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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY
INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY
This study was conducted for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (the Department) to determine hunters’ opinions on wildlife management in the state, as well as on selected hunting regulations and other hunting issues. The study entailed a telephone survey of Washington licensed hunters aged 12 years old and older. For the survey, telephones were selected as the preferred sampling medium because of the universality of telephone ownership. The telephone survey questionnaire was developed cooperatively by Responsive Management and the Department. Responsive Management conducted a pre-test of the questionnaire and made any necessary revisions based on the pre-test.

Interviews were conducted Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday noon to 5:00 p.m., and Sunday from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., local time. The survey was conducted in December 2007 through February 2008. Responsive Management obtained a total of 931 completed interviews. The survey was organized by species type, with questions designed specifically for deer, elk, game birds, waterfowl, black bear, cougar, and bighorn sheep/moose/mountain goat. For each species, the particular license types relevant to that type of species were sampled, and approximately 130 respondents were sampled for each species with two exceptions. For game birds, the sample was doubled to 260 to ensure a large enough sample size for several species within the “game bird” umbrella: wild turkey, pheasant, and quail. The potential pool of bighorn sheep/moose/mountain goat hunters was very small, so an attempt was made to reach every one of these hunters rather than a sample from their entire pool.

The software used for data collection was Questionnaire Programming Language 4.1. The analysis of data was performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software as well as proprietary software developed by Responsive Management.
OPINIONS ON WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT IN GENERAL

Most hunters in the survey give positive ratings of their understanding of the Department’s game management in Washington: from 57% to 72% (depending on hunter type) rate their understanding excellent or good, while from 27% to 41% rate it fair or poor. At the extremes of the scale, for each hunter type, excellent ratings exceed poor ratings.

- Despite the positive ratings above, the majority of all types of hunters agree that the Department needs to make more or better information available for people to understand the Department’s game management practices.

The survey asked each group of hunters about the importance of eight strategies for general wildlife management in Washington. All but one (changing the current special permit drawing system) are considered important by each group, with majorities of each group considering each one very or somewhat important. The top-ranked strategy among each group is providing the public with information about game management activities. The lowest ranked among each hunter group is changing the current special permit drawing system.

OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF DEER

Hunters are nearly evenly split on their opinions of deer management by the Department: 50% rate it excellent or good, while 44% rate it fair or poor. At the extremes, excellent ratings (8%) are exceeded by poor ratings (20%).

- Those who gave a fair or poor rating were asked why they rated it so low. The most common responses were that they are not satisfied with the job the Department is doing managing deer, that there is a (perceived) decline in the deer population, that the seasons are too short/or their timing is wrong, and/or that there are too many regulations or they are too confusing.

- Another question in the survey asked how well deer hunters understand deer management by the Department, and excellent/good ratings (56%) exceed fair/poor ratings (41%). In another question pertaining to understanding deer management, a majority of deer hunters (59%) agree that they personally need more information to understand the Department’s deer management practices, while 36% disagree. Finally,
when asked where they look for information on deer management, deer hunters most commonly say from the hunting regulations handbook, followed by from the agency website, from non-agency websites, from magazines, and from newspapers.

- The survey asked deer hunters to rate the importance of five strategies for deer management in Washington. While all five are deemed important by the vast majority of deer hunters, three in particular are highly rated: enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer (89% rate this as very or somewhat important), meeting deer population goals (85%), and increasing access to public and private lands for deer hunting (84%).

- When asked how they would prefer that the Department manage deer populations in Washington, the majority of deer hunters chose the middle answer: that they want to have a moderate buck harvest with some restrictions, resulting in some older, larger bucks in the herd (55% chose this answer). Otherwise, those wanting a low buck harvest, resulting in many older, larger bucks in the herd (21%) are about double those wanting a high buck harvest, resulting in mostly young, smaller bucks in the herd (11%).

- The large majority of deer hunters (68%) say that it is very or somewhat important that the Department provide late special permit buck hunts, while 23% say it is unimportant.

- A majority of deer hunters support (64%) the current 3-point antler restriction general season for mule deer in all of eastern Washington; meanwhile, 22% oppose. Regarding white-tailed deer, though, there is more opposition than for mule deer, with deer hunters split—44% support and 42% oppose—on a 3-point antler restriction general season for white-tailed deer in all of eastern Washington.

- Deer hunters are evenly split (42% support, and 42% oppose) on an “any-buck” general season for mule deer in eastern Washington. Note, however, that while support is evenly divided between strong and moderate, opposition is mostly strong opposition. Regarding an
“any-buck” general season for white-tailed deer in eastern Washington, there is much more support (53%) than opposition (28%).

- Deer hunters give more support (45%) than opposition (34%) to a limited-entry, special permit only season for mule deer in eastern Washington. A substantial percentage (18%) don’t know.

- Deer hunters have slightly less support (32%) than opposition (37%) for a limited-entry special permit only season for black-tailed deer in western Washington. Note that more than a quarter (27%) don’t know.

- A large majority of deer hunters (62%) say it is important (with most of them saying very important) to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives; meanwhile, 21% say it is unimportant. Cougar populations appear to be of even more concern to deer hunters, as 73% say it is important to reduce cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 17% say it is unimportant.

OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF ELK

- The majority of elk hunters (54%) rate the Department’s management of elk as excellent or good, while 42% rate it fair or poor; note that most of the ratings are moderate rather than extreme. Looking at the extremes of the scale, 8% give an excellent rating, while slightly more, 12%, give a poor rating.
  - Those who gave a fair or poor rating were asked why they rated it so low. The most common response was that they are not satisfied with the job that the Department is doing managing elk—the one reason that stood out among the rest.
  - Elk hunters are about evenly split on how well they say they understand elk management by the Department: 45% give an excellent or good rating of their understanding, while 50% give a fair or poor rating. Most ratings are moderate rather than extreme. A large majority of them (73%), however, agree that they need more information to understand the Department’s elk management practices (20% disagree). Finally, when asked to
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name the sources they look to for information about elk management in Washington, elk hunters most commonly look to the hunting regulations handbook; the web in general including, but not exclusively, agency websites; and word-of-mouth.

➢ The survey asked elk hunters to rate the importance of six strategies for elk management in Washington. While five of the six are deemed important by the vast majority of elk hunters, three in particular are highly rated: enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat for elk (85% rate this as very or somewhat important), increasing access to public and private lands for elk hunting (80%), and providing multi-season tag opportunities for elk hunting (75%). Managing shed antler hunting is the only strategy that is not deemed important—only 32% of elk hunters say this is important.

➢ The survey asked elk hunters about four elk management strategies pertaining to harvest objectives, asking if they support a low annual harvest of bulls (resulting in a cross-section of age classes, including some older bulls in the herd), a medium annual harvest, or a high annual harvest (resulting in a young age structure with a low number of mature bulls in the herd), as well as limited special permit hunting only, with no general season, resulting in a cross-section of age classes and the highest number of old bulls of the four options. The most support is for a low bull harvest, resulting in a cross-section of age classes, including some older bulls in the herd (64% support). This is followed by the 49% who support the medium harvest, resulting in a young age structure with a moderate to low number of mature bulls. There is less support for the other two options: 37% support limited special permit hunting only, and at the bottom of the ranking is the 27% who support a high harvest, resulting in a young age structure and a low number of mature bulls.

➢ The survey asked elk hunters about a change to the hunting season for bull elk in the Blue Mountains that would result in more bulls being harvested but a lower chance of harvesting a bull elk over 3 years old. More elk hunters support (39%) than oppose (26%) this potential change in the regulations, with a substantial percentage answering that they do not know (21%).
A large majority of elk hunters (68%) say it is important to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 19% say it is unimportant. Regarding cougar populations, an overwhelming majority of elk hunters (79%) say it is important to reduce cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 12% say it is unimportant.

OPINIONS ON MANAGEMENT OF GAME BIRDS

The survey explained that the Department is considering a program to provide some areas where hunters can expect fewer other hunters and where those hunters who are there would have a good chance of seeing game birds. A large majority of game bird hunters (59%) would support limiting the number of hunters in these specific areas in order to implement the program; 35% would oppose. Similarly, a majority of these hunters (52%) would support a limit on the number of days per week these areas could be hunted to implement the program; 42% would oppose. If the number of hunters is to be limited, the majority of these hunters would prefer limiting the number of hunters by a first-come, first-served limited parking arrangement rather than through an advanced reservation arrangement.

The large majority of pheasant hunters (70%) support having the Department provide quality pheasant hunting areas, which are areas where the number of hunters is limited and/or individual hunter harvest chance is increased; 22% oppose. Those who support were asked about options for implementation, and they are about evenly split between providing quality pheasant hunting areas by limiting the number of hunters in the area (39%) and limiting the number of days per week that an area could be hunted (45%). Also, those who support were asked to choose between limiting hunter numbers by a first-come, first-served limited parking arrangement (59%) or through an advanced reservation arrangement (30%), with the former getting more support than the latter.

Pheasant hunters were asked how they thought funding should be allocated between spending for purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and spending on habitat enhancement. Overall, they think more should be spent on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant: the
means are approximately 64% on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and 36% on habitat enhancement.

- In an open-ended question, wherein respondents could give any answer that came to mind and no list was read to them to prompt them, pheasant hunters were asked what they would change, if they could change one thing about the management of pheasant hunting in Washington. The most common answers are to improve habitat (26%), increase pheasant populations (18%), make more land available for hunting (15%), and make a better arrangements between the Department and private landowners to open up private lands (14%).

- A majority of wild turkey hunters (54%) would support a hen-only fall season if either-sex turkey hunting in the fall resulted in fewer toms being available in the spring; 36% would oppose.

- Three-fourths of wild turkey hunters (75%) think it is important for turkey management to ensure that private lands are available for turkey hunting.

- Among those who have hunted game birds (“terrestrial” birds, as opposed to waterfowl), there is more support (54%) than opposition (37%) for requiring hunters to use non-toxic shot on all state wildlife area lands. However, these hunters are about evenly split (45% support and 47% oppose) on requiring non-toxic shot on all public lands. Finally, there is slightly less support (43%) than opposition (49%) to requiring non-toxic shot for all upland game bird hunting.

**OPINIONS ON MANAGEMENT OF WATERFOWL AND OTHER MIGRATORY BIRDS**

- Waterfowl hunters show great concern about wetlands, as a huge majority (94%) think it is important to address loss of wetlands due to development and conversion to other uses (and most of those—82%—think it is *very* important).
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- Waterfowl hunters also show much concern for addressing the extensive backlog of unfunded habitat improvement projects in the state: 86% say this is important, with 66% saying it is very important.

- Waterfowl hunters show a similar level of concern for providing additional waterfowl hunting access in the Columbia Basin, Chehalis Valley, and Skagit area: 84% say this is important, with 60% saying it is very important.

- Most waterfowl hunters (60%) agree that the current prohibition on motorized waterfowl decoys should be continued, while 36% disagree. Note that most agreement and disagreement is strong, indicating a polarization of opinion.

- Waterfowl hunters are split over their perceptions of the importance of having the Department provide permanent waterfowl blinds on portions of public wildlife areas or private lands that the Department controls: 46% think this is important, and 44% think it is unimportant.

- The large majority of waterfowl hunters (78%) think it is important for the Department to provide open hunting areas without drawings, reservations, or specific hunting days on portions of public wildlife areas or private lands that the Department controls. Only 15% think this is unimportant.

- The survey asked waterfowl hunters about possible interference from other hunters on the Department’s wildlife area or private land controlled by the Department on which they hunted the most. Approximately a third of waterfowl hunters (32%) did not hunt on any such lands, and another 26% hunted on those lands but did not encounter many other hunters. Otherwise, more of them said that they encountered other hunters that interfered with their hunting (25%) than said they encountered other hunters that did not interfere with their hunting (16%).
The survey asked waterfowl hunters four questions about ways to limit the number of waterfowl hunters on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls. For each possible way to limit the number of hunters, the survey asked hunters if they support or oppose that way. Two of the ways have at least half of the hunters in support: 51% support designating a fixed number of parking spaces to limit hunter numbers, and 50% support designating specific hunting days per week to limit hunter numbers. An advanced registration system (44% support) and daily drawings (34%) to limit hunter numbers do not have a majority’s support. In fact, daily drawings is the only with a majority in opposition.

Duck hunters were asked if they support or oppose a split duck season (entailing a closure in the middle of the season), if the number of duck season days needs to be reduced because of lower populations, and slightly more support (54%) than oppose (42%).

A slight majority of goose hunters (51%) agree that the current goose season format in most of eastern Washington (Wednesdays, weekends, and holidays) provides better hunting than a 7-day per week season; however, 46% disagree.

The majority of waterfowl hunters (55%) could not say for what the money raised by the sale of state migratory bird stamps is used. Otherwise, their most common responses are that it is used for enhancing bird habitat on existing public lands (24%) or for purchasing bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation (21%). When asked to name which of the possible uses should be the top priority, waterfowl hunters are about evenly distributed among the four answers: 27% say the top priority for these funds should be for purchasing migratory bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation, 25% say it should be for working with private landowners to gain migratory bird hunting access, 23% say it should be for enhancing migratory bird habitat on existing Department or other public lands, and 19% say it should be for working with private landowners to enhance migratory bird habitat.

The survey informed waterfowl hunters that the funds from the sale of state migratory bird stamps can be used only for migratory bird habitat enhancements and that the funding has not
been adequate to fund all proposed projects. In light of this, the survey asked waterfowl
hunters if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the state migratory bird stamp
from $10 to $15 to fund more projects, and support (72%) far exceeds opposition (22%).
They were also asked if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the stamps to
fund hunter access programs, and support (67%) exceeds opposition (29%).

OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF BIGHORN SHEEP, MOOSE, AND
MOUNTAIN GOATS
➢ There were very few hunters in the state who had hunted for bighorn sheep, moose, or
mountain goat; for this reason, the sample size is small. This fact should be kept in mind in
examining the results below.

➢ Hunters of these particular game were asked about potential methods for increasing the odds
of drawing a permit to hunt one of these species. The most support is for the status quo—no
change to the current drawing system (61%). Otherwise, 22% want to give hunters with
more points a proportionally greater chance of drawing a permit. (Meanwhile, 17% do not
know.)

➢ There is more support (55%) than opposition (34%) for allocating specific seasons for
bighorn sheep, moose, and mountain goat for each weapon type use group.

OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF BLACK BEAR
➢ Those hunters who had purchased a bear-cougar license were asked which of five reasons
best describes the reason they purchased a bear-cougar license. Most commonly, they said
they primarily hunt deer or elk but purchased the license just in case they saw a bear or
cougar while hunting other animals (37% chose this reason) or that they specifically
purchased the license to hunt bear but also to have the license if an opportunity arose to hunt
cougar (30%). Low percentages purchased the license specifically to hunt both bear and
cougar (17%), specifically to hunt cougar (7%), or specifically to hunt bear (7%).

➢ Black bear hunters were asked about managing black bear populations as a tool to address
deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. A large majority of black bear
hunters (70%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives.

**OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF COUGAR AND ON THE PILOT COUGAR HOUND HUNT**

- As discussed in the previous section, those hunters who had purchased a bear-cougar license were asked which of five reasons best describes the reason they purchased a bear-cougar license. Most commonly, they said they primarily hunt deer or elk but purchased the license just in case they saw a bear or cougar while hunting other animals (37% chose this reason) or that they specifically purchased the license to hunt bear but also to have the license if an opportunity arose to hunt cougar (30%). Low percentages purchased the license specifically to hunt both bear and cougar (17%), specifically to hunt cougar (7%), or specifically to hunt bear (7%).

- A majority of cougar hunters (51%) live within 10 miles of a place to hunt cougar in Washington. The median one-way distance to a place to hunt cougar is 10 miles; the mean distance (37.65 miles) is somewhat longer, being pulled upward by the 9% of cougar hunters who live more than 100 miles to the nearest place to hunt cougar in Washington.

- The majority of cougar hunters (66%) think it is important to have a cougar hound season in their local area, with most of them saying *very* important. Even more (84%) think it is important for cougar management purposes to allow hound hunting for cougar, again with most of those saying *very* important. Note, however, that a majority (74%) also think it is important for cougar management purposes to have a general cougar season *without* hounds.

  - Another question asked if cougar hunters support or oppose reducing general cougar seasons, when necessary, to add a cougar hound season, and support (57%) far exceeds opposition (35%). Note, however, that most opposition is *strong*.

  - On the other hand, support (44%) is about the same as opposition (47%) for closing general cougar seasons, when necessary, to add a cougar hound season.
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The survey asked cougar hunters about options to manage cougar. The survey first explained that one option for managing cougar is to use zone management, which entails dividing the state into zones and mandating a particular hunt method for each zone. The majority of cougar hunters (61%) then indicated that they support zone management for cougars, with most of them saying that they strongly support. Nonetheless, 24% oppose.

- The most common reasons for opposition to zone management of cougar is simply that cougar hunters believe that cougar hunting regulations should apply statewide or that cougar hunters do not want more limitations on when and where to hunt.

Another option for managing cougar discussed in the survey is a quota system. The survey first offered the following explanation: “To increase hunting opportunities by extending season dates while still maintaining adequate control of harvest, wildlife managers often use a quota system. Under a typical quota system, the season closes once enough animals have been harvested.” The survey then asked cougar hunters if they support or oppose a quota system for managing cougar, and the majority of cougar hunters (70%) support a quota system; meanwhile, 23% oppose.

- Common reasons for supporting the quota system for cougar are that it is perceived as logical and reasonable or that respondents support ensuring that cougar are not over-harvested.
- Common reasons for opposing the quota system for cougar are that some hunters do not want to limit the number of cougars killed, that they do not think enough cougars will be killed under a quota system, that they do not think it will work, or that they need set season dates in order to be able to plan hunting trips.

The survey provided some information about the use of a quota system for cougar hunting in the past: “In the past, kill quotas for cougar have only been used for hound seasons in northeastern Washington. Using the quota system, hunters using dogs were required to call a toll-free phone number before they went hunting to make sure the season was still open. The state has considered combining the general cougar seasons with hound seasons, but would require general hunters to use the quota system and toll-free phone line also.” The survey then asked about support or opposition to using a quota system for general cougar season...
timeframes without the use of dogs, and opposition (55%) far exceeds support (35%). Furthermore, most opposition is strong.

- Only 1 of the 128 cougar hunters had participated in the pilot cougar hound hunt in northeastern Washington.

- Cougar hunters were asked about reducing cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. An overwhelming majority of cougar hunters (81%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives.

**OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF WOLVES**

- After being informed that wolves are highly likely to re-colonize Washington over the next 10 years, hunters were asked if they support or oppose having the Department manage wolves to be a self-sustaining population. Support exceeds opposition among every type of hunter except sheep/moose/goat hunters.
  - Common reasons for supporting include that the hunter likes wolves/that all wildlife deserves a chance to flourish, that wolves should be managed and controlled anyway, or that wolves should be managed so that they do not overpopulate.
  - Common reasons for opposing include concerns about potential damage to livestock and/or game and wildlife, that the respondent does not want wolves in the area, or that wolves are not manageable.

**OPINIONS ON FUNDING FOR HUNTING AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT**

- As discussed previously, the majority of waterfowl hunters (55%) could not say for what the money raised by the sale of state migratory bird stamps is used. Otherwise, their most common responses are that it is used for enhancing bird habitat on existing public lands (24%) or for purchasing bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation (21%). When asked to name which of the possible uses should be the top priority, waterfowl hunters are about evenly distributed among the four answers: 27% say the top priority for these funds should be purchasing migratory bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation, 25% say it should
be for working with private landowners to gain migratory bird hunting access, 23% say it should be for enhancing migratory bird habitat on existing Department or other public lands, and 19% say it should be for working with private landowners to enhance migratory bird habitat.

➢ Also as discussed previously, the survey informed waterfowl hunters that the funds from the sale of state migratory bird stamps can be used only for migratory bird habitat enhancements and that the funding has not been adequate to fund all proposed projects. In light of this, the survey asked waterfowl hunters if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the state migratory bird stamp from $10 to $15 to fund more projects, and support (72%) far exceeds opposition (22%). They were also asked if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the stamps to fund hunter access programs, and support (67%) exceeds opposition (29%).

➢ Also as previously discussed, pheasant hunters were asked how they thought funding should be allocated between spending for purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and spending on habitat enhancement. Overall, they think more should be spent on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant: the means are approximately 64% on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and 36% on habitat enhancement.

➢ After being informed that the Department uses auction and raffle permits for big game species to enhance the funding level for activities like research, habitat improvement, and disease testing, more hunters want to expand auction and raffle permit programs than want to lessen them. However, most commonly they want to keep them the same as they currently are.
A majority (56%) of small game license holders (either a small game license or a small game with big game license) would support a $5 increase on their small game license to have the Department maintain and increase hunting access on private lands, but 40% would oppose. Common reasons for opposing are that the cost of a license is already high enough or that the respondent believes increasing prices will not help the Department better manage hunting.

- In follow-up, those who opposed a $5 increase as discussed above were asked how much effect such an increase would have on their subsequent decision on whether to buy a small game license in the future. Most of them (52%) say it would affect their decision, but 46% say it would not.

OPINIONS ON HUNTING SEASONS AND HUNTING REGULATIONS

- For each type of hunter, support exceeds opposition for overlapping fall turkey season with fall big game season knowing that turkey hunting would still require using a shotgun or archery equipment; the most opposition is from cougar hunters.

- The large majority of hunters want the use of ATVs allowed for hunting, with restrictions, allowing them only for certain people (e.g., senior citizens) or situations (e.g., retrieving game).

OPINIONS ON COOPERATIVE ROAD MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

- More hunters support than oppose cooperative road management systems on public lands and private timberlands to reduce hunter crowding and disturbance of wildlife.

- The overwhelming majority of all types of hunters (ranging from 74% to 84%) support (with most of them strongly supporting) using road closures to maintain healthy game populations during critical periods of the year.
SATISFACTION WITH DEER HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY DEER HUNT

- Among deer hunters, satisfaction (64%) with deer hunting in Washington exceeded dissatisfaction (34%). Note, however, that most of those who were dissatisfied were very dissatisfied.
  - The most common reason for being satisfied was that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time. This was followed by the perception that the deer population was good and/or that the hunter harvested a deer.
  - Dissatisfaction was most commonly because of a (perceived) low deer population, that the season was too short, or that there were not enough places to hunt or to access hunting lands.

- Deer hunters were asked about the importance of seven factors in having a quality deer hunting experience. Four of the seven have a markedly higher percentage of deer hunters who say that they are very important for a quality deer hunting experience: the timing of the season (80% think this is very important), spending time with friends (80%), spending time with family (78%), and the length of the hunting season (70%). The number of other hunters (53%) and opportunities to harvest a mature buck (49%) or to harvest at all (48%) are not as important.
  - When asked in an open-ended question (meaning that the respondent could say anything that came to mind and that no pre-set list was read to them) if they could change one thing to improve the quality of deer hunting, deer hunters most commonly said longer seasons and/or later seasons.
SATISFACTION WITH ELK HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY ELK HUNT

Among elk hunters, satisfaction (68%) with elk hunting in Washington exceeded dissatisfaction (28%).

- The most common reason for being satisfied was that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time. This was followed by that they harvested an elk and/or that they think the elk population is good.
- Dissatisfaction was most commonly because of a (perceived) low elk population, that there were not enough places to hunt or to access hunting lands, that they were not successful in harvesting an elk, and/or that the season was too early.

Elk hunters were asked about the importance of seven factors in having a quality elk hunting experience. Two of the seven have a markedly higher percentage of elk hunters who say that they are very important for a quality elk hunting experience: spending time with family (72% think this is very important) and spending time with friends (72%). The least important is having a low number of other elk hunters in the field (47%).

- When asked in an open-ended question (meaning that the respondent could say anything that came to mind and that no pre-set list was read to them) if they could change one thing to improve the quality of elk hunting, elk hunters most commonly said better game management practices, later seasons, and/or longer seasons.

SATISFACTION WITH GAME BIRD HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY BIRD HUNT

A large majority of game bird hunters (87%) indicated that they had hunted pheasant in eastern Washington in the 2006-2007 season.

Pheasant hunters were slightly more satisfied than dissatisfied with pheasant hunting in eastern Washington: 53% were satisfied, but 41% were dissatisfied.

- Common reasons for being satisfied were that they perceived the bird population to be good, that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time, and/or that the respondent harvested a bird.
- The overriding reason for being dissatisfied was a (perceived) low pheasant population.
Quail hunters were overwhelmingly satisfied with their quail hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season: 78% were satisfied, and only 14% were dissatisfied.

- Common reasons for being satisfied were that they perceived the quail population to be good, that the hunter harvested a quail, and/or that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time.
- Dissatisfaction was most commonly because of a (perceived) low quail population.

Wild turkey hunters were overwhelmingly satisfied with their wild turkey hunting in Washington in 2006-2007: 92% were satisfied, with most of those being very satisfied.

- Common reasons for being satisfied were that they perceived the wild turkey population to be good, that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time, and/or that the respondent harvested a turkey.

Hunters who had hunted game birds were asked about the importance of three things for a quality bird hunting experience. Of the three, having maps of available public and private hunting lands is the highest rated in importance, with 70% saying this is very important. The other two factors have lower ratings: 40% say it is very important to have no access restrictions on bird hunting opportunities, and 25% say it is very important to have a guaranteed place to hunt through a reservation (indeed, this last one has more saying it is very unimportant—26%).

SATISFACTION WITH WATERFOWL HUNTING

The overwhelming majority of waterfowl hunters (79%) were satisfied with their waterfowl hunting in Washington during 2006-2007; meanwhile, 18% were dissatisfied.

- Common reasons for being satisfied were that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time, that they harvested waterfowl, and/or that they perceived the population to be good.
- The most common reasons for dissatisfaction were a (perceived) low waterfowl population, that there were not enough places to hunt or to access hunting lands, and/or a lack of habitat.
SATISFACTION WITH BLACK BEAR HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY BLACK BEAR HUNT

- The majority of black bear hunters (68%) were satisfied with their black bear hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season; 26% were dissatisfied.
  - Among black bear hunters, two reasons stand out for being satisfied with their black bear hunting: that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time and that they perceive the black bear population to be good.
  - A (perceived) low bear population was the overriding reason for dissatisfaction with black bear hunting.

SATISFACTION WITH COUGAR HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY COUGAR HUNT

- The majority of cougar hunters (59%) were satisfied with their cougar hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season, while 27% were dissatisfied.
  - The primary reason that cougar hunters were satisfied with their cougar hunting was that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time.
  - The most common reasons for being dissatisfied with cougar hunting were that they did not see any cougars, that they cannot use hounds, and/or that they did not harvest a cougar.

HUNTING ON PRIVATE LANDS IN WASHINGTON AND PARTICIPATION IN PRIVATE LANDS ACCESS PROGRAMS

- A majority of all types of hunters (ranging from 52% to 75%) had hunted on private lands in Washington in the previous 3 years—particularly bird and waterfowl hunters. Between a fifth and a third (ranging from 19% to 33%) had hunted on private lands enrolled in a Department private lands access program in the previous 3 years—again, particularly bird and waterfowl hunters.
  - Most hunters on access program lands were satisfied with their hunting on those lands in the access program.

- Those hunters who hunted on access program lands were asked what they would do in the hypothetical absence of these access programs. Most typically, they would hunt the same as
they do currently, but there are a some, particularly among bird hunters, who say that they would hunt less than they do now.

- Those hunters who had not hunted on access program lands were asked why they had not done so. Many said that they had heard of such program lands but preferred other private lands for hunting or that they or that they do not know how to use them. From 21% to 40% of the various hunter types had not heard of the programs.

- One of the survey questions (previously reported within a series of questions about the importance of various things for general wildlife management) asked hunters to rate the importance of providing public access to private industrial timberlands. They overwhelmingly think this to be important (mostly very important): from 81% to 94% of the various hunter types say providing public access to private industrial timberlands is important.

HUNTING OUTSIDE OF WASHINGTON STATE
- Approximately a quarter of each type of hunter in the survey (ranging from 18% to 33%) say that typically they hunt outside of Washington state (but not necessarily exclusively).
  - Most out-of-state hunters hunt out-of-state for 15 days or less.
  - Typical game hunted out-of-state includes elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, and pheasant. Obviously, the particular species and the order differ among the various types of hunters.
  - Common reasons for hunting out-of-state include the perception that there is more and/or better game out-of-state or that hunting experiences are better out-of-state.

HUNTING EQUIPMENT
- Deer hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt deer (80% of them used rifles), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (16%), muzzleloader rifles (8%), and shotguns (5%).
Elk hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt elk (69%), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (18%) and muzzleloader rifles (15%).

Black bear hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt black bear (88%), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (14%).

Cougar hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt cougar (85%), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (12%) and muzzleloader rifles (8%).

**HARVEST OF WILDLIFE IN WASHINGTON**

Just under a third of deer hunters (32%) harvested a deer in Washington during the 2006-2007 season.

- Most deer hunters (83%) think it is important for a quality deer hunt to have a chance of harvesting a deer. The same percentage (83%) think it is important for a quality deer hunt to have a chance of harvesting a mature buck.

While the majority of elk hunters did not harvest an elk, 16% harvested an elk in Washington during the 2006-2007 season.

**HUNTING AVIDITY**

The survey asked hunters how many years they had hunted in Washington. They are fairly well distributed among the age groups.

The survey asked hunters how many days per year they typically hunt in Washington. Most of them typically hunt for 15 days or less.

Finally, in an avidity question of waterfowl hunters, nearly half of them (48%) hunted waterfowl for 10 days or less during the 2006-2007 season. The mean was 18.86 days.
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INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted for the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife (the Department) to determine hunters’ opinions on wildlife management in the state, as well as on selected hunting regulations and other hunting issues. The study entailed a telephone survey of Washington licensed hunters aged 12 years old and older. Specific aspects of the research methodology are discussed below.

For the survey, telephones were selected as the preferred sampling medium because of the universality of telephone ownership. In addition, a central polling site at the Responsive Management office allowed for rigorous quality control over the interviews and data collection. Responsive Management maintains its own in-house telephone interviewing facilities. These facilities are staffed by interviewers with experience conducting computer-assisted telephone interviews on the subjects of natural resources and outdoor recreation. The telephone survey questionnaire was developed cooperatively by Responsive Management and the Department. Responsive Management conducted a pre-test of the questionnaire and made any necessary revisions based on the pre-test.

To ensure the integrity of the telephone survey data, Responsive Management has interviewers who have been trained according to the standards established by the Council of American Survey Research Organizations. Methods of instruction included lecture and role-playing. The Survey Center Managers and other professional staff conducted project briefings with the interviewers prior to the administration of this survey. Interviewers were instructed on type of study, study goals and objectives, handling of survey questions, interview length, termination points and qualifiers for participation, interviewer instructions within the survey instrument, reading of the survey instrument, skip patterns, and probing and clarifying techniques necessary for specific questions on the survey instrument. The Survey Center Managers and statisticians monitored the data collection, including monitoring of the actual telephone interviews without the interviewers’ knowledge, to evaluate the performance of each interviewer and ensure the integrity of the data.

Interviews were conducted Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday noon to 5:00 p.m., and Sunday from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., local time. A five-callback design was used to maintain the representativeness of the sample, to avoid bias toward people easy to reach by telephone, and to provide an equal opportunity for all to participate. When a respondent
could not be reached on the first call, subsequent calls were placed on different days of the week and at different times of the day. The survey was conducted in December 2007 through February 2008. Responsive Management obtained a total of 931 completed interviews.

The software used for data collection was Questionnaire Programming Language 4.1 (QPL). The survey data were entered into the computer as each interview was being conducted, eliminating manual data entry after the completion of the survey and the concomitant data entry errors that may occur with manual data entry. The survey instrument was programmed so that QPL branched, coded, and substituted phrases in the survey based on previous responses to ensure the integrity and consistency of the data collection.

The survey was organized by species type, with questions designed specifically for deer, elk, game birds, waterfowl, black bear, cougar, and bighorn sheep/moose/mountain goat. For each species, the particular license types relevant to that type of species were sampled, and approximately 130 respondents were sampled for each species with two exceptions: first, for game birds, the sample was doubled to 260 to ensure a large enough sample size for several species within the “game bird” umbrella, such as wild turkey and pheasant; and second, the potential pool of bighorn sheep/moose/mountain goat hunters was very small, so an attempt was made to reach every one of these hunters rather than a sample from their entire pool.

The analysis of data was performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software as well as proprietary software developed by Responsive Management. Note that some results may not sum to exactly 100% because of rounding. Additionally, rounding on the graphs may cause apparent discrepancies of 1 percentage point between the graphs and the reported results of combined responses (e.g., when “strongly support” and “moderately support” are summed to determine the total percentage in support). On questions that allowed multiple responses, percentages are of those who gave a response.

A note about the layout of the report: some graphs pertain to more than one section, so these graphs are discussed in more than one section of the report. In these instances, the graph is shown only in one section, with a call-out in the other section indicating where the graph is located.
OPINIONS ON WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT IN WASHINGTON

OPINIONS ON WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT IN GENERAL

- Most hunters in the survey give positive ratings of their understanding of the Department’s game management in Washington: from 57% to 72% (depending on hunter type) rate their understanding excellent or good, while from 27% to 41% rate it fair or poor. At the extremes of the scale, for each hunter type, excellent ratings exceed poor ratings.

- Despite the positive ratings above, the majority of all types of hunters agree that the Department needs to make more or better information available for people to understand the Department’s game management practices.

- The overwhelming majority of all types of hunters (ranging from 74% to 84%) support (with most of them strongly supporting) using road closures to maintain healthy game populations during critical periods of the year. (This graph is shown in the section of the report titled, “Opinions on Cooperative Road Management Systems.”)

- The survey asked each group of hunters about the importance of eight strategies for general wildlife management in Washington. All but one (changing the current special permit drawing system) are considered important by each group, with majorities of each group considering each one very or somewhat important. The top-ranked strategy among each group is providing the public with information about game management activities. The lowest ranked among each hunter group is changing the current special permit drawing system.
Q38. How well would you say you understand game management by the Department of Fish and Wildlife? Would you say your understanding is excellent, good, fair, or poor?
Q39. Do you agree or disagree that the Department needs to make more or better information available for people to understand the Department's game management practices?
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Deer hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 77%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 70%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 61%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 55%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 50%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 49%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 45%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 30%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Deer hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 92%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 87%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 81%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 77%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 76%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 71%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 67%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 42%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Deer hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 26%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 25%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 15%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 12%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 11%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 10%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 6%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 5%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Deer hunters.)

- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 12 percent
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 9 percent
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 8 percent
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 8 percent
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 8 percent
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 5 percent
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 4 percent
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 3 percent
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Elk hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 63%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 57%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 55%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 51%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 50%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 48%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 44%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 28%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Elk hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 90%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 85%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 81%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 79%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 76%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 75%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 74%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 57%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Elk hunters.)

- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 20%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 17%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 13%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 11%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 9%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 9%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 7%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 6%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Elk hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 12%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 8%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 6%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 5%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 5%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 3%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 3%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 2%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bird hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 66%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 61%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 60%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 66%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 56%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 52%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 50%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 20%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bird hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 93%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 88%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 81%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 80%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 79%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 78%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 74%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 38%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bird hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 30%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 23%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 12%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 11%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 9%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 9%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 6%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 3%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bird hunters.)

- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 12%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 11%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 7%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 5%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 5%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 3%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 3%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 1%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Black bear hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 67%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 62%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 61%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 58%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 52%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 48%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 46%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 27%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Black bear hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 92%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 90%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 86%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 81%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 77%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 76%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 71%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 48%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Black bear hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 27%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 20%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 12%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 11%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 11%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 9%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 5%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 3%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Black bear hunters.)

- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 8%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 7%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 5%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 5%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 5%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 2%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 2%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 2%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Cougar hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 73%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 66%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 64%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 64%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 56%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 55%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 55%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 35%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Cougar hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 97%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 87%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 85%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 84%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 79%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 77%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 73%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 49%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Cougar hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 25%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 20%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 18%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 13%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 10%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 6%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 5%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 2%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Cougar hunters.)

- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 13%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 10%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 8%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 6%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 4%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 2%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 2%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 0%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Waterfowl hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 70%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 69%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 66%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 63%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 60%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 56%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 52%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 18%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Waterfowl hunters.)

- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 94%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 91%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 87%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 84%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 83%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 81%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 79%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 37%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Waterfowl hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 31%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 15%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 13%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 8%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 5%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 5%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 5%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 4%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Waterfowl hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 15%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 7%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 4%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 3%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 2%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 2%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 1%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 1%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bighorn sheep / moose / mountain goat hunters.)

- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 83%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 67%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 67%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 61%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 61%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 56%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 39%
- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 17%
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are important for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bighorn sheep / moose / mountain goat hunters.)
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bighorn sheep / moose / mountain goat hunters.)
Percent who indicated that the following strategies are very unimportant for general wildlife management in Washington. (Bighorn sheep / moose / mountain goat hunters.)

- Changing the current special permit drawing system: 22%
- Making agreements with Treaty tribes to improve cooperative management of game species: 11%
- Setting standards of fair chase to improve the image and acceptance of hunting: 6%
- Controlling the use of ATVs and snowmobiles for hunting: 6%
- Providing the public with information about game management activities: 0%
- Addressing wildlife-human conflicts to minimize property damage: 0%
- Hunting to manage game populations in urbanizing areas: 0%
- Providing public access to private industrial timberlands: 0%
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF DEER

- Deer hunters are nearly evenly split on their opinions of deer management by the Department: 50% rate it excellent or good, while 44% rate it fair or poor. At the extremes, excellent ratings (8%) are exceeded by poor ratings (20%).
  
  - Those who gave an excellent or good rating most commonly gave as their reasoning that they are satisfied with the job the Department is doing and that the Department is maintaining a good deer population.
  
  - Those who gave a fair or poor rating were asked why they rated it so low. The most common responses were that they are not satisfied with the job the Department is doing managing deer, that there is a (perceived) decline in the deer population, that the seasons are too short/or their timing is wrong, and/or that there are too many regulations or they are too confusing.
  
  - Another question in the survey asked how well deer hunters understand deer management by the Department, and excellent/good ratings (56%) exceed fair/poor ratings (41%). Note, however, that excellent ratings (13%) are about the same as poor ratings (11%). In another question pertaining to understanding deer management, a majority of deer hunters (59%) agree that they personally need more information to understand the Department’s deer management practices, while 36% disagree. Finally, when asked where they look for information on deer management, deer hunters most commonly say from the hunting regulations handbook, followed by from the agency website, from non-agency websites, from magazines, and from newspapers.
  
  - Trends: The percentage who rated the Department’s management of deer as excellent or good declined slightly from 2002 to 2008.
  
  - Trends: There is little change in ratings of how well deer hunters understand deer management among the two years of study.

- The survey asked deer hunters to rate the importance of five strategies for deer management in Washington. While all five are deemed important by the vast majority of deer hunters, three in particular are highly rated: enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer (89% rate this as very or somewhat important), meeting deer
population goals (85%), and increasing access to public and private lands for deer hunting (84%).

- **Trends:** There is only a little change in opinion on the importance for deer management of increasing access to private and public lands for deer hunting: while overall importance ratings are the same, a greater percentage in 2008 rate it *very* important at the expense of *somewhat* important, relative to 2002.

- **Trends:** There is little change between the years of study regarding the importance for deer management for the Department to enhance or increase wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer.

- **Trends:** There was a decline from 2002 to 2008 in the perceived importance of meeting deer population goals as a deer management strategy.

- When asked how they would prefer that the Department manage deer populations in Washington, the majority of deer hunters chose the middle answer: that they want to have a moderate buck harvest with some restrictions, resulting in some older, larger bucks in the herd (55% chose this answer). Otherwise, those wanting a low buck harvest, resulting in many older, larger bucks in the herd (21%) are about double those wanting a high buck harvest, resulting in mostly young, smaller bucks in the herd (11%).

- The large majority of deer hunters (68%) say that it is very or somewhat important that the Department provide late special permit buck hunts, while 23% say it is unimportant.

- A majority of deer hunters support (64%) the current 3-point antler restriction general season for mule deer in all of eastern Washington; meanwhile, 22% oppose. Regarding white-tailed deer, though, there is more opposition than for mule deer, with deer hunters split—44% support and 42% oppose—on a 3-point antler restriction general season for white-tailed deer in all of eastern Washington.

- In response to a question asking them to name the percentage of the state’s Game Management Units they would prefer to be under a 3-point antler restriction general season for white-tailed deer, deer hunters’ answers generally fall into the lower end of the scale: 14% want none of the Units under the restriction, 31% want half or less but more
than none of the Units under the restriction, and 15% want all Units under the restriction. Note that the most common answer is, “Don’t know” (39%).

Deer hunters are evenly split (42% support, and 42% oppose) on an “any-buck” general season for mule deer in eastern Washington. Note, however, that while support is evenly divided between strong and moderate, opposition is mostly strong opposition. Regarding an “any-buck” general season for white-tailed deer in eastern Washington, there is much more support (53%) than opposition (28%).

• In response to a question asking them to name the percentage of the state’s Game Management Units they would prefer to be under an “any buck” general season for mule deer, deer hunters’ answers generally fall into the lower end of the scale: 17% want none of the Units under an “any buck” general season for mule deer, 36% want half or less but more than none of the Units so designated, and only 5% want all Units under an “any buck” general season for mule deer. Note that the most common answer is, “Don’t know” (40%).

• In response to a question asking them to name the percentage of the state’s Game Management Units they would prefer to be under an “any buck” general season for white-tailed deer, deer hunters’ answers generally fall into the lower end of the scale (although not to the extent as for mule deer): 11% want none of the Units under an “any buck” general season for white-tailed deer, 27% want half or less but more than none of the Units so designated, and only 14% want all Units under an “any buck” general season for white-tailed deer. Note that, again, the most common answer is, “Don’t know” (42%).

Deer hunters give more support (45%) than opposition (34%) to a limited-entry, special permit only season for mule deer in eastern Washington. A substantial percentage (18%) don’t know.

• In response to a question asking them to name the percentage of the state’s Game Management Units they would prefer to be under a limited entry, special permit season for mule deer, deer hunters’ answers generally fall into the lower end of the scale: 11% want none of the Units under a limited entry, special permit season for mule deer, 34%
want half or less but more than none of the Units so designated, and only 4% want all Units under a limited entry, special permit season for mule deer. Note that the most common answer, at nearly half, is, “Don’t know” (49%).

- Deer hunters have slightly less support (32%) than opposition (37%) for a limited-entry special permit only season for black-tailed deer in western Washington. Note that more than a quarter (27%) don’t know.

- In response to a question asking them to name the percentage of the state’s Game Management Units they would prefer to be under a limited entry, special permit season for black-tailed deer, nearly all deer hunters’ answers fall into the lower end of the scale: 20% want none of the Units under a limited entry, special permit season for black-tailed deer, 22% want half or less but more than none of the Units so designated, and only 4% want all Units under a limited entry, special permit season for black-tailed deer. Note that a slight majority (53%) answered, “Don’t know.”

- A large majority of deer hunters (62%) say it is important (with most of them saying very important) to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives; meanwhile, 21% say it is unimportant. Cougar populations appear to be of even more concern to deer hunters, as 73% say it is important to reduce cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 17% say it is unimportant.

- Elk hunters were asked these same questions discussed immediately above, with similar results. A large majority of elk hunters (68%) say it is important to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 19% say it is unimportant. Regarding cougar populations, an overwhelming majority of elk hunters (79%) say it is important to reduce cougar populations as a tool to address deer cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 12% say it is unimportant. (These graphs are shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Elk.”)
Black bear hunters also were asked about managing black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. A large majority of black bear hunters (70%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Black Bear.”)

Cougar hunters were asked about reducing cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. An overwhelming majority of cougar hunters (81%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Cougar and on the Pilot Cougar Hound Hunt.”)
Q89. Overall, how would you rate the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's management of deer? Would you say it is excellent, good, fair or poor? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Excellent: 8
- Good: 42
- Fair: 24
- Poor: 20
- Don't know: 6

Percent (n=132)
68) / 89) Overall, how would you rate the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's management of deer? (Deer hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q90. What were the main reasons you rated the Department's management of deer so high? (Asked of deer hunters who rated the Department of Fish and Wildlife’s management of deer as excellent or good.)

- Satisfied with the job the Department is doing managing deer: 58%
- Maintaining a good deer population: 34%
- See enough game wardens which deter violators: 5%
- Had a good hunting experience: 3%
- Other: 5%
Q91. What were the main reasons you rated the Department's management of deer so low? (Asked of deer hunters who rated the Department of Fish and Wildlife’s management of deer as fair or poor.)

- Not satisfied with the job the Department is doing managing deer: 46%
- Decline in deer population: 25%
- Seasons too short / season timing wrong: 21%
- Too many and/or confusing regulations: 12%
- Too many other predators (e.g., cougars, bears): 4%
- Too many hunters in the field: 4%
- Other: 5%
- Don’t know: 5%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q103. In terms of deer population estimates, season setting, and harvest goals, how well do you understand deer management by the Department of Fish and Wildlife? Would you say your understanding is excellent, good, fair, or poor? (Asked of deer hunters.)
In terms of deer population estimates, season setting, and harvest goals, how well do you understand deer management by the Department of Fish and Wildlife?

(Deer hunters.)

- Excellent: 12, 13
- Good: 48, 43
- Fair: 32, 30
- Poor: 6, 11
- Don't know: 1, 3

2002 survey | 2007 survey
Q104. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement: I personally need more information to understand the Department's deer management practices. (Asked of deer hunters.)

![Bar chart showing responses to Q104]
Q105. From what sources do you look for information on deer management in Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Hunting regulations handbook: 41%
- Any agency websites: 20%
- Internet (agency website not mentioned): 18%
- Magazines: 13%
- Newspapers: 11%
- Word-of-mouth: 7%
- Meetings: 5%
- State's Department of Fish and Wildlife: 5%
- Other: 13%
- Don't know / don't look for information: 6%
Q94-98. Percent who indicated that the following strategies for deer management in Washington are very important for the Department to address. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer: 75%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for deer hunting: 71%
- Meeting deer population goals: 64%
- Using antler restrictions to meet buck-to-doe ratio goals: 60%
- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for deer: 47%
Q94-98. Percent who indicated that the following strategies for deer management in Washington are important for the Department to address. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer: 89%
- Meeting deer population goals: 85%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for deer hunting: 84%
- Using antler restrictions to meet buck-to-doe ratio goals: 77%
- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for deer: 73%
Q94-98. Percent who indicated that the following strategies for deer management in Washington are unimportant for the Department to address. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Using antler restrictions to meet buck-to-doe ratio goals: 16%
- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for deer: 15%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for deer hunting: 13%
- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer: 7%
- Meeting deer population goals: 7%
Q94-98. Percent who indicated that the following strategies for deer management in Washington are very unimportant for the Department to address. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for deer: 6%
- Using antler restrictions to meet buck-to-doe ratio goals: 5%
- Meeting deer population goals: 4%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for deer hunting: 3%
- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer: 3%
72) / 94) How important or unimportant for deer management is it for the Department to increase access to private and public lands for deer hunting? (Deer hunters.)

73) / 95) How important or unimportant for deer management is it for the Dept. to enhance or increase wildlife habitat on public and private lands for deer hunting? (Deer hunters.)
74) / 96) How important or unimportant for deer management is it for the Department to meet deer population goals? (Deer hunters.)

Percent

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Very important</th>
<th>Somewhat important</th>
<th>Neither important nor unimportant</th>
<th>Somewhat unimportant</th>
<th>Very unimportant</th>
<th>Don't know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>75</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2002 survey [ ] 2007 survey [ ]
Q99. How would you prefer that the Department manage deer populations in Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- **Allow a high buck harvest, with few restrictions and a long season, resulting in mostly young, smaller bucks in the herd**: 11%
- **Allow a moderate buck harvest, with some restrictions and a shorter season, which would result in some older, larger bucks in the herd**: 55%
- **Allow a low buck harvest, with stronger restrictions and a short season, which would result in many older, larger bucks in the herd**: 21%
- **Don’t know**: 12%

Percent (n=132)
Q100. How important or unimportant is it to you that the Department provide late special permit buck hunts? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Very important: 40
- Somewhat important: 28
- Neither important nor unimportant: 3
- Somewhat unimportant: 9
- Very unimportant: 14
- Don't know: 5

Percent (n=132)
Q109. Do you support or oppose the current 3-point antler restriction general season for mule deer in all of eastern Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Strongly support: 47%
- Moderately support: 17%
- Neither support nor oppose: 1%
- Moderately oppose: 8%
- Strongly oppose: 14%
- Don't know: 13%

Percent (n=132)
Q113. Do you support or oppose a 3-point antler restriction general season for white-tailed deer in all of eastern Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Strongly support: 25
- Moderately support: 19
- Neither support nor oppose: 4
- Moderately oppose: 14
- Strongly oppose: 28
- Don't know: 11

Percent (n=132)
Q114. What percentage of the state's Game Management Units would you prefer to be under a 3-point antler restriction general season for white-tailed deer? (Asked of deer hunters.)

Don't know: 39
0%: 14
1% - 24%: 12
25%: 3
26% - 49%: 6
50%: 10
51% - 74%: 0
75%: 0
76% - 99%: 0
100%: 15
Q110. Do you support or oppose an "any-buck" general season for mule deer in eastern Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Strongly support: 21
- Moderately support: 21
- Neither support nor oppose: 6
- Moderately oppose: 9
- Strongly oppose: 33
- Don't know: 10

(Percent n=132)
Q116. Do you support or oppose an "any-buck" general season for white-tailed deer in eastern Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- **Strongly support**: 34
- **Moderately support**: 19
- **Neither support nor oppose**: 5
- **Moderately oppose**: 14
- **Strongly oppose**: 14
- **Don't know**: 14

Percent (n=132)
Q111. What percentage of the state's Game Management Units would you prefer to be under an 'any buck' general season for mule deer? (Asked of deer hunters.)

![Bar chart showing the distribution of preferences for the percentage of Game Management Units under an 'any buck' general season for mule deer.]

- 100%: 5
- 76% - 99%: 2
- 75%: 0
- 51% - 74%: 1
- 50%: 16
- 26% - 49%: 7
- 25%: 3
- 1% - 24%: 11
- 0%: 17
- Don't know: 40

Percent (n=132)
Q117. What percentage of the state's Game Management Units would you prefer to be under an any-buck general season for white-tailed deer? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- 100%: 14
- 76% - 99%: 2
- 75%: 3
- 51% - 74%: 2
- 50%: 11
- 26% - 49%: 4
- 25%: 2
- 1% - 24%: 11
- 0%: 11
- Don't know: 42

(Percent n=132)
Q106. Do you support or oppose limited-entry, special permit only season for mule deer in eastern Washington? ( Asked of deer hunters.)

- Strongly support: 20
- Moderately support: 25
- Neither support nor oppose: 3
- Moderately oppose: 9
- Strongly oppose: 25
- Don't know: 18
Q107. What percentage of the state's Game Management Units would you prefer to be under a limited entry, special permit-only season for mule deer? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- 100%: 4
- 76% - 99%: 0
- 75%: 1
- 51% - 74%: 1
- 50%: 8
- 26% - 49%: 5
- 25%: 5
- 1% - 24%: 15
- 0%: 11
- Don't know: 49

(Percent n=132)
Q119. Do you support or oppose limited-entry, special permit only season for black-tailed deer in western Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Strongly support: 14
- Moderately support: 18
- Neither support nor oppose: 4
- Moderately oppose: 14
- Strongly oppose: 23
- Don't know: 27

(Percent n=132)
Q120. What percentage of the state's Game Management Units would you prefer to be under a limited-entry, special permit only season for black-tailed deer? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- 100%: 4
- 76% - 99%: 0
- 75%: 1
- 51% - 74%: 1
- 50%: 3
- 26% - 49%: 5
- 25%: 2
- 1% - 24%: 12
- 0%: 20
- Don't know: 53

Percent (n=132)
Q101. How important or unimportant is managing black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives? (Asked of deer hunters.)
Q102. How important or unimportant is reducing cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives? (Asked of deer hunters.)
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF ELK

- The majority of elk hunters (54%) rate the Department’s management of elk as excellent or good, while 42% rate it fair or poor; note that most of the ratings are moderate rather than extreme. Looking at the extremes of the scale, 8% give an excellent rating, while slightly more, 12%, give a poor rating.
  - Those who gave an excellent or good rating most commonly gave as their reasoning that they are satisfied with the job the Department is doing and/or that the Department is maintaining a good elk population.
  - Those who gave a fair or poor rating were asked why they rated it so low. The most common response was that they are not satisfied with the job that the Department is doing managing elk—the one reason that stood out among the rest.
  - Elk hunters are about evenly split on how well they say they understand elk management by the Department: 45% give an excellent or good rating of their understanding, while 50% give a fair or poor rating. Most ratings are moderate rather than extreme. A large majority of them (73%), however, agree that they need more information to understand the Department’s elk management practices (20% disagree). Finally, when asked to name the sources they look to for information about elk management in Washington, elk hunters most commonly look to the hunting regulations handbook; the web in general including, but not exclusively, agency websites; and word-of-mouth.
  - Trends: Understanding of elk management by elk hunters has apparently declined since 2002, as a smaller percentage rate their understanding as excellent or good in 2008, compared to 2002.

- The survey asked elk hunters to rate the importance of six strategies for elk management in Washington. While five of the six are deemed important by the vast majority of elk hunters, three in particular are highly rated: enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat for elk (85% rate this as very or somewhat important), increasing access to public and private lands for elk hunting (80%), and providing multi-season tag opportunities for elk hunting (75%). Managing shed antler hunting is the only strategy that is not deemed important—only 32% of elk hunters say this is important.
• Trends: There is only a little change in opinion on the importance for elk management of increasing access to private and public lands for elk hunting: while overall importance ratings are about the same, a greater percentage in 2008 rate it very important at the expense of somewhat important, relative to 2002.

• Trends: There is just a slight decline in importance ratings from 2002 to 2008 regarding the importance for elk management for the Department to enhance or increase wildlife habitat on public and private lands for elk.

The survey asked elk hunters about four elk management strategies pertaining to harvest objectives, asking if they support a low annual harvest of bulls (resulting in a cross-section of age classes, including some older bulls in the herd), a medium annual harvest, or a high annual harvest (resulting in a young age structure with a low number of mature bulls in the herd), as well as limited special permit hunting only, with no general season, resulting in a cross-section of age classes and the highest number of old bulls of the four options. The most support is for a low bull harvest, resulting in a cross-section of age classes, including some older bulls in the herd (64% support). This is followed by the 49% who support the medium harvest, resulting in a young age structure with a moderate to low number of mature bulls. There is less support for the other two options: 37% support limited special permit hunting only, and at the bottom of the ranking is the 27% who support a high harvest, resulting in a young age structure and a low number of mature bulls.

The survey asked elk hunters about a change to the hunting season for bull elk in the Blue Mountains that would result in more bulls being harvested but a lower chance of harvesting a bull elk over 3 years old. More elk hunters support (39%) than oppose (26%) this potential change in the regulations, with a substantial percentage answering that they do not know (21%).

A large majority of elk hunters (68%) say it is important to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 19% say it is unimportant. Regarding cougar populations, an overwhelming majority of elk hunters (79%)
say it is important to *reduce* cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 12% say it is unimportant.

- Deer hunters were asked these same questions discussed immediately above, with similar results. A large majority of deer hunters (62%) say it is important (with most of them saying *very* important) to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives; meanwhile, 21% say it is unimportant. Cougar populations appear to be of even more concern to deer hunters, as 73% say it is important to *reduce* cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 17% say it is unimportant. (These graphs are shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Deer.”)

- Black bear hunters also were asked about managing black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. A large majority of black bear hunters (70%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Black Bear.”)

- Cougar hunters were asked about reducing cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. An overwhelming majority of cougar hunters (81%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Cougar and on the Pilot Cougar Hound Hunt.”)
Q141. Overall, how would you rate the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's management of elk? Would you say it is excellent, good, fair, or poor? (Asked of elk hunters.)
Overall, how would you rate the Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife's management of elk? Would you say it is excellent, good, fair or poor?

(Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 survey</th>
<th>2007 survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q142. What were the main reasons you rated the Department's management of elk so high? (Asked of elk hunters who rated the Department of Fish and Wildlife's management of elk as excellent or good.)
Q143. What were the main reasons you rated the Department's management of elk so low? (Asked of elk hunters who rated the Department of Fish and Wildlife's management of elk as fair or poor.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Not satisfied with the job the Department is doing managing elk: 47%
- Too many and/or confusing regulations / rules: 8%
- Need more law enforcement / wardens in the field: 8%
- Seasons too short / season timing wrong: 8%
- Decline in elk population: 6%
- Tribal hunting has no restrictions: 6%
- Not enough access to hunting: 4%
- Other: 4%
- Don't know: 13%
Q160. In terms of elk population estimates, season setting, and harvest goals, how well do you understand elk management by the Department of Fish and Wildlife? Would you say your understanding is excellent, good, fair, or poor? (Asked of elk hunters.)
In terms of elk population estimates, season setting, and harvest goals, how well do you understand elk management by the Department of Fish and Wildlife?

(Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 survey</th>
<th>2007 survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Excellent</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Poor</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q161. Do you agree or disagree with the following statement? I personally need more information to understand the Department's elk management practices. (Asked of elk hunters.)
Q162. In which sources do you look to find information on elk management in Washington? (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Hunting regulations handbook: 35%
- Internet (agency website not mentioned): 25%
- Any agency websites: 20%
- Word-of-mouth: 17%
- Books / other publications: 9%
- Magazines: 9%
- Newspapers: 6%
- Any state agency department: 5%
- Other: 7%
- Don't know / don't look for information: 7%
Q146-151. Percent who indicated that the following efforts for elk management in Washington are very important for the Department. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat for elk: 72%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for elk hunting: 66%
- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for elk: 49%
- Addressing disturbance issues on winter range, such as shed-antler hunting, ORV use, or other recreational activities: 32%
- Providing quality bull elk hunting opportunities through restricting general season opportunities for hunting bulls: 32%
- Managing shed antler hunting: 17%
Q146-151. Percent who indicated that the following efforts for elk management in Washington are important for the Department. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat for elk: 85%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for elk hunting: 80%
- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for elk: 75%
- Providing quality bull elk hunting opportunities through restricting general season opportunities for hunting bulls: 62%
- Addressing disturbance issues on winter range, such as shed-antler hunting, ORV use, or other recreational activities: 61%
- Managing shed antler hunting: 32%
Q146-151. Percent who indicated that the following efforts for elk management in Washington are unimportant for the Department. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Managing shed antler hunting: 41%
- Providing quality bull elk hunting opportunities through restricting general season opportunities for hunting bulls: 25%
- Addressing disturbance issues on winter range, such as shed-antler hunting, ORV use, or other recreational activities: 22%
- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for elk: 21%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for elk hunting: 12%
- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat for elk: 7%
Q146-151. Percent who indicated that the following efforts for elk management in Washington are very unimportant for the Department. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Managing shed antler hunting: 25%
- Providing quality bull elk hunting opportunities through restricting general season opportunities for hunting bulls: 13%
- Addressing disturbance issues on winter range, such as shed-antler hunting, ORV use, or other recreational activities: 12%
- Providing multi-season tag opportunities for elk: 11%
- Increasing access to private and public lands for elk hunting: 7%
- Enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat for elk: 2%
115) / 146) What about increasing access to private and public lands for elk hunting? (How important or unimportant for elk management is it for the Department to increase access to private and public lands for elk hunting?)
(Elk hunters.)

116) / 147) What about enhancing or increasing wildlife habitat for elk? (How important or unimportant for elk management is it for the Department to enhance or increase wildlife habitat for elk?)
(Elk hunters.)
Q155-158. Percent who indicated strongly supporting the following Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife elk management strategies. (Asked of elk hunters.)

A lower annual harvest of males with higher than average antlerless harvest, which would result in a cross-section of age classes, including some old animals in the elk population

Limited special permit hunting only, with no general hunting season opportunity, which would result in a cross-section of age classes with highest number of old bulls in the elk population

A medium annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a moderate to low number of mature bulls

A higher annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a low numbers of mature males
A lower annual harvest of males with higher than average antlerless harvest, which would result in a cross-section of age classes, including some old animals in the elk population (64% support).

A medium annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a moderate to low number of mature bulls (49% support).

Limited special permit hunting only, with no general hunting season opportunity, which would result in a cross-section of age classes with highest number of old bulls in the elk population (37% support).

A higher annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a low numbers of mature males (27% support).
Q155-158. Percent who indicated opposing the following Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife elk management strategies. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- A higher annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a low numbers of mature males
- Limited special permit hunting only, with no general hunting season opportunity, which would result in a cross-section of age classes with highest number of old bulls in the elk population
- A medium annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a moderate to low number of mature bulls
- A lower annual harvest of males with higher than average antlerless harvest, which would result in a cross-section of age classes, including some old animals in the elk population
Q155-158. Percent who indicated strongly opposing the following Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife elk management strategies. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Limited special permit hunting only, with no general hunting season opportunity, which would result in a cross-section of age classes with highest number of old bulls in the elk population: 38%
- A higher annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a low numbers of mature males: 34%
- A medium annual harvest, which would result in a young age structure in the herd and a moderate to low number of mature bulls: 16%
- A lower annual harvest of males with higher than average antlerless harvest, which would result in a cross-section of age classes, including some old animals in the elk population: 12%
Q159. What about a change to the hunting season for bull elk in the Blue Mountains that would result in more bulls being harvested but a lower chance of harvesting a bull over 3 years old? (Would you support or oppose this Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife elk management strategy. (Asked of elk hunters.)
Q152. How important or unimportant is managing black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives? (Asked of elk hunters.)
Q153. How important or unimportant is reducing cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives? (Asked of elk hunters.)
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF GAME BIRDS

- The survey explained that the Department is considering a program to provide some areas where hunters can expect fewer other hunters and where those hunters who are there would have a good chance of seeing game birds. A large majority of game bird hunters (59%) would support limiting the number of hunters in these specific areas in order to implement the program; 35% would oppose. Similarly, a majority of these hunters (52%) would support a limit on the number of days per week these areas could be hunted to implement the program; 42% would oppose. If the number of hunters is to be limited, the majority of these hunters would prefer limiting the number of hunters by a first-come, first-served limited parking arrangement rather than through an advanced reservation arrangement.

- The large majority of pheasant hunters (70%) support having the Department provide quality pheasant hunting areas, which are areas where the number of hunters is limited and/or individual hunter harvest chance is increased; 22% oppose. Those who support were asked about options for implementation, and they are about evenly split between providing quality pheasant hunting areas by limiting the number of hunters in the area (39%) and limiting the number of days per week that an area could be hunted (45%). Also, those who support were asked to choose between limiting hunter numbers by a first-come, first-served limited parking arrangement (59%) or through an advanced reservation arrangement (30%), with the former getting more support than the latter.

- Pheasant hunters were asked how they thought funding should be allocated between spending for purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and spending on habitat enhancement. Overall, they think more should be spent on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant: the means are approximately 64% on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and 36% on habitat enhancement.

- In an open-ended question, wherein respondents could give any answer that came to mind and no list was read to them to prompt them, pheasant hunters were asked what they would change, if they could change one thing about the management of pheasant hunting in Washington. The most common answers are to improve habitat (26%), increase pheasant
populations (18%), make more land available for hunting (15%), and make a better 
arrangements between the Department and private landowners to open up private lands 
(14%).

- There is much more support (55%) than opposition (28%) for overlapping fall turkey season 
with fall big game season knowing that turkey hunting would still require using a shotgun or 
archery equipment. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on 
Hunting Seasons and Hunting Regulations.”)

- A majority of wild turkey hunters (54%) would support a hen-only fall season if either-sex 
turkey hunting in the fall resulted in fewer toms being available in the spring; 36% would 
oppose.

- Three-fourths of wild turkey hunters (75%) think it is important for turkey management to 
ensure that private lands are available for turkey hunting.

- Among those who have hunted game birds (“terrestrial” birds, as opposed to waterfowl), 
there is more support (54%) than opposition (37%) for requiring hunters to use non-toxic 
shot on all state wildlife area lands. However, these hunters are about evenly split (45% 
support and 47% oppose) on requiring non-toxic shot on all public lands. Finally, there is 
slightly less support (43%) than opposition (49%) to requiring non-toxic shot for all upland 
game bird hunting.
  - Trends: There is not much change in opinion on use of non-toxic shot for all upland 
game bird hunting between 2002 and 2008; while there is slightly less overall opposition 
in 2008, there is actually slightly more strong opposition.
Q210. The Department is considering a program to provide some areas where hunters can expect fewer other hunters and would have a good chance of seeing game birds. To do this, would you support or oppose improving hunter harvest by limiting the number of hunters in an area? (Asked of bird hunters.)
Q211. Would you support or oppose providing a hunt area with few other hunters and a good chance of seeing game birds by limiting the number of days per week an area could be hunted? (Asked of bird hunters.)

![Bar chart showing the responses to Q211.](chart.png)
Q212. Would you prefer hunter numbers to be regulated by advanced reservations or by first-come-first-served limited parking spots at a site? (Asked of bird hunters.)
Q224. Do you support or oppose the Department providing Quality Pheasant Hunting Areas, which are areas where hunter participation is controlled and/or individual hunter harvest chance is increased? (Asked of those who hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

- Strongly support: 37%
- Moderately support: 33%
- Neither support nor oppose: 5%
- Moderately oppose: 6%
- Strongly oppose: 16%
- Don't know: 4%
Q225. Would you prefer hunter harvest be improved by limiting the number of hunters in an area or by limiting the number of days per week an area could be hunted? (Asked of those who hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and support the Department providing Quality Pheasant Hunting Areas.)

Limiting the number of hunters in an area:
- 39%

Limiting the number of days per week an area could be hunted:
- 45%

Don't know:
- 16%
Q226. Would you prefer hunter numbers to be regulated by advanced reservations or by first-come-first-served limited parking spots at a site? (Asked of those who hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and support the Department providing Quality Pheasant Hunting Areas.)

- Advanced reservations: 30%
- First-come-first-served limited parking spots at a site: 59%
- Don't know: 11%
Q228. What do you think should be the percent of spending for purchase and release? (Asked of those who hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

- 76% - 100%: 39
- 51% - 75%: 9
- 26% - 50%: 18
- 0% - 25%: 8
- Don't know: 25

Mean = 63.73
Q230. What do you think should be the percent of spending for habitat enhancement? (Asked of those who hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

Mean = 35.95
Q234. If you could change one thing about pheasant hunting management in Washington, what would it be? (Asked of those who have hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

- Improve / more habitat: 26%
- Increase pheasant population (e.g., release and/or hatchery programs): 18%
- More lands available for hunting on: 15%
- Better relationship / arrangement with the Department and the private land owners (e.g., access to land, habitat enhancement): 14%
- Nothing: 12%
- Various changes in regulations (e.g., season(s), bag limits): 11%
- Other: 13%
- Don't know: 9%
Q245. If fall either-sex turkey hunting resulted in decreased availability of toms in the spring, would you support or oppose a hen-only fall season? (Asked of those who hunted wild turkey during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Count</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (n=48)
Q246. How important or unimportant for turkey management is it for the Department to ensure private lands turkey hunting opportunities? (Asked of those who hunted wild turkey during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

- Very important: 50%
- Somewhat important: 25%
- Neither important nor unimportant: 2%
- Somewhat unimportant: 8%
- Very unimportant: 13%
- Don't know: 2%

(Percent n=48)
Q207. What about requiring hunters to use non-toxic shot on all state wildlife area lands? (Asked of bird hunters.)

- Strongly support: 32%
- Moderately support: 22%
- Neither support nor oppose: 7%
- Moderately oppose: 10%
- Strongly oppose: 27%
- Don't know: 2%

Percent (n=260)
Q208. What about requiring non-toxic shot on all public lands? (Asked of bird hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Opinion</th>
<th>Percent (n=260)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (n=260)
Q209. What about requiring hunters to use non-toxic shot for all upland game bird hunting? (Asked of bird hunters.)
What about requiring hunters to use non-toxic shot for all upland game bird hunting? (Do you support this Washington Department of Fish and wildlife bird management strategy?)

(Game bird hunters.)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of hunters supporting or opposing the use of non-toxic shot for upland game bird hunting in 2002 and 2007 surveys.]
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF WATERFOWL AND OTHER MIGRATORY BIRDS

➢ Waterfowl hunters show great concern about wetlands, as a huge majority (94%) think it is important to address loss of wetlands due to development and conversion to other uses (and most of those—82%—think it is very important).

➢ Waterfowl hunters also show much concern for addressing the extensive backlog of unfunded habitat improvement projects in the state: 86% say this is important, with 66% saying it is very important.

➢ Waterfowl hunters show a similar level of concern for providing additional waterfowl hunting access in the Columbia Basin, Chehalis Valley, and Skagit area: 84% say this is important, with 60% saying it is very important.

➢ Most waterfowl hunters (60%) agree that the current prohibition on motorized waterfowl decoys should be continued, while 36% disagree. Note that most agreement and disagreement is strong, indicating a polarization of opinion.

➢ Waterfowl hunters are split over their perceptions of the importance of having the Department provide permanent waterfowl blinds on portions of public wildlife areas or private lands that the Department controls: 46% think this is important, and 44% think it is unimportant.

➢ The large majority of waterfowl hunters (78%) think it is important for the Department to provide open hunting areas without drawings, reservations, or specific hunting days on portions of public wildlife areas or private lands that the Department controls. Only 15% think this is unimportant.

➢ The survey asked waterfowl hunters about possible interference from other hunters on the Department’s wildlife area or private land controlled by the Department on which they hunted the most. Approximately a third of waterfowl hunters (32%) did not hunt on any such lands, and another 26% hunted on those lands but did not encounter many other hunters.
Otherwise, more of them said that they encountered other hunters that interfered with their hunting (25%) than said they encountered other hunters that did not interfere with their hunting (16%).

The survey asked waterfowl hunters four questions about ways to limit the number of waterfowl hunters on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls. For each possible way to limit the number of hunters, the survey asked hunters if they support or oppose that way. Two of the ways have at least half of the hunters in support: 51% support designating a fixed number of parking spaces to limit hunter numbers, and 50% support designating specific hunting days per week to limit hunter numbers. An advanced registration system (44% support) and daily drawings (34%) to limit hunter numbers do not have a majority’s support. In fact, daily drawings is the only with a majority in opposition.

Duck hunters were asked if they support or oppose a split duck season (entailing a closure in the middle of the season), if the number of duck season days needs to be reduced because of lower populations, and slightly more support (54%) than oppose (42%).

- Trends: There is less support overall for a split duck season in 2008, when compared to 2002, including much less strong support. Note the wording difference in the two questions: The 2002 asked if the respondent agreed with this statement: If duck season days need to be reduced due to lower populations, I would support a split duck season (a closure in the middle of the season) to provide some days early and some days later in the season, rather than a continuous season that opens in November.. Meanwhile, the 2008 wording asked about support or opposition, as shown on the graph.

A slight majority of goose hunters (51%) agree that the current goose season format in most of eastern Washington (Wednesdays, weekends, and holidays) provides better hunting than a 7-day per week season; however, 46% disagree.

- Trends: Disagreement is much higher in 2008 relative to 2002, at the expense of “Don’t know” responses; interestingly, agreement is about the same in the two years of study.
➢ The majority of waterfowl hunters (55%) could not say for what the money raised by the sale of state migratory bird stamps is used. Otherwise, their most common responses are that it is used for enhancing bird habitat on existing public lands (24%) or for purchasing bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation (21%). When asked to name which of the possible uses should be the top priority, waterfowl hunters are about evenly distributed among the four answers: 27% say the top priority for these funds should be purchasing migratory bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation, 25% say it should be for working with private landowners to gain migratory bird hunting access, 23% say it should be for enhancing migratory bird habitat on existing Department or other public lands, and 19% say it should be for working with private landowners to enhance migratory bird habitat.

➢ The survey informed waterfowl hunters that the funds from the sale of state migratory bird stamps can be used only for migratory bird habitat enhancements and that the funding has not been adequate to fund all proposed projects. In light of this, the survey asked waterfowl hunters if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the state migratory bird stamp from $10 to $15 to fund more projects, and support (72%) far exceeds opposition (22%). They were also asked if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the stamps to fund hunter access programs, and support (67%) exceeds opposition (29%).
Q256. How important or unimportant is addressing loss of wetlands and other habitats for migratory game birds, due to development and conversion to other uses? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Very important: 82
- Somewhat important: 12
- Neither important nor unimportant: 1
- Somewhat unimportant: 2
- Very unimportant: 2
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=131)
Q257. How important or unimportant is addressing an extensive backlog of unfunded habitat improvement projects? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)
Q258. How important or unimportant is providing additional waterfowl hunting access in the Columbia Basin, Chehalis Valley, and Skagit area? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Very important: 60%
- Somewhat important: 24%
- Neither important nor unimportant: 2%
- Somewhat unimportant: 5%
- Very unimportant: 1%
- Don't know: 9%

(n=131)
Q268. Do you agree or disagree that the current prohibition on motorized waterfowl decoys should be continued? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Strongly agree: 46
- Moderately agree: 14
- Neither agree nor disagree: 2
- Moderately disagree: 9
- Strongly disagree: 27
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=131)
Q270. How important or unimportant is it for the Department to provide permanent waterfowl blinds on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)
Q271. How important or unimportant is it for the Department to provide open hunting areas without drawings, reservations, or specific hunting days on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)
Q269. Regarding the Department's Wildlife Area or private land controlled by the Department where you hunted waterfowl most last season, please indicate which statement best reflects your opinion. (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Did not hunt a Department Wildlife Area or land controlled by the Department: 32%
- I encountered many other hunters in the area, which interfered with my hunting: 25%
- I encountered many other hunters in the area, but it did not interfere with my hunting: 16%
- I did not encounter many other hunters in the area: 26%
- Don't know: 1%
Q274-277. Percent who indicated strongly supporting the following ways to limit the number of waterfowl hunters on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls. (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)
Q274-277. Percent who indicated supporting the following ways to limit the number of waterfowl hunters on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls. (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Designating a fixed number of parking spaces to limit hunter numbers: 51%
- Designating specific hunting days per week to limit hunter numbers: 50%
- An advance reservation system: 44%
- Daily drawings to limit hunter numbers: 34%
Q274-277. Percent who indicated opposing the following ways to limit the number of waterfowl hunters on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls. (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)
Q274-277. Percent who indicated strongly opposing the following ways to limit the number of waterfowl hunters on portions of public Wildlife Areas or private lands that the Department controls. (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Daily drawings to limit hunter numbers: 42%
- An advance reservation system: 34%
- Designating specific hunting days per week to limit hunter numbers: 29%
- Designating a fixed number of parking spaces to limit hunter numbers: 18%
Q266. If the number of duck season days needs to be reduced because of lower populations, would you support or oppose a split duck season, which entails a closure in the middle of the season, to provide some days early and some days later in the season, rather than a continuous season that opens in November? (Asked of duck hunters.)

- Strongly support: 25
- Moderately support: 29
- Neither support nor: 4
- Moderately oppose: 15
- Strongly oppose: 27
228) / 266) If duck season days need to be reduced due to lower populations, would you support or oppose a split duck season, which entails a closure in the middle of the season, to provide some days early and some days later in the season, rather than a continuous season that opens in November? (Duck hunters.)
Q267. Do you agree or disagree that the current goose season format in most of eastern Washington, which is Wednesdays, weekends, and holidays, provides better hunting than a 7-day per week season? (Asked of goose hunters.)

- Strongly agree: 38
- Moderately agree: 13
- Moderately disagree: 21
- Strongly disagree: 25
- Don't know: 4

Percent
230) / 267) Do you agree or disagree that the current goose season format in most of eastern Washington, which is Wednesdays, weekends, and holidays, provides better hunting than a 7-day per week season? (Goose hunters.)

![Bar chart showing the distribution of responses to the question. The chart compares 2002 survey results with 2007 survey results.]

- Strongly agree: 2002 - 35%, 2007 - 38%
- Moderately agree: 2002 - 17%, 2007 - 13%
- Neither agree nor disagree: 2002 - 2%, 2007 - 0%
- Moderately disagree: 2002 - 11%, 2007 - 21%
- Strongly disagree: 2002 - 14%, 2007 - 25%
- Don't know: 2002 - 21%, 2007 - 4%
Q261. Do you know what the money raised from the sale of state migratory bird stamps is used for? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Enhancing bird habitat on existing public lands: 24%
- Purchasing bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation: 21%
- Working with private landowners to enhance migratory bird habitat: 10%
- Working with private landowners to gain migratory bird hunting access: 8%
- Any other answer: 8%
- Don't know: 55%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q263. Which of the following should be the top priority for the money from the sale of migratory bird stamps? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Purchasing migratory bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation: 27%
- Enhancing migratory bird habitat on existing department or other public lands: 23%
- Working with private landowners to gain migratory bird hunting access: 25%
- Working with private landowners to enhance migratory bird habitat: 19%
- None of these: 2%
- Don't know: 5%

(Percent based on n=131)
Q264. Money raised from the sale of state migratory bird stamps can only be used for migratory bird habitat enhancements and has not been adequate to fund all proposed projects. Do you support or oppose increasing the cost of the state migratory bird stamp from $10 to $15 to fund purchase and/or enhancement of migratory bird habitat? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

![Bar chart showing responses to Q264.]

- Strongly support: 43
- Moderately support: 29
- Neither support nor oppose: 5
- Moderately oppose: 7
- Strongly oppose: 15
- Don’t know: 1

Percent (n=131)
Q265. Do you support or oppose increasing the cost of state migratory bird stamps to fund hunter access programs? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Strongly support: 31
- Moderately support: 36
- Neither support nor oppose: 2
- Moderately oppose: 10
- Strongly oppose: 19
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=131)
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF BIGHORN SHEEP, MOOSE, AND MOUNTAIN GOATS

There were very few hunters in the state who had hunted for bighorn sheep, moose, or mountain goat; for this reason, the sample size is small. This fact should be kept in mind in examining the results below.

Hunters of these particular game were asked about potential methods for increasing the odds of drawing a permit to hunt one of these species. The most support is for the status quo—no change to the current drawing system (61%). Otherwise, 22% want to give hunters with more points a proportionally greater chance of drawing a permit. (Meanwhile, 17% do not know.)

- Several of the options have no support at all: none of these respondents indicated that they want to increase the application fee, limit the hunt choices to less than four, require a minimum number of points for entry into some hunts, or disallow hunters who apply for deer or elk special permits to also apply for special permits.

There is more support (55%) than opposition (34%) for allocating specific seasons for bighorn sheep, moose, and mountain goat for each weapon type use group.
Q279. Which of the following methods would you support for increasing the odds of drawing a permit for bighorn sheep, moose, or mountain goat? (Asked of those who hunted bighorn sheep, moose, or mountain goat during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

- Give hunters with more points a proportionally greater advantage for being selected. 22%
- I don't support a change and would like to maintain the current system. 61%
- Don't know 17%
Q280. Do you support or oppose allocating specific seasons for bighorn sheep, moose, and mountain goat for each weapon type user group, such as archery, muzzleloader, and modern firearm? (Asked of those who hunted bighorn sheep, moose, or mountain goat during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF BLACK BEAR

Those hunters who had purchased a bear-cougar license were asked which of five reasons best describes the reason they purchased a bear-cougar license. Most commonly, they said they primarily hunt deer or elk but purchased the license just in case they saw a bear or cougar while hunting other animals (37% chose this reason) or that they specifically purchased the license to hunt bear but also to have the license if an opportunity arose to hunt cougar (30%). Low percentages purchased the license specifically to hunt both bear and cougar (17%), specifically to hunt cougar (7%), or specifically to hunt bear (7%).

Black bear hunters were asked about managing black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. A large majority of black bear hunters (70%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives.

A large majority of deer hunters (62%) say it is important (with most of them saying very important) to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives; meanwhile, 21% say it is unimportant. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Deer.”)

A large majority of elk hunters (68%) say it is important to manage black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 19% say it is unimportant. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Elk.”)
Q203. Which of the following statements best describes your reason for purchasing a bear-cougar license. (Asked of those who purchased a bear-cougar license during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

- I purchased the license specifically to hunt cougar. 7
- I purchased the license specifically to hunt both cougar and bear. 17
- I purchased the license specifically to hunt bear, but also to have if I had an opportunity to hunt cougar. 30
- I purchased the license specifically to hunt bear and had no interest in cougar. 7
- I primarily hunt deer or elk, but I purchased the license just in case I saw a bear or cougar while hunting other animals. 37
- Don't know 3

Percent (n=30)
Q171. How important or unimportant is managing black bear populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives? (Asked of black bear hunters.)
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF COUGAR AND ON THE PILOT COUGAR HOUND HUNT

- As discussed in the previous section, those hunters who had purchased a bear-cougar license were asked which of five reasons best describes the reason they purchased a bear-cougar license. Most commonly, they said they primarily hunt deer or elk but purchased the license just in case they saw a bear or cougar while hunting other animals (37% chose this reason) or that they specifically purchased the license to hunt bear but also to have the license if an opportunity arose to hunt cougar (30%). Low percentages purchased the license specifically to hunt both bear and cougar (17%), specifically to hunt cougar (7%), or specifically to hunt bear (7%). (This graph is shown in the previous section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Black Bear.”)

- A majority of cougar hunters (51%) live within 10 miles of a place to hunt cougar in Washington. The median one-way distance to a place to hunt cougar is 10 miles; the mean distance (37.65 miles) is somewhat longer, being pulled upward by the 9% of cougar hunters who live more than 100 miles to the nearest place to hunt cougar in Washington.

- The majority of cougar hunters (66%) think it is important to have a cougar hound season in their local area, with most of them saying very important. Even more (84%) think it is important for cougar management purposes to allow hound hunting for cougar, again with most of those saying very important. Note, however, that a majority (74%) also think it is important for cougar management purposes to have a general cougar season without hounds.
  - Another question asked if cougar hunters support or oppose reducing general cougar seasons, when necessary, to add a cougar hound season, and support (57%) far exceeds opposition (35%). Note, however, that most opposition is strong.
  - On the other hand, support (44%) is about the same as opposition (47%) for closing general cougar seasons, when necessary, to add a cougar hound season.

- The survey asked cougar hunters about options to manage cougar. The survey first explained that one option for managing cougar is to use zone management, which entails dividing the state into zones and mandating a particular hunt method for each zone. The majority of
cougar hunters (61%) then indicated that they support zone management for cougars, with most of them saying that they *strongly* support. Nonetheless, 24% oppose.

- The most common reasons for opposition to zone management of cougar is simply that cougar hunters believe that cougar hunting regulations should apply statewide or that cougar hunters do not want more limitations on when and where to hunt.

➢ Another option for managing cougar discussed in the survey is a quota system. The survey first offered the following explanation: “To increase hunting opportunities by extending season dates while still maintaining adequate control of harvest, wildlife managers often use a quota system. Under a typical quota system, the season closes once enough animals have been harvested.” The survey then asked cougar hunters if they support or oppose a quota system for managing cougar, and the majority of cougar hunters (70%) support a quota system; meanwhile, 23% oppose.

- Common reasons for supporting the quota system for cougar are that it is perceived as logical and reasonable or that respondents support ensuring that cougar are not over-harvested.

- Common reasons for opposing the quota system for cougar are that some hunters do not want to limit the number of cougars killed, that they do not think enough cougars will be killed under a quota system, that they do not think it will work, or that they need set season dates in order to be able to plan hunting trips.

- Trends: Opinion is about the same regarding a quota system for managing the cougar harvest between the two years of study.

➢ The survey provided some information about the use of a quota system for cougar hunting in the past: “In the past, kill quotas for cougar have only been used for hound seasons in northeastern Washington. Using the quota system, hunters using dogs were required to call a toll-free phone number before they went hunting to make sure the season was still open. The state has considered combining the general cougar seasons with hound seasons, but would require general hunters to use the quota system and toll-free phone line also.” The survey then asked about support or opposition to using a quota system for general cougar season
timeframes without the use of dogs, and opposition (55%) far exceeds support (35%). Furthermore, most opposition is strong.

- Only 1 of the 128 cougar hunters had participated in the pilot cougar hound hunt in northeastern Washington. This small sample renders moot some of the results of subsequent questions. Nonetheless, this lone respondent strongly supports the pursuit season component that was used during the pilot cougar hound hunt. He/she also strongly supports the regulation to restrict the cougar hound hunt to only dog owners who own a dog capable of tracking and baying a cougar.

- Cougar hunters were asked about reducing cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives. An overwhelming majority of cougar hunters (81%) say such management is important as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives.

- Cougar predation appears to be of concern to deer hunters, too, as 73% say it is important to reduce cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 17% say it is unimportant. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Deer.”)

- An overwhelming majority of elk hunters (79%) say it is important to reduce cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives, while 12% say it is unimportant. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Elk.”)
Q182. How far is it, one-way, from your home to the nearest place to hunt cougar in Washington? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

More than 200 miles | 4
101 - 200 miles | 5
51 - 100 miles | 7
41 - 50 miles | 7
31 - 40 miles | 2
21 - 30 miles | 7
16 - 20 miles | 9
11 - 15 miles | 5
6 - 10 miles | 13
2 - 5 miles | 9
1 mile | 18
0 miles | 12
Don't know | 3

Mean = 37.65
Q181. Is it important to you to have a cougar hound season in your local area? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

- Very important: 53
- Somewhat important: 13
- Neither important nor unimportant: 4
- Somewhat unimportant: 13
- Very unimportant: 16
Q190. How important or unimportant for cougar management is it for the Department to allow hound hunting for cougar? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

- Very important: 68%
- Somewhat important: 16%
- Neither important nor unimportant: 1%
- Somewhat unimportant: 5%
- Very unimportant: 9%
- Don't know: 1%

(Percent n=128)
Q191. How important or unimportant for cougar management in Washington is providing a general cougar season without hounds? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

- Very important: 52%
- Somewhat important: 22%
- Neither important nor unimportant: 1%
- Somewhat unimportant: 11%
- Very unimportant: 11%
- Don't know: 3%

Percent (n=128)
Q200. Do you support or oppose reducing general cougar seasons when necessary to add a cougar hound season? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

- Strongly support: 30
- Moderately support: 27
- Neither support nor oppose: 4
- Moderately oppose: 7
- Strongly oppose: 28
- Don't know: 4

Percent (n=128)
Q201. Do you support or oppose closing general cougars seasons when necessary to add a cougar hound season? (Asked of cougar hunters.)
Q193. One option to manage cougar is to use zone management. The Department is considering dividing the state into about 6 cougar management zones and identifying a hunt method for each zone. Do you support or oppose zone management for cougar hunting? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>n=128</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (n=128)
Q194. Why do you oppose zone management for cougar hunting? (Asked of cougar hunters who oppose zone management for cougar hunting.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Should be statewide / no zones: 26%
- Don't want more limitations on where or when to hunt: 19%
- Don't think that the Department should manage this procedure: 16%
- Too complicated / too many regulations already: 13%
- No reason: 10%
- Prefer the current system: 6%
- Other: 16%

Percent
Q195. To increase hunting opportunities by extending season dates while still maintaining adequate control of harvest, wildlife managers often use a quota system. Under a typical quota system, the season closes once enough animals have been harvested. Do you support or oppose the use of a quota system for managing cougar harvest? (Asked of cougar hunters.)
204) / 195) To increase hunting opportunities by extending season dates while still maintaining adequate control of harvest, wildlife managers often use a quota system. Under a typical quota system, the season closes once enough animals have been harvested. Do you support or oppose the use of a quota system for managing cougar harvest? (Cougar hunters.)
Q196. Why do you support the use of a quota system for managing cougar harvest? (Asked of cougar hunters who support the use of a quota system for managing cougar harvest.)

- Reasonable / logical way to control population: 55%
- Don't want too many killed: 18%
- Current cougar population is too high / need to keep cougars under control: 7%
- Hound hunting may be reintroduced: 4%
- More opportunities to hunt: 2%
- Other: 8%
- No reason / don't know: 11%
Q197. Why do you oppose the use of a quota system for managing cougar harvest? (Asked of cougar hunters who oppose the use of a quota system for managing cougar harvest.)

- Number of cougars killed and/or season should not be limited: 23%
- Don't think enough cougars would be killed: 17%
- Don't think it will work: 13%
- Need set seasons to arrange time to hunt: 13%
- Worried that the counts would be wrong (e.g., population, harvest): 7%
- No reason: 7%
- Other: 17%
Q198. [The quota system was explained, as shown in text box below.] Do you support or oppose using a quota system for general cougar season timeframes without the use of dogs? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

EXPLANATION GIVEN:
In the past, kill quotas for cougar have only been used for hound seasons in northeastern Washington. Using the quota system, hunters using dogs were required to call a toll-free phone number before they went hunting to make sure the season was still open. The state has considered combining the general cougar seasons with hound seasons, but would require general hunters to use the quota system and toll-free phone line also.
Q180. Did you participate in the pilot cougar hound hunt in northeastern Washington? ( Asked of cougar hunters.)

Yes 1

No 99

Percent (n=128)
Q192. How important or unimportant is reducing cougar populations as a tool to address deer and elk populations that are not meeting objectives? (Asked of cougar hunters.)
OPINIONS ON THE MANAGEMENT OF WOLVES

- After being informed that wolves are highly likely to re-colonize Washington over the next 10 years, hunters were asked if they support or oppose having the Department manage wolves to be a self-sustaining population. Support exceeds opposition among every type of hunter except sheep/moose/goat hunters.
  - Common reasons for supporting include that the hunter likes wolves/that all wildlife deserves a chance to flourish, that wolves should be managed and controlled anyway, or that wolves should be managed so that they do not overpopulate.
  - Common reasons for opposing include concerns about potential damage to livestock and/or game and wildlife, that the respondent does not want wolves in the area, or that wolves are not manageable.
Q67. Wolves are highly likely to re-colonize Washington over the next 10 years. Do you support or oppose having the Department manage the wolves to be a self-sustaining population?
Q68. Why do you support? (Asked of those who support having the Department manage the wolves to be a self-sustaining population.)
Q69. Why do you oppose? (Asked of those who oppose having the Department manage the wolves to be a self-sustaining population.)

- Livestock, game and/or other wildlife populations would decline. (43% Deer, 49% Elk, 46% Bird, 49% Black Bear, 49% Cougar, 49% Waterfowl, 46% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Don't want/need any wolves in the area. (22% Deer, 30% Elk, 39% Bird, 28% Black Bear, 24% Cougar, 22% Waterfowl, 15% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Wolves are not manageable. Wolves have been known to be destructive. (15% Deer, 19% Elk, 15% Bird, 19% Black Bear, 16% Cougar, 15% Waterfowl, 11% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Don't think that the Department and/or any agency should manage the wolves. (11% Deer, 11% Elk, 11% Bird, 11% Black Bear, 11% Cougar, 11% Waterfowl, 11% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Don't think the Department could manage the wolves. (6% Deer, 8% Elk, 6% Bird, 8% Black Bear, 8% Cougar, 8% Waterfowl, 8% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Let the people manage the wolves and/or issue hunting licenses. (8% Deer, 8% Elk, 8% Bird, 8% Black Bear, 8% Cougar, 8% Waterfowl, 8% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Don't like/agree with the idea / bad idea. (3% Deer, 3% Elk, 3% Bird, 3% Black Bear, 3% Cougar, 3% Waterfowl, 3% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Human and wolf contact/conflicts would increase. (11% Deer, 11% Elk, 11% Bird, 11% Black Bear, 11% Cougar, 11% Waterfowl, 11% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
- Other. (8% Deer, 8% Elk, 8% Bird, 8% Black Bear, 8% Cougar, 8% Waterfowl, 8% Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)
OPINIONS ON FUNDING FOR HUNTING AND WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

The majority of waterfowl hunters (55%) could not say for what the money raised by the sale of state migratory bird stamps is used. Otherwise, their most common responses are that it is used for enhancing bird habitat on existing public lands (24%) or for purchasing bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation (21%). When asked to name which of the possible uses should be the top priority, waterfowl hunters are about evenly distributed among the four answers: 27% say the top priority for these funds should be for purchasing migratory bird habitat threatened with loss or degradation, 25% say it should be for working with private landowners to gain migratory bird hunting access, 23% say it should be for enhancing migratory bird habitat on existing Department or other public lands, and 19% say it should be for working with private landowners to enhance migratory bird habitat. (These graphs are shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Waterfowl and Other Migratory Birds.”)

The survey informed waterfowl hunters that the funds from the sale of state migratory bird stamps can be used only for migratory bird habitat enhancements and that the funding has not been adequate to fund all proposed projects. In light of this, the survey asked waterfowl hunters if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the state migratory bird stamp from $10 to $15 to fund more projects, and support (72%) far exceeds opposition (22%). They were also asked if they would support or oppose increasing the cost of the stamps to fund hunter access programs, and support (67%) exceeds opposition (29%). (These graphs are shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Waterfowl and Other Migratory Birds.”)

Pheasant hunters were asked how they thought funding should be allocated between spending for purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and spending on habitat enhancement. Overall, they think more should be spent on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant: the means are approximately 64% on purchase and release of pen-reared pheasant and 36% on habitat enhancement. (These graphs are shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Game Birds.”)
After being informed that the Department uses auction and raffle permits for big game species to enhance the funding level for activities like research, habitat improvement, and disease testing, more hunters want to expand auction and raffle permit programs than want to lessen them. However, most commonly they want to keep them the same as they currently are.

A majority (56%) of small game license holders (either a small game license or a small game with big game license) would support a $5 increase on their small game license to have the Department maintain and increase hunting access on private lands, but 40% would oppose. Common reasons for opposing are that the cost of a license is already high enough or that the respondent believes increasing prices will not help the Department better manage hunting.

- In follow-up, those who opposed a $5 increase as discussed above were asked how much effect such an increase would have on their subsequent decision on whether to buy a small game license in the future. Most of them (52%) say it would affect their decision, but 46% say it would not.
Q64. The Department uses auction and raffle permits for big game species to enhance the funding level for activities like research, habitat improvement, and disease testing. Do you think the Department should expand its auction and raffle programs, keep them at the same level, or lessen the auction and raffle programs?
Q49. Would you support or oppose a $5 increase on your small game hunting license to have the Department maintain and increase hunting access on private lands? (Asked of those who purchased a small game or small game with big game license during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)
Q50. Why are you opposed? (Asked of those who have purchased a small game or small game with big game license during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and who oppose a $5 increase on his/her hunting license to have the Department maintain and increase hunting access on private lands.)

- Cost of license already too high / already pay enough: 39%
- Department already does a poor job of management, so increasing prices will not help: 18%
- Money not going where it should: 7%
- Have own private land or friends / family have private land to hunt on: 7%
- Seasons are too short and/or not enough game to justify an increased cost of license: 7%
- Don't want to pay for something that doesn't apply to me: 5%
- Too many changes now / regulations too complicated already: 4%
- Other: 18%
Q51. How much effect would a $5 increase in your small game license have on your decision on whether to buy one in the future? (Asked of those who purchased a small game or small game with big game license during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and oppose a $5 increase on his/her hunting license to have the Department maintain and increase hunting access on private lands.)

- Strongly affect my decision: 32%
- Moderately affect my decision: 20%
- Not affect my decision at all: 46%
- Don’t know: 2%
OPINIONS ON HUNTING SEASONS AND HUNTING REGULATIONS

- For each type of hunter, support exceeds opposition for overlapping fall turkey season with fall big game season knowing that turkey hunting would still require using a shotgun or archery equipment; the most opposition is from cougar hunters.

- A slight majority of goose hunters (51%) agree that the current goose season format in most of eastern Washington (Wednesdays, weekends, and holidays) provides better hunting than a 7-day per week season; however, 46% disagree. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Waterfowl and Other Migratory Birds.”)

- Most waterfowl hunters (60%) agree that the current prohibition on motorized waterfowl decoys should be continued, while 36% disagree. Note that most agreement or disagreement is strong, indicating a polarization of opinion. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on the Management of Waterfowl and Other Migratory Birds.”)

- The large majority of hunters want the use of ATVs allowed for hunting, with restrictions, allowing them only for certain people (e.g., senior citizens) or situations (e.g., retrieving game).
Q65. Would you support or oppose overlapping fall turkey season with fall big game seasons knowing that turkey hunting would still require using shotgun or archery equipment?

![Bar chart showing hunters' opinions on wildlife management and other hunting issues in Washington.](chart)
Q66. Which statement best describes your opinion on the use of ATV's while hunting?

1. Should not be allowed at all.

2. Should be allowed only for certain people or situations, such as for seniors or for retrieval of game.

3. Should be allowed for most hunting activities.

4. Should be allowed for any hunting activities.

5. Don't know

Deer (n=132)
Elk (n=130)
Bird (n=260)
Black Bear (n=132)
Cougar (n=128)
Waterfowl (n=131)
Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
OPINIONS ON COOPERATIVE ROAD MANAGEMENT SYSTEMS

- More hunters support than oppose cooperative road management systems on public lands and private timberlands to reduce hunter crowding and disturbance of wildlife.

- The overwhelming majority of all types of hunters (ranging from 74% to 84%) support (with most of them strongly supporting) using road closures to maintain healthy game populations during critical periods of the year.
Q52. Do you support or oppose the cooperative road management systems on public lands and private timberlands to reduce hunter crowding and disturbance of wildlife? Or have you not heard of these systems?
Q53. Do you support or oppose using road closures to maintain healthy game populations during critical periods of the year?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Percent (n=132)</th>
<th>Deer (n=132)</th>
<th>Elk (n=130)</th>
<th>Bird (n=260)</th>
<th>Black Bear (n=132)</th>
<th>Cougar (n=128)</th>
<th>Waterfowl (n=131)</th>
<th>Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent (n=130)</th>
<th>Deer (n=130)</th>
<th>Elk (n=130)</th>
<th>Bird (n=260)</th>
<th>Black Bear (n=132)</th>
<th>Cougar (n=128)</th>
<th>Waterfowl (n=131)</th>
<th>Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent (n=260)</th>
<th>Deer (n=132)</th>
<th>Elk (n=130)</th>
<th>Bird (n=260)</th>
<th>Black Bear (n=132)</th>
<th>Cougar (n=128)</th>
<th>Waterfowl (n=131)</th>
<th>Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent (n=131)</th>
<th>Deer (n=132)</th>
<th>Elk (n=130)</th>
<th>Bird (n=260)</th>
<th>Black Bear (n=132)</th>
<th>Cougar (n=128)</th>
<th>Waterfowl (n=131)</th>
<th>Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Categories</th>
<th>Percent (n=18)</th>
<th>Deer (n=132)</th>
<th>Elk (n=130)</th>
<th>Bird (n=260)</th>
<th>Black Bear (n=132)</th>
<th>Cougar (n=128)</th>
<th>Waterfowl (n=131)</th>
<th>Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SATISFACTION AND DISSATISFACTION WITH HUNTING IN WASHINGTON

SATISFACTION WITH DEER HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY DEER HUNT

- Among deer hunters, satisfaction (64%) with deer hunting in Washington exceeded dissatisfaction (34%). Note, however, that most of those who were dissatisfied were very dissatisfied.
  - The most common reason for being satisfied was that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time. This was followed by the perception that the deer population was good and/or that the hunter harvested a deer.
  - Dissatisfaction was most commonly because of a (perceived) low deer population, that the season was too short, or that there were not enough places to hunt or to access hunting lands.
  - Trends: Satisfaction with deer hunting has slightly declined from 2002 to 2008. Regarding particular reasons, more in 2008 say there are not enough deer, but fewer say that there are too many hunters in the field.

- Deer hunters were asked about the importance of seven factors in having a quality deer hunting experience. Four of the seven have a markedly higher percentage of deer hunters who say that they are very important for a quality deer hunting experience: the timing of the season (80% think this is very important), spending time with friends (80%), spending time with family (78%), and the length of the hunting season (70%). The number of other hunters (53%) and opportunities to harvest a mature buck (49%) or to harvest at all (48%) are not as important.
  - When asked in an open-ended question (meaning that the respondent could say anything that came to mind and that no pre-set list was read to them) if they could change one thing to improve the quality of deer hunting, deer hunters most commonly said longer seasons and/or later seasons.
  - Trends: There is little change in opinion on the importance of the length of the hunting season between 2002 and 2008.
  - Trends: The timing of the hunting season is more important in 2008, relative to 2002.
• Trends: There is little change in opinion on the importance of a chance of harvesting a deer between 2002 and 2008.

• Trends: Of less importance in 2008 relative to 2002 is the number of other hunters in the field.

• Trends: Note there was a change in wording from 2002 to 2008. The 2002 survey asked about the importance of spending time with family and friends; the 2008 survey asked about family and friends separately. These trends graphs are shown, with little change in the importance of this between the two years of study.

• Trends: Of slightly more importance in 2008 relative to 2002 is the opportunity to harvest a mature buck.
Q75. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your deer hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Very satisfied: 31
- Somewhat satisfied: 33
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 2
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 9
- Very dissatisfied: 25
- Don't know: 1

Percent (n=132)
41) / 75) Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your deer hunting in Washington during the 2000/2006-2007 season? (Deer hunters.)

!!!chart!!!

- Somewhat satisfied: 26% (2002), 33% (2007)
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 1% (2002), 2% (2007)
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 10% (2002), 9% (2007)
- Don't know: 1% (2002), 1% (2007)
Q76. Why were you satisfied with your deer hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those deer hunters who were satisfied with their deer hunting.)

- Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time: 48%
- Good deer population: 23%
- Harvested a deer: 20%
- Time alone / quiet and peaceful: 5%
- Saw a few deer: 5%
- Spent time with family: 5%
- Other: 6%
Q77. Why were you dissatisfied with your deer hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of deer hunters who were dissatisfied with their deer hunting.)

- Low deer population: 38%
- Season too short / need more seasons: 13%
- Not enough places to hunt and/or access to hunting areas: 13%
- Season too early: 9%
- Poor management by the Department: 9%
- Bad weather: 7%
- Did not have enough time to hunt often: 7%
- Not successful in harvesting a deer: 7%
- Too many hunters in the field: 7%
- Other: 4%
46) / 77) Why were you dissatisfied with your deer hunting in Washington during the 2000/2006-2007 season? (Of those dissatisfied.)
(Deer hunters.)

- Not enough deer in general
- Too many hunters in the field
- Had little/no time to hunt
- Not enough places to hunt
- Did not harvest a deer

Multiple Responses Allowed

2002 survey 2007 survey
Q81-87. Percent who indicated that to have a quality deer hunting experience, the following factors are very important. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- The timing of the hunting season: 80%
- Spending time with friends: 80%
- Spending time with family: 78%
- The length of the hunting season: 70%
- The number of other deer hunters in the field: 53%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature buck: 49%
- The chance of harvesting a deer: 48%
Q81-87. Percent who indicated that to have a quality deer hunting experience, the following factors are important. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- The timing of the hunting season: 96%
- Spending time with friends: 93%
- The length of the hunting season: 90%
- Spending time with family: 86%
- The chance of harvesting a deer: 83%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature buck: 83%
- The number of other deer hunters in the field: 75%
Q81-87. Percent who indicated that to have a quality deer hunting experience, the following factors are unimportant. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- The number of other deer hunters in the field: 17%
- The chance of harvesting a deer: 14%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature buck: 14%
- Spending time with family: 12%
- The length of the hunting season: 6%
- Spending time with friends: 6%
- The timing of the hunting season: 2%
Q81-87. Percent who indicated that to have a quality deer hunting experience, the following factors are very unimportant. (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Spending time with family: 8%
- The number of other deer hunters in the field: 7%
- The chance of harvesting a deer: 6%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature buck: 5%
- Spending time with friends: 2%
- The length of the hunting season: 1%
- The timing of the hunting season: 0%
59) / 81) What about the length of the hunting season? (How important is this to having a quality deer hunting experience?)

(Deer hunters.)

60) / 82) What about the timing of the hunting season? (How important is this to having a quality deer hunting experience?)

(Deer hunters.)
61) / 83) What about the chance of harvesting a deer? (How important is this to having a quality deer hunting experience?)
(Deer hunters.)

62) / 84) What about the number of other deer hunters in the field? (How important is this to having a quality deer hunting experience?)
(Deer hunters.)
63) / 85) What about spending time with family and friends / family?
(How important is this to having a quality deer hunting experience?)
(Deer hunters.)
64) / 87) What about the opportunity to harvest a mature buck? (How important is this to having a quality deer hunting experience?)

(Deer hunters.)

![Survey Results Chart]

- **2002 Survey**
  - Very important: 41%
  - Somewhat important: 38%
  - Somewhat unimportant: 13%
  - Very unimportant: 8%

- **2007 Survey**
  - Very important: 49%
  - Somewhat important: 34%
  - Somewhat unimportant: 9%
  - Very unimportant: 5%
Q88. If you could change only one thing to improve the quality of your deer hunt what would that be? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Longer season(s): 24%
- Later season(s): 21%
- Better game management practices: 12%
- Increase deer populations: 8%
- Better / more access to hunting: 5%
- Fewer restrictions (e.g., make a 2-point legal, abolish lottery, more special permits): 5%
- Reduce the number of hunters in the field: 5%
- More hunting areas: 4%
- Other: 12%
- Don't know: 11%

Percent
SATISFACTION WITH ELK HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY ELK HUNT

Among elk hunters, satisfaction (68%) with elk hunting in Washington exceeded dissatisfaction (28%).

- The most common reason for being satisfied was that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time. This was followed by that they harvested an elk and/or that they think the elk population is good.
- Dissatisfaction was most commonly because of a (perceived) low elk population, that there were not enough places to hunt or to access hunting lands, that they were not successful in harvesting an elk, and/or that the season was too early.
- Trends: Satisfaction with elk hunting is about the same between the two years of study (64% were satisfied in 2002; 68% were satisfied in 2008). Reasons for dissatisfaction differ slightly, with not enough elk and not harvesting an elk slightly greater in 2008 relative to 2002; hunter crowding, on the other hand, was greater in 2002.

Elk hunters were asked about the importance of seven factors in having a quality elk hunting experience. Two of the seven have a markedly higher percentage of elk hunters who say that they are very important for a quality elk hunting experience: spending time with family (72% think this is very important) and spending time with friends (72%). The least important is having a low number of other elk hunters in the field (47%).

- When asked in an open-ended question (meaning that the respondent could say anything that came to mind and that no pre-set list was read to them) if they could change one thing to improve the quality of elk hunting, elk hunters most commonly said better game management practices, later seasons, and/or longer seasons.
- Trends: There is little change in opinion on the importance of the length of the hunting season between 2002 and 2008.
- Trends: The timing of the hunting season is just slightly more important in 2008, relative to 2002.
- Trends: Of slightly less importance in 2008 relative to 2002 is the number of other hunters in the field.
• Trends: Note there was a change in wording from 2002 to 2008. The 2002 survey asked about the importance of spending time with family and friends; the 2008 survey asked about family and friends separately. These trends graphs are shown, with little change in the importance of this between the two years of study, with most of the variation in very important and somewhat important rather than in total importance.

• Trends: Of more importance in 2008 relative to 2002 is the opportunity to harvest a mature bull.
Q127. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your elk hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of elk hunters.)

Very satisfied: 30
Somewhat satisfied: 38
Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 2
Somewhat dissatisfied: 10
Very dissatisfied: 18
Don't know: 1

Percent (n=130)
Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your elk hunting in Washington during the 2000/2006-2007 season?

(Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q128. Why were you satisfied with your elk hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of elk hunters who were satisfied with their elk hunting.)

- Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time: 51%
- Harvested an elk: 23%
- Good elk population: 17%
- Regulations working (e.g., not too many hunters, road closures, special permits): 5%
- Good hunting experience but elk numbers were low: 3%
- Other: 7%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent
Q129. Why were you dissatisfied with your elk hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of elk hunters who were dissatisfied with their elk hunting.)

- Low elk population: 38%
- Not enough places to hunt and/or access to hunting areas: 14%
- Not successful in harvesting an elk: 14%
- Season too early: 11%
- Poor management by the Department: 8%
- Too many hunters in the field: 8%
- Bad weather: 8%
- Other: 8%

Multiple Responses Allowed
89) / 129) Why were you dissatisfied with your elk hunting in Washington during the 2000/2006-2007 season? (Of those dissatisfied.)
(Elk hunters.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not enough elk in general</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Too many hunters in the field</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Did not harvest a elk</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q133-139. Percent who indicated that to have a quality elk hunting experience, the following factors are very important. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Spending time with family: 72%
- Spending time with friends: 72%
- The timing of the hunting season: 62%
- The length of the hunting season: 59%
- The chance of harvesting an elk: 56%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature bull: 55%
- Having a low number of other elk hunters in the field: 47%
Q133-139. Percent who indicated that to have a quality elk hunting experience, the following factors are important. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Spending time with friends: 92%
- The timing of the hunting season: 90%
- The chance of harvesting an elk: 90%
- The length of the hunting season: 86%
- Spending time with family: 85%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature bull: 83%
- Having a low number of other elk hunters in the field: 73%
Q133-139. Percent who indicated that to have a quality elk hunting experience, the following factors are unimportant. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Having a low number of other elk hunters in the field: 16%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature bull: 13%
- Spending time with family: 9%
- The chance of harvesting an elk: 8%
- The length of the hunting season: 6%
- The timing of the hunting season: 5%
- Spending time with friends: 2%
Q133-139. Percent who indicated that to have a quality elk hunting experience, the following factors are very unimportant. (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Having a low number of other elk hunters in the field: 6%
- Spending time with family: 5%
- The chance of harvesting an elk: 3%
- The opportunity to harvest a mature bull: 3%
- The timing of the hunting season: 2%
- Spending time with friends: 2%
- The length of the hunting season: 1%
102) / 133) What about the length of the hunting season? (How important or unimportant to you is the length of the hunting season in having a quality elk hunting experience?)
(Elk hunters.)

103) / 134) What about the timing of the hunting season? (How important or unimportant to you is the timing of the hunting season in having a quality elk hunting experience?)
(Elk hunters.)
104) / 135) What about the chance of harvesting an elk? (How important or unimportant to you is the chance of harvesting an elk in having a quality elk hunting experience?)
(Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unimportant</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

105) / 136) What about having a low number of other elk hunters in the field? (How important or unimportant to you is having a low number of other elk hunters in the field in having a quality elk hunting experience?)
(Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unimportant</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
106) / 137) What about spending time with family and friends / family? (How important or unimportant to you is spending time with family in having a quality elk hunting experience?) (Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unimportant</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

106) / 138) What about spending time with family and friends / friends? (How important or unimportant to you is spending time with family in having a quality elk hunting experience?) (Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td>72%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>8%</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unimportant</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
107) / 139) What about the opportunity to harvest a mature bull? (How important or unimportant to you is the opportunity to harvest a mature bull in having a quality elk hunting experience?)

(Elk hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Importance Level</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very important</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat important</td>
<td>34%</td>
<td>28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat unimportant</td>
<td>16%</td>
<td>10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very unimportant</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- 2002 survey
- 2007 survey
Q140. If you could change only one thing to improve the quality of your elk hunt what would that be? (Asked of elk hunters.)

![Bar chart showing responses to Q140]

- Better game management practices: 16
- Later season(s): 14
- Longer season(s): 12
- More hunting areas: 9
- Nothing: 9
- Better chance of harvesting a mature bull: 7
- Better / more access to hunting: 5
- Increase elk population: 4
- Stricter regulations (e.g., more road closures, limit seasons or permits): 4
- Other: 11
- Don't know: 6
SATISFACTION WITH GAME BIRD HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY BIRD HUNT

- A large majority of game bird hunters (87%) indicated that they had hunted pheasant in eastern Washington in the 2006-2007 season.

- Pheasant hunters were slightly more satisfied than dissatisfied with pheasant hunting in eastern Washington: 53% were satisfied, but 41% were dissatisfied.
  - Common reasons for being satisfied were that they perceived the bird population to be good, that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time, and/or that the respondent harvested a bird.
  - The overriding reason for being dissatisfied was a (perceived) low pheasant population.
  - Trends: Satisfaction with eastern Washington pheasant hunting is about the same between 2002 and 2008; overall dissatisfaction is about the same, although 2008 saw a switch from very dissatisfied to just moderately dissatisfied among many hunters.

- Quail hunters were overwhelmingly satisfied with their quail hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season: 78% were satisfied, and only 14% were dissatisfied.
  - Common reasons for being satisfied were that they perceived the quail population to be good, that the hunter harvested a quail, and/or that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time.
  - Dissatisfaction was most commonly because of a (perceived) low quail population.
  - Trends: Satisfaction with quail hunting has declined slightly from 2002 to 2008.

- Wild turkey hunters were overwhelmingly satisfied with their wild turkey hunting in Washington in 2006-2007: 92% were satisfied, with most of those being very satisfied.
  - Common reasons for being satisfied were that they perceived the wild turkey population to be good, that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time, and/or that the respondent harvested a turkey.
  - The sample size of dissatisfied turkey hunters was too small for results to be presented.
  - Trends: Satisfaction with wild turkey hunting has declined markedly from 2002 to 2008.
Hunters who had hunted game birds were asked about the importance of three things for a quality bird hunting experience. Of the three, having maps of available public and private hunting lands is the highest rated in importance, with 70% saying this is very important. The other two factors have lower ratings: 40% say it is very important to have no access restrictions on bird hunting opportunities, and 25% say it is very important to have a guaranteed place to hunt through a reservation (indeed, this last one has more saying it is very unimportant—26%).
Q220. Did you hunt pheasant in eastern Washington in the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of bird hunters.)

- Yes: 87%
- No: 11%
- Don't know: 2%
Q221. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your eastern Washington pheasant hunting during the 2006-07 season? (Asked of those who hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)
Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your eastern Washington pheasant hunting during the 2000/2006-07 season? (Pheasant hunters.)

![Bar chart showing percentages of responses to the satisfaction question. The chart compares responses from 2002 and 2007 surveys. The categories are: Very satisfied, Somewhat satisfied, Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied, Somewhat dissatisfied, Very dissatisfied, Don't know. The percentages are as follows:

2002 survey:
- Very satisfied: 29%
- Somewhat satisfied: 28%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 0%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 13%
- Very dissatisfied: 33%
- Don't know: 4%

2007 survey:
- Very satisfied: 22%
- Somewhat satisfied: 25%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 6%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 20%
- Very dissatisfied: 21%
- Don't know: 0%]
Q222. Why were you satisfied with your eastern Washington pheasant hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those who have hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and were satisfied with their pheasant hunting.)

- Good bird population: 51%
- Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time: 27%
- Harvested a bird: 24%
- Other: 16%
- Not too many hunters in the field: 7%
- Access to private land: 5%
Q223. Why were you dissatisfied with your eastern Washington pheasant hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those who have hunted pheasant during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and were dissatisfied with their pheasant hunting.)

- Low / lack of pheasant population: 77%
- Not enough places to hunt: 12%
- Loss of / unmanged habitat: 9%
- Didn't harvest a bird: 5%
- Other: 16%
Q237. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your quail hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those who hunted quail during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>Percent (n=73)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your quail hunting in Washington during the 2000/2006-07 season? (Quail hunters.)

- Very satisfied: 2002 survey = 44%, 2007 survey = 47%
- Somewhat satisfied: 2002 survey = 44%, 2007 survey = 34%
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 2002 survey = 0%, 2007 survey = 5%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 2002 survey = 6%, 2007 survey = 10%
- Very dissatisfied: 2002 survey = 3%, 2007 survey = 4%
- Don't know: 2002 survey = 0%, 2007 survey = 3%

Legend: ■ 2002 survey □ 2007 survey
Q238. Why were you satisfied with your quail hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those who have hunted quail during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and were satisfied with their quail hunting.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Good quail population: 63
- Harvested a quail: 19
- Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time: 19
- Access to private land: 2
- Not too many hunters in the field: 2
- Other: 11
Q239. Why were you dissatisfied with your quail hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those who have hunted quail during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and were dissatisfied with their quail hunting.)

- Low / lack of quail population: 60%
- Not enough places to hunt: 20%
- Bad year / unlucky: 20%
Q242. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your wild turkey hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those who hunted wild turkey during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington.)

- Very satisfied: 63%
- Somewhat satisfied: 29%
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 4%
- Very dissatisfied: 4%
Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your wild turkey hunting in Washington during the 2006-07 season? (Wild turkey hunters.)

**2002 survey**
- Very satisfied: 45
- Somewhat satisfied: 30
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 29
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 15
- Very dissatisfied: 6
- Don't know: 3

**2007 survey**
- Very satisfied: 63
- Somewhat satisfied: 29
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 0
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 4
- Very dissatisfied: 4
- Don't know: 0
Q243. Why were you satisfied with your wild turkey hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of those who have hunted wild turkey during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington and were satisfied with their wild turkey hunting.)

- **Good turkey population**: 45%
- **Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time**: 32%
- **Harvested a turkey**: 20%
- **Access to private land**: 9%
- **Not too many hunters in the field**: 7%
- **Other**: 14%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q215-217. Percent who indicated that to have a quality bird hunting experience, the following factors are very important. (Asked of bird hunters.)

- Having maps of available public and private hunting lands: 70%
- Having no access restrictions on bird hunting opportunities: 40%
- Having a guaranteed place to hunt by reservation: 25%
Q215-217. Percent who indicated that to have a quality bird hunting experience, the following factors are important. (Asked of bird hunters.)

- Having maps of available public and private hunting lands: 88%
- Having no access restrictions on bird hunting opportunities: 64%
- Having a guaranteed place to hunt by reservation: 47%
Q215-217. Percent who indicated that to have a quality bird hunting experience, the following factors are unimportant. (Asked of bird hunters.)

- Having a guaranteed place to hunt by reservation: 45%
- Having no access restrictions on bird hunting opportunities: 22%
- Having maps of available public and private hunting lands: 10%
Q215-217. Percent who indicated that to have a quality bird hunting experience, the following factors are very unimportant. (Asked of bird hunters.)

- Having a guaranteed place to hunt by reservation: 26%
- Having no access restrictions on bird hunting opportunities: 9%
- Having maps of available public and private hunting lands: 7%
SATISFACTION WITH WATERFOWL HUNTING

- The overwhelming majority of waterfowl hunters (79%) were satisfied with their waterfowl hunting in Washington during 2006-2007; meanwhile, 18% were dissatisfied.

- Common reasons for being satisfied were that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time, that they harvested waterfowl, and/or that they perceived the population to be good.

- The most common reasons for dissatisfaction were a (perceived) low waterfowl population, that there were not enough places to hunt or to access hunting lands, and/or a lack of habitat.

- Trends: Satisfaction with waterfowl hunting has substantially increased from 2002 to 2008, particularly the percentage who are very satisfied.
Q249. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your waterfowl hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Very satisfied: 44
- Somewhat satisfied: 35
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 3
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 11
- Very dissatisfied: 7

(Percent n=131)
Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your waterfowl hunting in Washington during the 2000/2006-07 season? (Waterfowl hunters.)
Q250. Why were you satisfied with your waterfowl hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

- Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time: 38%
- Harvested a waterfowl: 32%
- Good waterfowl population: 23%
- Good places / access to hunt: 12%
- Not too many hunters in the field: 4%
- No reason: 3%
- Spent time with family: 2%
- Other: 9%
Q251. Why were you dissatisfied with your waterfowl hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of waterfowl hunters who were dissatisfied with their waterfowl hunting.)

- Low / lack of waterfowl population: 52%
- Not enough places / access to hunt: 17%
- Lack of habitat / lack of water: 13%
- Bad weather: 9%
- Problems with other hunters: 9%
- Didn't harvest any waterfowl: 4%
- Other: 17%
SATISFACTION WITH BLACK BEAR HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY BLACK BEAR HUNT

The majority of black bear hunters (68%) were satisfied with their black bear hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season; 26% were dissatisfied.

- Among black bear hunters, two reasons stand out for being satisfied with their black bear hunting: that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time and that they perceive the black bear population to be good.

- A (perceived) low bear population was the overriding reason for dissatisfaction with black bear hunting.

- Trends: Satisfaction with black bear hunting has increased in 2008, relative to 2002, particularly the percentage who are very satisfied.
Q168. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your black bear hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of black bear hunters.)

- Very satisfied: 29
- Somewhat satisfied: 39
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 7
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 19
- Very dissatisfied: 6

Percent (n=132)
188) / 168) Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your black bear hunting in Washington during the 2006-07 season? (Black bear hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfied Level</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q169. Why were you satisfied with your black bear hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of black bear hunters who were satisfied with their black bear hunting.)

- Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time: 60
- Good bear population: 27
- Harvested a bear: 10
- Not too many hunters in the field: 2
- No reason: 2
- Other: 4
Q170. Why were you dissatisfied with your black bear hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of black bear hunters who were dissatisfied with their black bear hunting.)

- Low bear population: 58%
- Not successful in harvesting a bear: 15%
- Elimination of baiting: 12%
- Season too short and/or too early: 9%
- Not enough and/or bad hunting areas: 6%
- Other: 9%
SATISFACTION WITH COUGAR HUNTING AND FACTORS OF A QUALITY COUGAR HUNT

The majority of cougar hunters (59%) were satisfied with their cougar hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season, while 27% were dissatisfied.

- The primary reason that cougar hunters were satisfied with their cougar hunting was that they enjoy the outdoors/that they had a good time.

- The most common reasons for being dissatisfied with cougar hunting were that they did not see any cougars, that they cannot use hounds, and/or that they did not harvest a cougar.

- Trends: As with black bear hunting, satisfaction with cougar hunting has increased in 2008, relative to 2002, again, particularly the percentage who are very satisfied.

Only 1 of the 128 cougar hunters had participated in the pilot cougar hound hunt in northeastern Washington, rendering moot some of the results of subsequent questions. For what it is worth, this lone cougar hunter was very satisfied with the cougar hound hunt in northeastern Washington in which he/she participated, but gave no answer in response to the reason why he/she was satisfied.
Q177. Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your cougar hunting in Washington during the 2006-07 season? (Asked of cougar hunters.)

- Very satisfied: 21
- Somewhat satisfied: 88
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 13
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 13
- Very dissatisfied: 14
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=128)
197) / 177) Overall, were you satisfied or dissatisfied with your cougar hunting in Washington during the 2000/2006-07 season? (Cougar hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Satisfaction Level</th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Very satisfied</td>
<td>10%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat satisfied</td>
<td>37%</td>
<td>38%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied</td>
<td>14%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Somewhat dissatisfied</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Very dissatisfied</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>14%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q178. Why were you satisfied with your cougar hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of cougar hunters who were satisfied with their cougar hunting.)

Enjoy hunting and/or outdoors / had a good time: 58%
Saw some / tracked some: 12%
No reason: 7%
Season was long enough and/or at the right time: 5%
Harvested a cougar: 4%
Spent time with family / friends: 4%
Enjoyed the challenge of hunting cougars without dogs: 4%
Other: 18%
Q179. Why were you dissatisfied with your cougar hunting in Washington during the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of cougar hunters who were dissatisfied with their cougar hunting.)

- Didn't see any cougars: 32%
- Can't use hounds: 26%
- Didn't harvest a cougar: 21%
- Too many restrictions on when or where a cougar can be killed: 9%
- Other: 12%
LOCATIONS OF HUNTING

HUNTING ON PRIVATE LANDS IN WASHINGTON AND PARTICIPATION IN PRIVATE LANDS ACCESS PROGRAMS

- A majority of all types of hunters (ranging from 52% to 75%) had hunted on private lands in Washington in the previous 3 years—particularly bird and waterfowl hunters. Between a fifth and a third (ranging from 19% to 33%) had hunted on private lands enrolled in a Department private lands access program in the previous 3 years—again, particularly bird and waterfowl hunters.

- Most hunters on access program lands were satisfied with their hunting on those lands in the access program.

- Among respondents, the most common species hunted on private lands enrolled in a Department private lands access program were various types of deer, elk, and pheasant. There is much variation among hunter types (for instance, bird hunters have both pheasant and quail high on the list).

- Those hunters who hunted on access program lands were asked what they would do in the hypothetical absence of these access programs. Most typically, they would hunt the same as they do currently, but there are some, particularly among bird hunters, who say that they would hunt less than they do now.

- Those hunters who had not hunted on access program lands were asked why they had not done so. Many said that they had heard of such program lands but preferred other private lands for hunting or that they or that they do not know how to use them. From 21% to 40% of the various hunter types had not heard of the programs.

- A majority (56%) of small game license holders (either a small game license or a small game with big game license) would support a $5 increase on their small game license to have the Department maintain and increase hunting access on private lands, but 40% would oppose. Common reasons for opposing are that the cost of a license is already high enough or that the
respondent believes increasing prices will not help the Department better manage hunting. (These graphs are shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on Funding for Hunting and Wildlife Management.”)

- In follow-up, those who opposed a $5 increase as discussed above were asked how much effect such an increase would have on their subsequent decision on whether to buy a small game license in the future. Most of them (52%) say it would affect their decision, but 46% say it would not. (This graph is also shown in the section of this report titled, “Opinions on Funding for Hunting and Wildlife Management.”)

- One of the survey questions (previously reported within a series of questions about the importance of various things for general wildlife management) asked hunters to rate the importance of providing public access to private industrial timberlands. They overwhelmingly think this to be important (mostly very important): from 81% to 94% of the various hunter types say providing public access to private industrial timberlands is important.
Q40. Now I'd like to talk to you about your experience hunting on private lands in Washington. Have you hunted on private property in Washington in the past 3 years?
Q41. In the past 3 years, have you hunted on private lands enrolled in a Department private lands access program, such as "Feel Free to Hunt," "Hunt by Written Permission," or "Register to Hunt"? (Asked of those who have hunted on private property in Washington in the past 3 years.)

![Bar chart showing responses to Q41]
Q41. In the past 3 years, have you hunted on private lands enrolled in a Department private lands access program, such as "Feel Free to Hunt," "Hunt by Written Permission," or "Register to Hunt"? (Out of all hunters.)

![Bar chart showing responses to Q41.]

- Yes
  - Deer (n=132) 27%
  - Elk (n=130) 33%
  - Bird (n=260) 20%
  - Black Bear (n=132) 21%
  - Cougar (n=128) 32%
  - Waterfowl (n=131) 19%
  - Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18) 22%

- No
  - Deer (n=132) 70%
  - Elk (n=130) 79%
  - Bird (n=260) 63%
  - Black Bear (n=132) 78%
  - Cougar (n=128) 76%
  - Waterfowl (n=131) 65%
  - Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18) 72%

- Don't know
  - Deer (n=132) 3%
  - Elk (n=130) 2%
  - Bird (n=260) 5%
  - Black Bear (n=132) 2%
  - Cougar (n=128) 3%
  - Waterfowl (n=131) 3%
  - Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18) 6%
Q46. How satisfied or dissatisfied were you with your hunting on lands in the private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)
Q44. In the past 3 years, which species did you hunt on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)

- Mule deer: 57%
- White-tailed deer: 51%
- Pheasant: 26%
- Black-tailed deer: 11%
- Elk: 11%
- Quail / bobwhite: 11%
- Duck: 9%
- Wild turkey: 9%
- Black bear: 3%
- Chukar / partridge: 3%
- Cougar: 3%
- Dove / mourning dove: 3%
- Geese: 3%
- Grouse: 3%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q44. In the past 3 years, which species did you hunt on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)
Q44. In the past 3 years, which species did you hunt on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)

- **Pheasant**: 60%
- **Quail / bobwhite**: 31%
- **White-tailed deer**: 26%
- **Mule deer**: 20%
- **Duck**: 15%
- **Elk**: 13%
- **Chukar / partridge**: 9%
- **Grouse**: 9%
- **Black-tailed deer**: 8%
- **Geese**: 6%
- **Wild turkey**: 5%
- **Black bear**: 4%
- **Dove / mourning dove**: 4%
- **Cougar**: 2%
- **Coyote**: 2%
- **Hare / rabbit**: 1%

(Multiple Responses Allowed)
Q44. In the past 3 years, which species did you hunt on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)

- Mule deer: 41
- Elk: 30
- Pheasant: 30
- Black-tailed deer: 22
- White-tailed deer: 19
- Wild turkey: 19
- Black bear: 11
- Duck: 7
- Geese: 7
- Chukar / partridge: 4
- Cougar: 4
- Coyote: 4
- Quail / bobwhite: 4

Multiple Responses Allowed

Black Bear (n=27)
Q44. In the past 3 years, which species did you hunt on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)

- Mule deer: 59
- White-tailed deer: 41
- Cougar: 19
- Elk: 19
- Pheasant: 19
- Black bear: 15
- Coyote: 11
- Dove / mourning dove: 11
- Wild turkey: 11
- Black-tailed deer: 7
- Geese: 4
- Grouse: 4
- Quail / bobwhite: 4

Multiple Responses Allowed

Cougar (n=27)
Q44. In the past 3 years, which species did you hunt on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)

- Pheasant: 40
- Duck: 31
- Geese: 31
- Mule deer: 26
- Quail / bobwhite: 26
- White-tailed deer: 14
- Dove / mourning dove: 12
- Elk: 12
- Wild turkey: 7
- Chukar / partridge: 5
- Hare / rabbit: 5
- Black bear: 2
- Cougar: 2
- Grouse: 2

Multiple Responses Allowed

Waterfowl (n=42)
Q44. In the past 3 years, which species did you hunt on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)

- Elk: 2
- White-tailed deer: 2
- Black-tailed deer: 1
- Mule deer: 1

Multiple Responses Allowed

Number of sheep / moose / goat hunters

- Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=4)
Q47. If the private lands access program did not exist, would you...? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)
Q48. Which of the following best describes why you have not hunted on private lands enrolled in the Department's private lands access program? (Asked of those who have hunted on private lands not enrolled in a private lands access program in Washington in the past 3 years.)
Q63. What about providing public access to private industrial timberlands?
HUNTING OUTSIDE OF WASHINGTON STATE

Approximately a quarter of each type of hunter in the survey (ranging from 18% to 33%) say that typically they hunt outside of Washington state (but not necessarily exclusively).

- Most out-of-state hunters hunt out-of-state for 15 days or less, as shown in the graph.
- Typical game hunted out-of-state includes elk, mule deer, white-tailed deer, and pheasant. Obviously, the particular species and the order differ among the various types of hunters.
- Common reasons for hunting out-of-state include the perception that there is more and/or better game out-of-state or that hunting experiences are better out-of-state.
Q30. Do you typically hunt anywhere outside of Washington state?

Yes
- Deer (n=132)
- Elk (n=130)
- Bird (n=260)
- Black Bear (n=132)
- Cougar (n=128)
- Waterfowl (n=131)
- Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)

No
- Deer (n=132)
- Elk (n=130)
- Bird (n=260)
- Black Bear (n=132)
- Cougar (n=128)
- Waterfowl (n=131)
- Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q31. On average, how many days per year do you hunt in other places outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

[Diagram showing the distribution of hunting days per year by species and duration for various species and species groups: Deer, Elk, Bird, Black Bear, Cougar, Waterfowl, and Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat.]

- More than 30 days
- 26 - 30 days
- 21 - 25 days
- 16 - 20 days
- 11 - 15 days
- 9 - 10 days
- 7 - 8 days
- 5 - 6 days
- 3 - 4 days
- 1 - 2 days
- Don't know

Percent
Q35. What types of game do you usually hunt outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

- White-tailed deer: 53% (n=30)
- Elk: 47%
- Mule deer: 43%
- Black bear: 13%
- Antelope: 10%
- Black-tailed deer: 10%
- Cougar: 10%
- Pheasant: 10%
- Moose: 7%
- Quail / bobwhite: 7%
- Dove / mourning dove: 3%
- Duck: 3%
- Geese: 3%
- Grouse: 3%
- Wild turkey: 3%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q35. What types of game do you usually hunt outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

![Bar chart showing the types of game hunted outside of Washington.]

- Elk (n=24): 42%
- Mule deer: 21%
- White-tailed deer: 13%
- Duck: 8%
- Black bear: 8%
- Geese: 8%
- Moose: 8%
- Pheasant: 8%
- Wild turkey: 8%
- Antelope: 4%
- Black-tailed deer: 4%
- Dove / mourning dove: 4%
- Hare / rabbit: 4%
- Quail / bobwhite: 4%
Q35. What types of game do you usually hunt outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who hunted various types of game. The chart includes:
- White-tailed deer: 41%
- Elk: 34%
- Mule deer: 27%
- Pheasant: 27%
- Duck: 11%
- Geese: 11%
- Moose: 8%
- Antelope: 6%
- Wild turkey: 6%
- Grouse: 5%
- Black bear: 3%
- Black-tailed deer: 3%
- Chukar / partridge: 3%
- Dove / mourning dove: 3%
- Quail / bobwhite: 3%

Multiple Responses Allowed]
Q35. What types of game do you usually hunt outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

- Mule deer: 69%
- Elk: 67%
- White-tailed deer: 42%
- Moose: 11%
- Antelope: 8%
- Black-tailed deer: 6%
- Pheasant: 6%
- Black bear: 3%
- Cougar: 3%
- Wild turkey: 3%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Black Bear (n=36)
Q35. What types of game do you usually hunt outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

- Elk: 69%
- Mule deer: 66%
- White-tailed deer: 38%
- Antelope: 14%
- Black bear: 14%
- Cougar: 10%
- Black-tailed deer: 7%
- Grouse: 7%
- Pheasant: 7%
- Chukar / partridge: 3%
- Dove / mourning dove: 3%
- Duck: 3%
- Quail / bobwhite: 3%
- Wild turkey: 3%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Cougar (n=29)
Q35. What types of game do you usually hunt outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

- Mule deer: 50%
- Pheasant: 32%
- Elk: 29%
- White-tailed deer: 21%
- Duck: 18%
- Black-tailed deer: 12%
- Geese: 12%
- Black bear: 9%
- Wild turkey: 9%
- Antelope: 6%
- Chukar / partridge: 6%
- Dove / mourning dove: 6%
- Moose: 6%
- Quail / bobwhite: 6%
- Grouse: 3%
- Hare / rabbit: 3%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q35. What types of game do you usually hunt outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Elk: 3
- Mule deer: 3
- White-tailed deer: 3
- Black-tailed deer: 2
- Black bear: 1
- Duck: 1
- Geese: 1
- Moose: 1
- Pheasant: 1

Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=6)
Q37. What are your main reasons for hunting in other places outside of Washington? (Asked of those who have typically hunted in other places outside of Washington.)

More / better game available
Overall better hunting experience / opportunities
Not satisfied with Washington's Department of Fish and Wildlife / better management from other states' Department
Hunt with family and/or friends that live in another state
Different hunting experience / different scenery
Less people / hunters around
Different / better hunting seasons
Live or own a home / property in another state
Washington doesn't offer the species I hunt
Other

Percent

- Deer (n=30)
- Elk (n=24)
- Bird (n=64)
- Black Bear (n=36)
- Cougar (n=29)
- Waterfowl (n=34)
- Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=6)
HUNTING EQUIPMENT

- Deer hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt deer (80% of them used rifles), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (16%), muzzleloader rifles (8%), and shotguns (5%).

- Elk hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt elk (69%), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (18%) and muzzleloader rifles (15%).

- Black bear hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt black bear (88%), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (14%).

- Cougar hunters most commonly used rifles to hunt cougar (85%), distantly followed by those who used archery equipment (12%) and muzzleloader rifles (8%).
Q73. What type of hunting equipment did you use to hunt deer during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Rifle: 80%
- Archery: 16%
- Muzzleloader: 8%
- Shotgun: 5%
- Handgun: 2%
- Don't know: 2%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q125. What type of hunting equipment did you use to hunt elk during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington? (Asked of elk hunters.)

- Rifle: 69
- Archery: 18
- Muzzleloader rifle: 15
- Black powder handgun: 2
- Handgun: 1
- Muzzleloader shotgun: 1
- Other: 1
Q166. What type of hunting equipment did you use to hunt black bear during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington? (Asked of black bear hunters.)

- Rifle: 88%
- Archery: 14%
- Shotgun: 3%
- Handgun: 3%
- Muzzleloader rifle: 3%
- Black powder handgun: 2%
Q175. What type of hunting equipment did you use to hunt cougar during the 2006-2007 hunting season in Washington? (Asked of cougar hunters.)
HARVEST OF WILDLIFE IN WASHINGTON

- Just under a third of deer hunters (32%) harvested a deer in Washington during the 2006-2007 season.
  - Most deer hunters (83%) think it is important for a quality deer hunt to have a chance of harvesting a deer. The same percentage (83%) think it is important for a quality deer hunt to have a chance of harvesting a mature buck.

- While the majority of elk hunters did not harvest an elk, 16% harvested an elk in Washington during the 2006-2007 season.
Q78. Did you harvest a deer in Washington in 2006-2007? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Yes: 32
- No: 67
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=132)
(Deer hunters.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>2002 Survey</th>
<th>2007 Survey</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q83. How important or unimportant is the chance of harvesting a deer in having a quality deer hunting experience? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Very important: 48%
- Somewhat important: 35%
- Neither important nor unimportant: 3%
- Somewhat unimportant: 8%
- Very unimportant: 6%
- Don't know: 1%
Q87. How important or unimportant is the opportunity to harvest a mature buck in having a quality deer hunting experience? (Asked of deer hunters.)

- Very important: 49
- Somewhat important: 34
- Neither important nor unimportant: 3
- Somewhat unimportant: 9
- Very unimportant: 5

Percent (n=132)
Q130. Did you harvest an elk in Washington in 2006-2007? (Asked of elk hunters.)

Yes: 16
No: 84

Percent (n=130)
HUNTING AVIDITY

- The survey asked hunters how many years they had hunted in Washington. They are fairly well distributed among the age groups.

- The survey asked hunters how many days per year they typically hunt in Washington. Most of them typically hunt for 15 days or less.

- Most out-of-state hunters hunt out-of-state for 15 days or less. (This graph is shown in the section of this report titled, “Hunting Outside of Washington State.”)

- Finally, in an avidity question of waterfowl hunters, nearly half of them (48%) hunted waterfowl for 10 days or less during the 2006-2007 season. The mean was 18.86 days.
Q21. How many years have you hunted in Washington?

- More than 50 years
- 46 - 50 years
- 41 - 45 years
- 36 - 40 years
- 31 - 35 years
- 26 - 30 years
- 21 - 25 years
- 16 - 20 years
- 11 - 15 years
- 6 - 10 years
- 1 - 5 years
- Don't know

Percent

- Deer (n=132)
- Elk (n=130)
- Bird (n=260)
- Black Bear (n=132)
- Cougar (n=128)
- Waterfowl (n=131)
- Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q24. How many days per year do you typically hunt in Washington?

- More than 60 days
- 51 - 60 days
- 41 - 50 days
- 31 - 40 days
- 26 - 30 days
- 21 - 25 days
- 16 - 20 days
- 11 - 15 days
- 6 - 10 days
- 1 - 5 days
- Don't know

Deer (n=132)
Elk (n=130)
Bird (n=260)
Black Bear (n=132)
Cougar (n=128)
Waterfowl (n=131)
Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q252. How many days did you hunt waterfowl in the 2006-2007 season? (Asked of waterfowl hunters.)

Mean = 18.86
DEMOGRAPHIC CHARACTERISTICS

- Most of the hunters in the survey are male (from 94% to 98%).

- The overwhelming majority of hunters in the survey consider themselves white/Caucasian.

- The ages of hunters in the survey are shown, with the most common age categories being 45 to 54 years old and 55 to 64 years old.

- The overwhelming majority of hunters in the survey are residents of Washington; the counties of residence of the various types of hunters are shown. A graph of the years of residency in Washington is shown, fairly evenly distributed among the categories of years.
  - Those who are not Washington residents are most commonly residents of Oregon, California, or Idaho.

- Most commonly, hunters in the survey consider their place of residence to be a rural area or a small city/town. Only 18% or less (depending on the hunter type) live in a large city or urban area.

- Educational levels of hunters in the survey are shown.

- Occupations of respondents are shown. The construction industry (plumbers, electricians, etc.) is predominant, but government services, retail/wholesale sales, and manufacturing are important occupations.

- Household incomes of hunters in the survey are shown.

- The majority of hunters in the survey are not members of any wildlife interest groups that promote conservation and habitat enhancements; otherwise, the most popular organizations are the Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation and Ducks Unlimited.
Q308. Respondent's gender (observed, not asked by interviewer).
Q297. What races or ethnic backgrounds do you consider yourself, and please mention all that apply?

![Bar chart showing percentage of responses for different races or ethnic backgrounds and wildlife species hunted.](chart.png)

- White or Caucasian
- Native American or Alaskan native or Aleutian
- Hispanic or Latino
- East Asian
- Don't know / can't say

Percent

Deer (n=132)
Elk (n=130)
Bird (n=260)
Black Bear (n=132)
Cougar (n=128)
Waterfowl (n=131)
Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q302. Respondent's age.

![Bar chart showing age distribution for different species of animals.]

- **65 years old or older**:
  - Deer (n=132): 18
  - Elk (n=130): 15
  - Bird (n=260): 13
  - Black Bear (n=132): 11
  - Cougar (n=128): 10
  - Waterfowl (n=131): 22
  - Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18): 8

- **55-64 years old**
- **45-54 years old**
- **35-44 years old**
- **25-34 years old**
- **18-24 years old**
- **Under 18 years old**
- **Don't know / Refused**

Percent of respondents for each age group and species.
Q283. Are you a permanent resident of Washington State?
Q289. In what county do you live? (Asked of those that are a permanent resident of Washington State.)
(Sorted by total.) (Part 1)
Q289. In what county do you live? (Asked of those that are a permanent resident of Washington State.) (Sorted by total.) (Part 2)
Q289. In what county do you live? (Asked of those that are a permanent resident of Washington State.)
(Sorted by total.) (Part 3)
Q289. In what county do you live? (Asked of those that are a permanent resident of Washington State.) (Sorted by total.) (Part 4)
Q289. In what county do you live? (Shows top few counties.)

- Clark: 11%
- King: 11%
- Pierce: 8%
- Snohomish: 7%
- Spokane: 5%
- Yakima: 5%
- Grays Harbor: 4%
- Kitsap: 4%
- Thurston: 4%
- Chelan: 3%
- Island: 3%
- Walla Walla: 3%

(Deer: n=132)
Q289. In what county do you live? (Shows top few counties.)

- Pierce: 11
- Snohomish: 10
- Benton: 9
- Spokane: 8
- Clark: 5
- King: 5
- Yakima: 5
- Clallam: 5
- Lewis: 5
- Thurston: 5

Percent of all elk hunters
Q289. In what county do you live? (Shows top few counties.)

- King: 12%
- Spokane: 10%
- Pierce: 8%
- Snohomish: 7%
- Benton: 6%
- Stevens: 5%
- Whatcom: 4%
- Grays Harbor: 3%
- Thurston: 3%
- Clark: 3%
- Lewis: 3%
- Yakima: 3%

Percent of all bird hunters (n=260)
Q289. In what county do you live? (Shows top few counties.)

- Snohomish: 12%
- King: 11%
- Clark: 10%
- Pierce: 9%
- Thurston: 5%
- Cowlitz: 5%
- Benton: 4%
- Lewis: 4%
- Skamania: 4%
- Spokane: 3%
- Whatcom: 3%

[Graph showing the percentage of all black bear hunters by county]
Q289. In what county do you live? (Shows top few counties.)

- Pierce: 13%
- King: 10%
- Clark: 9%
- Snohomish: 7%
- Spokane: 5%
- Thurston: 5%
- Benton: 4%
- Clallam: 4%
- Stevens: 4%
- Lewis: 3%
- Skamania: 3%
- Yakima: 3%
Q289. In what county do you live? (Shows top few counties.)

- King: 14
- Yakima: 10
- Pierce: 8
- Spokane: 8
- Benton: 6
- Whatcom: 6
- Clark: 5
- Grant: 5
- Okanogan: 5
- Snohomish: 5
- Skagit: 4
- Douglas: 3

Percent of all waterfowl hunters
Q289. In what county do you live? (Shows top few counties; shows number, not percentage.)

Number of all sheep/moose/goat hunters

- Grays Harbor: 3
- Kittitas: 2
- Clallam: 1
- Clark: 1
- Cowlitz: 1
- Jefferson: 1
- King: 1
- Lewis: 1
- Lincoln: 1
- Okanogan: 1
- Pierce: 1
- Snohomish: 1
- Spokane: 1
- Stevens: 1
- Thurston: 1

Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q287. How many years have you been a Washington resident? (Asked of those that are a permanent resident of Washington State.) (Part 1)

More than 65 years

61 - 65 years

56 - 60 years

51 - 55 years

46 - 50 years

41 - 45 years

36 - 40 years

Percent

[Graph showing the distribution of years as a percentage for different species groups (Deer, Elk, Bird, Black Bear, Cougar, Waterfowl, Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat)]
Q287. How many years have you been a Washington resident? (Asked of those that are a permanent resident of Washington State.) (Part 2)
Q285. Other states of residence.  
(Of those who are not permanent residents of Washington and named another state of residence.)  
(Sorted by total in state.)
Q292. Do you consider your place of residence to be in a large city, a suburban area, a small city/town, or a rural area?
Q293. What is the highest level of education you have completed?
Q299/300. Respondent's occupation. (Part 1)
Q299/300. Respondent's occupation. (Part 2)

- Agriculture / farming
- Transportation / shipping
- Medical / wellness
- Computer / technical / electronics
- Education
- Finance / insurance / real estate
- Landscaping
- Disabled

Legend:
- Deer (n=132)
- Elk (n=130)
- Bird (n=260)
- Black Bear (n=132)
- Cougar (n=128)
- Waterfowl (n=131)
- Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q299/300. Respondent's occupation. (Part 3)

- Restaurant / hotel / tourism / entertainment
- Logging / milling
- Homemaker
- Military
- Unemployed
- Other
- Don't know / can't be categorized / can't say

- Deer (n=132)
- Elk (n=130)
- Bird (n=260)
- Black Bear (n=132)
- Cougar (n=128)
- Waterfowl (n=131)
- Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q294. Which of these categories best describes your total household income before taxes last year?

![Income Distribution Chart]

- Under $20,000
- $20,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$99,999
- $100,000-$119,999
- $120,000 or more
- Don't know / can't say

Deer (n=132)
Elk (n=130)
Bird (n=260)
Black Bear (n=132)
Cougar (n=128)
Waterfowl (n=131)
Bighorn Sheep / Moose / Mountain Goat (n=18)
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?

- No, not a member: 67% (n=132)
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation: 14%
- Ducks Unlimited: 6%
- Local sportsman club: 5%
- Mule Deer Foundation: 2%
- Pheasants Forever: 2%
- National Wild Turkey Federation: 2%
- Other: 5%
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?

- No, not a member: 75%
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation: 14%
- Ducks Unlimited: 5%
- North American Hunting Club: 3%
- Mule Deer Foundation: 1%
- Pheasants Forever: 1%
- Other: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Elk (n=130)
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Responses Allowed</th>
<th>Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No, not a member</td>
<td>62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks Unlimited</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local sportsman club</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pheasants Forever</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mule Deer Foundation</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North American Hunting Club</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Bird (n=260)
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?

- No, not a member: 61
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation: 11
- Ducks Unlimited: 8
- North American Hunting Club: 2
- Local sportsman club: 2
- Mule Deer Foundation: 2
- National Wild Turkey Federation: 2
- Other: 5

Multiple Responses Allowed

Black Bear (n=132)
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?

- No, not a member: 64%
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation: 20%
- Ducks Unlimited: 6%
- North American Hunting Club: 4%
- Local sportsman club: 3%
- Mule Deer Foundation: 1%
- National Wild Turkey Federation: 1%
- Pheasants Forever: 1%
- Other: 5%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Cougar (n=128)
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?

- No, not a member: 42%
- Ducks Unlimited: 41%
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation: 7%
- Pheasants Forever: 5%
- Local sportsman club: 4%
- North American Hunting Club: 2%
- National Wild Turkey Federation: 2%
- Mule Deer Foundation: 1%
- Other: 8%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Waterfowl (n=131)
Q291. Are you a member of any wildlife interest groups to promote conservation and habitat enhancements for wildlife?

- No, not a member: 9
- Local sportsman club: 4
- Mule Deer Foundation: 1
- North American Hunting Club: 1
- Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation: 1
- Other: 1

Multiple Responses Allowed

Number of sheep / moose / goat hunters
ABOUT RESPONSIVE MANAGEMENT
Responsive Management is a nationally recognized public opinion and attitude survey research firm specializing in natural resource and outdoor recreation issues. Its mission is to help natural resource and outdoor recreation agencies and organizations better understand and work with their constituents, customers, and the public.

Utilizing its in-house, full-service, computer-assisted telephone and mail survey center with 45 professional interviewers, Responsive Management has conducted more than 1,000 telephone surveys, mail surveys, personal interviews, and focus groups, as well as numerous marketing and communications plans, need assessments, and program evaluations on natural resource and outdoor recreation issues.

Clients include most of the federal and state natural resource, outdoor recreation, and environmental agencies, and most of the top conservation organizations. Responsive Management also collects attitude and opinion data for many of the nation’s top universities, including the University of Southern California, Virginia Tech, Colorado State University, Auburn, Texas Tech, the University of California—Davis, Michigan State University, the University of Florida, North Carolina State University, Penn State, West Virginia University, and others.

Among the wide range of work Responsive Management has completed during the past 20 years are studies on how the general population values natural resources and outdoor recreation, and their opinions on and attitudes toward an array of natural resource-related issues. Responsive Management has conducted dozens of studies of selected groups of outdoor recreationists, including anglers, boaters, hunters, wildlife watchers, birdwatchers, park visitors, historic site visitors, hikers, and campers, as well as selected groups within the general population, such as landowners, farmers, urban and rural residents, women, senior citizens, children, Hispanics, Asians, and African-Americans. Responsive Management has conducted studies on environmental education, endangered species, waterfowl, wetlands, water quality, and the reintroduction of numerous species such as wolves, grizzly bears, the California condor, and the Florida panther.
Responsive Management has conducted research on numerous natural resource ballot initiatives and referenda and helped agencies and organizations find alternative funding and increase their memberships and donations. Responsive Management has conducted major agency and organizational program needs assessments and helped develop more effective programs based upon a solid foundation of fact. Responsive Management has developed Web sites for natural resource organizations, conducted training workshops on the human dimensions of natural resources, and presented numerous studies each year in presentations and as keynote speakers at major natural resource, outdoor recreation, conservation, and environmental conferences and meetings.

Responsive Management has conducted research on public attitudes toward natural resources and outdoor recreation in almost every state in the United States, as well as in Canada, Australia, the United Kingdom, France, Germany, and Japan. Responsive Management routinely conducts surveys in Spanish and has also conducted surveys and focus groups in Chinese, Korean, Japanese, and Vietnamese.
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