)

33. Currently, youth-specific seasons for turkeys and deer are only open to resident youth hunters under 16 years of age. If regulations were changed to allow non-resident youth hunters to participate in these seasons, would you take non-resident youth clients during these seasons? *(Please check one)* n=160
- 64.4% Yes
- 22.5% No
- 13.1% I am not sure.
34. How do you think making the change described in question 33 would change the number of youths you provide with guiding or outfitting services? (Please circle one.) \( n=157 \)  

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Increase greatly</th>
<th>Stay the same</th>
<th>Decrease greatly</th>
<th>I am not sure.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>19.7%</td>
<td>27.4%</td>
<td>1.3%</td>
<td>15.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

35. Do you provide guiding or outfitting services for white-tailed deer hunting in Illinois? (Please check one.) \( n=165 \)  

- 98.2% Yes
- 1.8% No (Please skip to question 52.)

36. Annually, how many hunters do you guide or outfit to hunt white-tailed deer specifically? (Please indicate.) \( n=154 \)  

Mean = 33.4, Range = 3-250 hunters

37. What percent of your clients hunt white-tailed deer during the following seasons? (Please indicate.)  

- \( n=154, \text{Mean} = 74.9\% \) archery season
- \( n=117, \text{Mean} = 25.6\% \) regular firearm season
- \( n=66, \text{Mean} = 10.0\% \) muzzleloader only season
- \( n=23, \text{Mean} = 8.3\% \) late winter antlerless season

38. What percent of your clients who hunt white-tailed deer are residents of Illinois? (Please indicate.) \( n=145 \)  

Mean = 8.2% Illinois resident hunters

39. Do you set an annual quota or goal for the number of does to be harvested off of the lands on which you guide or outfit? (Please check one.) \( n=161 \)  

- 71.4% Yes
- 27.3% No (Please skip to question 41.)
- 1.2% I am not sure.

40. If you do set an annual goal or quota for doe harvest, what was that goal for the 2008-2009 deer hunting seasons? (Please indicate.) \( n=108 \)  

Mean = 23.3, Range = 2-100 does

41. How many does were harvested by your clients during the 2008-2009 deer hunting seasons? (Please indicate.) \( n=134 \)  

Mean = 13.8, Range = 0-75 does
42. Do you require your clients to harvest antlerless deer from the lands on which you guide or outfit? \( (Please \ check \ one.) \ n=157 \)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 21.0\% Yes
   \item 77.1\% No
   \item 1.9\% I am not sure.
   \end{itemize}

43. Do you provide incentives for your clients to harvest antlerless deer on the lands where you guide or outfit? \( (Please \ check \ one.) \ n=159 \)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 41.5\% Yes
   \item 57.9\% No \( (Please \ skip \ to \ question \ 45.) \)
   \item 0.6\% I am not sure.
   \end{itemize}

44. Please briefly describe the incentive you provide your clients to harvest antlerless deer.

   \textbf{See Table 4.}

45. Do you take clients for paid, antlerless-only hunts as a part of your guiding or outfitting business? \( (Please \ check \ one.) \ n=159 \)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 27.0\% Yes
   \item 71.7\% No
   \item 1.3\% I am not sure.
   \end{itemize}

46. Do you allow hunters to access the lands on which you guide or outfit at any time during the year to hunt antlerless deer free-of-charge? \( (Please \ check \ one.) \ n=164 \)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 57.3\% Yes
   \item 41.5\% No
   \item 1.2\% I am not sure.
   \end{itemize}

47. Do you set an annual quota or goal for the number of antlered deer to be harvested off of the lands on which you guide or outfit? \( (Please \ check \ one.) \ n=158 \)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item 45.6\% Yes
   \item 51.9\% No \( (Please \ skip \ to \ question \ 49.) \)
   \item 1.2\% I am not sure.
   \end{itemize}

48. If you do set an annual goal or quota for antlered deer harvest, what was that goal for the 2008-2009 deer hunting seasons? \( (Please \ indicate.) \ n=63 \)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item Mean = 16.8, Range = 2-80 antlered deer
   \end{itemize}

49. How many antlered deer were harvested by your clients during the 2008-2009 deer hunting seasons? \( (Please \ indicate.) \ n=139 \)
   \begin{itemize}
   \item Mean = 10.0, Range = 0-70 antlered deer
   \end{itemize}
50. Do you set restrictions on the types of antlered deer your clients are allowed to harvest? (Please check one.) \(n=163\)
   \[85.9\% \text{ Yes} \]
   \[14.1\% \text{ No (Please skip to question 52.)} \]
   \[0.0\% \text{ I am not sure.} \]

51. Which of the following restrictions do you impose on the harvest of antlered deer? (Please check all that apply.) \(n=280\)
   \[2.1\% \text{ Clients may harvest any deer they are able or willing to harvest.} \]
   \[3.2\% \text{ Clients may not harvest a buck until they have harvested a doe.} \]
   \[8.9\% \text{ Clients may not harvest a buck with fewer than 4 antler points on 1 side.} \]
   \[0.7\% \text{ Clients may not harvest a buck with 4 or more antler points on 1 side.} \]
   \[39.3\% \text{ Clients may not harvest a buck with antlers below a certain Boone and Crocket or Pope and Young point value.} \]
   \[26.4\% \text{ Clients may not harvest a buck fawn.} \]
   \[11.4\% \text{ Clients may not harvest a fawn of any sex.} \]
   \[1.1\% \text{ Clients may not harvest a doe of any age.} \]
   \[6.8\% \text{ Other (Please indicate.___________________________)} \]

52. Do you have a deer management plan for the lands on which you guide or outfit? Please do not consider the “Proposed Management Plan” form which is required with your license application. (Please check one.) \(n=166\)
   \[71.7\% \text{ Yes} \]
   \[27.1\% \text{ No (Please skip to question 54.)} \]
   \[1.2\% \text{ I am not sure.} \]

53. If you do have a deer management plan for the lands on which you guide or outfit, who assisted you in preparing the plan? (Please check all that apply.) \(n=179\)
   \[43.6\% \text{ No one; I prepared the plan alone.} \]
   \[19.6\% \text{ My guide/outfitter employee(s)} \]
   \[10.1\% \text{ My friend(s) and/or family} \]
   \[12.3\% \text{ Landowner(s) whose land I access} \]
   \[5.0\% \text{ A private conservation organization (such as QDMA, Pheasants Forever, etc.)} \]
   \[2.2\% \text{ Illinois DNR employee(s)} \]
   \[3.0\% \text{ Illinois Department of Agriculture employee(s)} \]
   \[2.2\% \text{ A private landowner organizations (such as Illinois Farm Bureau, etc.)} \]
   \[2.2\% \text{ Other (Please indicate.________________________________) } \]
54. If you wanted to prepare a deer management plan for the lands on which you guide or outfit, who would you contact for assistance or information? (*Please check all that apply.*) \( n=281 \)

- 18.5% I would not contact anyone for assistance.
- 2.5% U.S. Department of Agriculture
- 2.8% Illinois Department of Agriculture
- 17.4% Illinois DNR
- 3.2% Illinois Farm Bureau
- 3.2% University of Illinois Extension Services
- 12.8% Private wildlife conservation organizations (QDMA, Pheasants Forever, etc.)
- 0.7% Local or municipal government
- 7.1% Friends, family and neighbors
- 16.7% Landowner(s) whose land I access
- 13.5% My guide/outfitter employee(s)
- 1.4% Other (*Please specify.* ________________________________)

**Information about you.** Please tell us about yourself by completing the following questions. All responses will be kept confidential.

55. In what year were you born? \( n=160, \text{Mean age} = 48.2 \text{ years}, \text{Range age} = 25-85 \)

56. Are you 98.8% male or 1.2% female? (*Please check one.*) \( n=168 \)

57. What is your highest level of education? (*Please check one.*) \( n=163 \)

- 2.5% Less than high school diploma
- 23.3% High school graduate or GED
- 6.7% Vocational or trade school
- 22.1% Some college
- 8.6% Associate’s Degree (2 year)
- 27.0% Bachelor’s Degree (4 year)
- 9.8% Graduate/Professional Degree

58. What is your approximate annual household income? (*Please check one.*) \( n=143 \)

- 7.0% Less than $20,000 per year
- 13.3% $20,000 to $39,999 per year
- 19.6% $40,000 to $59,999 per year
- 21.0% $60,000 to $79,999 per year
- 10.5% $80,000 to $99,999 per year
- 14.7% $100,000 to $149,999 per year
- 14.0% Over $150,000 per year
59. How would you describe the area where you currently live? (Please check one.) \( n=164 \)

- **61.2%** Rural setting, on a farm
- **14.5%** Rural setting, not on a farm
- **3.6%** Rural subdivision
- **4.8%** Suburban area on the edge of a town or city
- **10.3%** Within a small town (Population less than 25,000)
- **4.2%** Within an urban area (Population between 25,000 and 500,000)
- **0.6%** Within a metropolitan area (Population more than 500,000)

**THANK YOU VERY MUCH FOR YOUR PARTICIPATION!**

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

A summary of the study findings will be available at:

www.inhs.illinois.edu/programs/hd/.

**THANK YOU FOR YOUR TIME AND ASSISTANCE!**

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 62702-1271, (217) 782-7616 or the Officer of Human Resources, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Washington, DC.
Appendix B. Cover Letter 1, which accompanied the initial mailing of the Outfitter Licensing in Illinois survey.

ILLINOIS NATURAL HISTORY SURVEY
Institute of Natural Resource Sustainability
University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign

January 5, 2010

Dear Outfitter,

I am writing to ask for your help in a study of outfitters and hunting guides in Illinois. This study, jointly conducted by the Illinois Department of Natural Resources and the Illinois Natural History Survey, is an effort to learn about your outfitting/guiding business and the hunting activities of your clients in Illinois. Results of this study will help us establish outfitting and licensing systems that will benefit outfitters, while ensuring conservation of game species and hunting opportunities in the state.

This survey is being sent to all licensed outfitters in Illinois in order to learn about the diversity of outfitting and guiding businesses in the state. Please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire, even if you did not outfit in Illinois during 2009. Your responses are confidential and will not be associated with your name or address in published reports. While your response to this questionnaire and any of the questions is completely voluntary, you can help us create an outfitting system which will work for you by sharing your experiences and views. You may skip any questions you do not feel comfortable answering. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, please contact Linda Campbell, Survey Administrator, at (217) 244-5121 or write her at the address listed below. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at (217) 333-2670 (collect calls accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

You may access the results of this and other studies of wildlife use 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/.

Sincerely,

Stacy A. Lischka
Human Dimensions Specialist
Illinois Natural History Survey
Dear Outfitter,

Recently you received a questionnaire about your outfitting or guiding business in Illinois. If you have already returned the questionnaire, please accept our sincere thanks. If you have not returned the questionnaire, please do so today. Your views are crucially important, even if you did not guide in Illinois in 2009. We look forward to hearing from you soon. Thank you for your cooperation.

Stacy Lischka
Human Dimensions Specialist,
Illinois Natural History Survey
February 10, 2010

Dear Outfitter,

A few weeks ago, we sent you a questionnaire asking about your outfitting or guiding business in Illinois. To the best of our knowledge, the questionnaire has not yet been returned. If this letter and your completed questionnaire have crossed in the mail, please accept our sincere thanks for your participation in this study.

Your views are crucially important, even if you did not guide in Illinois during 2009. The comments of outfitters who have already responded show that outfitters and guides have many different types of businesses in Illinois and have a variety of concerns about outfitting regulations and licensing. The results of this study will help Illinois Department of Natural Resources biologists make informed decisions about how to manage outfitting and guiding in Illinois to the benefit to all Illinois hunters and citizens.

If you have not already done so, please take a few minutes to complete the enclosed questionnaire. The enclosed questionnaire is a duplicate copy of the one you received earlier. Your responses are completely confidential and will not be associated with your name or address in any printed reports. While your response to this questionnaire and any of the questions is completely voluntary, you can help us effectively manage outfitting in Illinois by sharing your experiences and views. You may skip any questions you do not feel comfortable answering. We look forward to hearing from you soon.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, please contact Linda Campbell, Survey Administrator, at (217) 244-5121 or write her at the address listed below. If you have any questions about your rights as a participant in this study, please contact the University of Illinois Institutional Review Board at (217) 333-2670 (Collect calls accepted if you identify yourself as a research participant) or via email at irb@illinois.edu.

Thank you very much for helping with this important study.

Sincerely,

Stacy A. Lischka
Human Dimensions Specialist
Illinois Natural History Survey