



2015 – 2019 Big Game Season Structure

Summary Report of Public Involvement

April 24, 2014

Prepared by: Big Game Season Structure Team

Craig McLaughlin (Chair)	Mark Leslie
John Broderick	Jim Aragon
Brian Kurzel	Matt Thorpe
Brett Ackerman	Jim Haskins
Jody Kennedy	Stacy Lischka

CONTENTS

I.	INTRODUCTION	2
II.	BACKGROUND	2
III.	PROCESS SUMMARY	3
	Internal Scoping	3
	Big Game Attitude Survey	4
	Involvement of Public and Stakeholders	5
IV.	PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY	7
	Big Game Attitude Survey	5
	Public Comments	9
	Public Respondent Characteristics	11
	Telephone Town Halls	12
	Focus Groups	12
V.	CONCLUSION	14
VI.	APPENDIX	14
	Big Game Attitude Survey Results	15

I. INTRODUCTION

Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) uses a five-year Big Game Season Structure (BGSS) as a framework to guide annual big game hunting regulations, primarily through setting the timing, length, and number of seasons for hunting big game in the state. The current BGSS planning horizon will expire at the end of 2014, and the agency has prioritized a publicly-driven process to generate an updated BGSS framework for 2015-2019. This document describes the public involvement activities that have taken place to ensure that interested citizens, stakeholders, decision-makers and the general public are informed about the Big Game Season Structure review process and have an opportunity to provide their input.

II. BACKGROUND

The Big Game Season Structure is intended to guide CPW's management activities to keep game populations in balance with habitat and help CPW provide a broad range of hunting experiences to fit the varied preferences of different hunters. CPW aims to continue to improve upon the existing structure, and public input is an essential part of that aim.

The CPW 2015-2019 Big Game Season Structure process was initiated by the Commission in the summer of 2013. CPW established an internal Big Game Season Structure Planning Team that included representatives from Terrestrial and Policy and Planning sections and Area Wildlife Managers from all regions to lead the process. During the fall of 2013, CPW undertook an internal review process to identify BGSS issues to help frame the public outreach process for the 2015-2019 season structure. This review was finalized and the outcomes were shared with the Commission early in 2014. At the same time, CPW sent a Big Game Attitude Survey to about 7,000 resident and nonresident licensed big game hunters to capture quantitative data on the level of satisfaction with big game hunting experiences in Colorado. On February 1, CPW launched an extensive outreach effort to inform the public and stakeholders about BGSS and collect input from the public on how the current hunting season structure is working and how it can be improved.

CPW used multiple tools to share information on the BGSS process with the public and to collect public input. These tools included media/social media, the CPW website, direct stakeholder contacts, sixteen local public meetings, two statewide telephone town hall meetings, three focus groups and a randomly sampled mail survey.

Following the review of outcomes from the public input process, CPW staff will develop alternative proposals for the 2015-2019 Big Game Season Structure. These will be presented to the Parks and Wildlife Commission in June 2014. In order to inform regulation setting for the 2015 seasons, the Commission will need to approve the 2015-2019 Big Game Season Structure in September 2014.

III. PROCESS SUMMARY

CPW used three overarching information gathering processes to inform recommendations for the 2015-2019 Big Season Structure. These were 1) an internal scoping process to identify and define the major issues to inform public engagement; 2) a quantitative survey of big game hunters to capture information related to big game hunting activities and attitudes; and 3) extensive outreach to stakeholders and interested members of the public to solicit and collect comments in a consistent format. The following summarizes each of these three processes.

Internal Scoping

In the fall of 2013, prior to soliciting involvement from the public, CPW held an internal scoping process to identify the primary BGSS issues from staff. These issues, identified through management experience and public involvement at the field level, provided a framework that was used to assist and inform the public outreach process. The internal scoping process did not seek to resolve the issues or to preclude the public from raising any other issue.

From the internal scoping process, the primary issues identified were summarized under seven categories listed here (in no particular order of importance):

1. Preference point allocation and hunting opportunity, including measures to address preference point creep and examination of the hybrid draw system;
2. Expansion of youth hunting opportunity;
3. Pronghorn season timing, including rescheduling of the muzzleloader season;
4. Expansion of bear hunting opportunity, including examination of concurrent license participation rules;
5. Consideration of different options for mountain lion season, including modifying the overall length of the season, creating geographically distinct seasons, and examining the newly-created April season;
6. Examination of elk and deer seasons, including consideration of the original purpose(s) of the 1st and 4th seasons, measures to promote redistribution of elk from private land, the length, timing, and overlap of the archery and muzzleloader seasons, the length of regular rifle seasons, the length of breaks between seasons, and the implementation of private- land-only seasons in general.
7. Examination of moose seasons, including method of take restrictions, length of seasons, and overlap with elk seasons.

These seven issue areas provided a framework to support public involvement. Using this framework, staff developed more detailed information about these issue categories which were presented at public meetings. CPW staff also designed public comment forms that asked the public to identify which of

these categories were most important to them and then offered them an opportunity to provide detailed comments for their top priorities. Comment forms also allowed for the public to identify and comment on issues not captured in this list.

Big Game Attitude Survey

This survey was designed to provide information to identify issues pertinent to Big Game Season Structure decisions. In addition, the information collected through the survey will inform future discussions of license allocation, landowner relations and other issues related to big game management in Colorado. Information gathered in this survey can be applied to the current discussions and those that will occur for the next several years in order to understand the attitudes, beliefs, values and activities of big game hunters in Colorado.

Study Objectives:

- 1) Measure satisfaction with overall and specific aspects of the Big Game hunting seasons and licensing process among deer, elk, black bear and mountain lion hunters.
- 2) Track hunting activities of deer, elk, bear and mountain lion hunters in relation to specific aspects of hunting in Colorado, such as area hunted, methods to acquire licenses, use of guides, public land hunting, harvest decisions, hunters in party, etc.
- 3) Provide information to track the effects of Big Game management decisions on hunter activities, satisfaction and retention.
- 4) Provide information to support broader discussion on hunter recruitment, hunter activities, and perceptions of CPW into the future.

Methods:

A total of 6,774 individuals who purchased a big game license in Colorado in 2012 were randomly selected to receive a Big Game Attitude Survey (BGAS). The sample was stratified in order to ensure representation of lower participation activities, and included resident and non-resident deer, elk, black bear and mountain lion hunters (Table 1). Within each strata, individuals were randomly selected. We were unable to meet our goal of sampling 500 non-resident mountain lion hunters because of the small number of license purchasers who fit this criteria.

Sampled individuals were mailed a letter inviting them to complete an online survey on January 16, 2014. Non-respondents were mailed a paper copy of the survey (with an additional option to respond online) on February 20, 2014, followed on March 21, 2014 with a second paper copy of the survey. Survey mailings included a cover letter introducing the project and a postage paid envelope in which to return a completed questionnaire. Remaining non-respondents were mailed a reminder postcard on March 27, 2014 with the information to complete the survey online. Once survey mailings were complete, all remaining non-respondents were mailed a shortened, post-card style questionnaire designed to assess non-respondent bias on April 21, 2014.

Table 1. Sample for Big Game Attitude Survey.

Species Hunted	Resident Sample	Non-resident Sample
Elk	1,000	1,000
Mule deer	1,000	1,000
Black bear	1,000	1,000
Mountain lion	500	274

Involvement of Public and Stakeholders

Public outreach and education about the 2015-2019 BGSS process began in November 2013 and direct consultation with the public took place from February 1, 2014 through April 16, 2014. This consultation period focused on raising awareness of the Big Game Season Structure process and creating opportunities for interested individuals and organizations to share their thoughts, preferences and suggestions. Through public meetings, the webpage, direct communications, media, telephone town halls and other outreach activities, we encouraged the public to share their ideas and opinions with us.

Stakeholders List: In the fall of 2013, CPW prepared for public involvement in the Big Game Season Structure process by identifying representatives of key stakeholder groups, local community leaders and other potentially interested participants. Contact information for these individuals was compiled into an email list of over 800 stakeholders. CPW communicated with individuals and groups on this list during the BGSS public involvement process to inform them about public meetings and other comment opportunities.

Materials: To help inform the public and solicit their input, CPW staff developed a variety of handouts, fliers and other informational materials for distribution at public meetings, on the website and through license agents and CPW offices. From January through April 2014, the CPW website featured a prominent link to the BGSS webpage. The webpage, which received 32,179 views during the public comment period, provides access to general information, in-depth resource materials on the Big Game Season Structure and details for how the public can be involved and provide input. During the public comment period, an electronic comment form was available and could be mailed or submitted to CPW online.

Announcements: CPW first reached out to the extensive stakeholder list to inform them of the BGSS process in November 2013. In January 2014, a formal announcement for the BGSS process was sent to the stakeholders email list and the CPW Insider Email list, an E-Newsletter that reaches 18,000 individuals. The announcement described the process, invited recipients to 16 public meetings around the state, and provided details for how to learn more about BGSS and submit comments. A CPW press release presented this information to media outlets around the state. Over a dozen media outlets have printed stories about the 2015-2019 Big Game Season Structure since February 2014. CPW Facebook posts were made throughout the public comment period with a link to the online public comment form.

A formal presentation was made to the Sportsmen's Roundtable on February 15th and BGSS team members directly notified stakeholders of the BGSS process at the Colorado Farm Bureau and Colorado Cattlemen's Association statewide meetings. Area Wildlife Managers also shared BGSS materials through regional offices and events around the state.

Public Meetings: CPW organized and hosted 16 public meetings. These took place across the state in every region. Meetings were designed to give everyone an opportunity to learn about the specific issues addressed by the BGSS process, to speak with experienced staff and to have their questions asked and opinions heard. In addition, public meetings were an opportunity for staff to share the public comment form and encourage hunters to offer their input. Meetings were well-advertised and well-attended. In total, 388 people attended BGSS public meetings. Comment forms received at these meetings were captured in a database and carefully reviewed by the CPW BGSS team.

Telephone Town Hall: In early March, CPW and an independent contractor held two telephone town hall meetings, one for resident licensed hunters and one for nonresident licensed hunters. Between the two calls, 50,000 big game hunters (25,000 resident and 25,000 nonresident) were contacted and 4,169 hunters participated in the calls. CPW Area Wildlife Managers and other members of the BGSS team participated on each call, giving an overview of the Big Game Season Structure process, answering questions and encouraging participants to provide comments through the CPW website. The goal for these calls was to reach out to 50,000 licensed hunters, inform them about BGSS and encourage them to provide input. Telephone town hall meetings offered a unique method allowing for direct participation of large numbers of licensed hunters who might not hear about BGSS through other channels. Furthermore, the telephone town hall format provided an important method for reaching nonresident hunters who are unlikely to travel to a public meeting in Colorado. Information collected during these calls was compared with our Big Game Attitude Survey and public comment responses and reviewed by the CPW BGSS team.

Public Comments: Based on the categories developed during the internal scoping process, CPW staff developed a standard public comment form. This form was made easily accessible on our website and was well advertised through every BGSS outreach opportunity. Comment forms were designed to facilitate organization of comments by the issue categories while also allowing individuals to add issues and to provide detailed comments. During the public comment period, we received over 3,000 written comments. The large majority of the individual and unique comments received came in the format of the BGSS public comment form. All the public comments were compiled into a database and summarized.

Focus Groups: Upon reviewing early public comment data, CPW staff found that the preference point system was a common area of concern among Colorado hunters who attended a public meeting and/or filled out a public comment form. In response to the public's interest in making changes to the preference point system, the BGSS team held three focus groups to collect more detailed information on hunters' interests in regards to preference points. One focus group was held in Denver with licensed hunters who had ten or more preference points for deer/elk. One was held in Pueblo with hunters who had between four and nine points for deer/elk. The third was held in Delta with hunters who had three

or fewer points for deer/elk. Between eight and ten individuals were invited to participate in each focus group. The objectives of the BGSS focus groups were:

- 1) Get reactions from elk and deer hunters with three different levels of preference points (low, mid and high) on potential changes to the preference point system;
- 2) Learn about the perceptions, rationales and feelings toward potential changes to the preference point system from elk and deer hunters with three different levels of preference points; and
- 3) Get information from elk and deer hunters on their underlying issues regarding preference points.

Focus groups provided a valuable source of qualitative data to accompany the quantitative surveys and general public comments. Quantitative surveys are limited to questions that can be asked in a questionnaire, and stakeholder meetings tend to attract motivated individuals and organized interests groups. Focus groups complement these two approaches by providing more detailed qualitative information from a randomly selected sample of the public. The BGSS team is using this detailed information to craft a suite of proposed changes to the preference point system and to ascertain the risks associated with changing the system.

IV. PUBLIC INPUT SUMMARY

Big Game Attitude Survey Results

We received a total of 3,096 valid responses to the survey (Table 2), for an overall response rate of 48%.

Table 2. Response from Big Game Attitude Survey.

Species Hunted	Response Method	Resident Responses	Non-resident Responses	Overall response rate
Elk	Online	115	193	
	Paper	283	328	
	TOTAL	398	521	46%
Mule deer	Online	141	184	
	Paper	280	344	
	TOTAL	421	528	47%
Black bear	Online	149	171	
	Paper	282	298	
	TOTAL	431	469	45%
Mountain lion	Online	52	25	

	Paper	145	64	
	TOTAL	197	89	37%

A full copy of survey questions and results follow this summary in Appendix I. In order to clarify results of several specific questions, additional tables are presented below (Tables 3-6). The inclusion of these tables is intended to provide clearer understanding of results, but does not imply increased importance of these questions.

Table 3. Types of land hunted for various big game species, as reported by respondents to the 2014 Big Game Attitude Survey in Colorado.

Type of land hunted	Elk		Mule deer		Pronghorn		Black bear		Mountain lion	
	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Private land only	223	17%	124	23%	51	61%	76	21%	27	16%
Public land only	878	68%	328	62%	24	29%	233	63%	83	49%
Public and private land	197	15%	81	15%	9	11%	57	16%	56	33%
Not sure	1	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	1%	5	3%

Table 4. Overall satisfaction with the big game hunting experience in Colorado between 2010 and 2013, as reported by respondents to the 2014 Big Game Attitude Survey in Colorado.

Satisfaction	Elk		Mule deer		Pronghorn		Black bear		Mountain lion	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Very satisfied	741	29%	485	29%	80	27%	191	23%	114	39%
Somewhat satisfied	913	36%	622	37%	97	33%	223	27%	71	25%
Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied	305	12%	211	13%	47	16%	202	24%	58	20%
Somewhat unsatisfied	333	13%	216	13%	47	16%	110	13%	24	8%
Very unsatisfied	248	10%	158	9%	24	8%	101	12%	23	8%

Table 5. Satisfaction with respondents' ability to purchase or draw a big game hunting license in Colorado between 2010 and 2013, as reported by respondents to the 2014 Big Game Attitude Survey in Colorado.

Satisfaction	Elk		Mule deer		Pronghorn		Black bear		Mountain lion	
	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%	<i>N</i>	%	<i>n</i>	%
Very satisfied	1189	46%	492	27%	78	20%	379	45%	202	66%
Somewhat satisfied	703	27%	516	28%	82	21%	247	29%	32	11%
Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied	253	10%	220	12%	54	14%	104	12%	41	13%
Somewhat unsatisfied	224	9%	296	16%	73	19%	51	6%	8	3%
Very unsatisfied	197	8%	296	16%	98	26%	71	8%	23	8%

Public Comments

CPW received 3,149 separate written comments. These came in the form of written or online comment forms, e-mails, and comment letters submitted from stakeholder organizations including Colorado Bow Hunters Association, National Wildlife Federation, CLUB 20, the Outfitters Association, the Sierra Club and the Colorado Mule Deer Association. 2,044 comments were the same form letter requesting discontinuation of sport hunting of mountain lions.

For organization of the public comments, we focused on the 1,105 unique comments that we received. The form letter was incorporated into these results once. Broken down by the seven categories identified during internal scoping, the public comments we received looked like this:

- Preference points: 787 or 85% of public comments identified this as a priority issue.
- Elk/deer season: 753 or 81% of public comments identified this as a priority issue.
- Youth hunting: 235 or 25% of public comments identified this as a priority issue.
- Bear hunting: 181 or 20% of public comments identified this as a priority issue.
- Pronghorn season: 151 or 16% of public comments identified this as a priority issue.
- Moose season: 140 or 15% of public comments identified this as a priority issue.
- Mountain Lion season: 85 or 9% of public comments identified this as a priority issue.

Satisfaction with Hunting in Colorado: The majority of individuals who filled out the public comment form answered a satisfaction question in the range between very satisfied to neither satisfied nor unsatisfied with their overall hunting experience for big game in Colorado.

increase the preference for a youth to be able draw a license. There were also a number of comments that supported the existing efforts of CPW to create opportunities for youth hunting and comments that supported changes to establish special youth seasons and/or areas.

Bear Hunting: Of the public comment forms that identified bear hunting as a top concern (20%), a large majority of the individuals commented that they would like more opportunities to hunt this species. Most of these comments favored allowing for baiting, the use of dogs and for opening up a spring hunt, which are issues beyond the authority of the Parks and Wildlife Commission.

Pronghorn season: Pronghorn season was identified as a top concern in 16 percent of the public comment forms. The most common issue identified in the comments was in regard to the timing of muzzleloader and rifle seasons.

Moose Seasons: Moose seasons were identified as a priority issue in 15 percent of the public comment forms. Many of these comments remarked on the increase in moose visible during the year. Some said that the current management practices should stay the same and some pushed for more opportunity to hunt Moose.

Mountain Lion Season: When considering only the public comment forms, there were relatively few individuals who marked mountain lions as their issue of top concern. For these individuals, comments leaned in favor of increasing the harvest and allowing more opportunity. The 2,044 comment form letters received that were all the same comment, requested that CPW stop the sport hunting of mountain lions. These comments reflected that female lions are frequently either pregnant or have young cubs and that when females are hunted, their young are unlikely to survive.

Public Respondent Characteristics

The Big Game Attitude Survey and the public comment forms included questions that captured some of the same characteristics of respondents in order to allow the BGSS team to assess the representativeness of the respondents. The following provides a comparison of hunters who submitted public comment forms and those who responded to the Big Game Attitude Survey.

Table 6. The method preferred to hunt big game in Colorado, as reported by respondents to the 2014 Big Game Attitude Survey and BGSS public comment forms in Colorado.

Method of Take	Public Comment Form	Big Game Attitude Survey
Rifle	50%	71%
Archery	37%	21%
Muzzleloader	12%	8%

Table 7. Organizational affiliations as reported by respondents to the 2014 Big Game Attitude Survey and BGSS public comment forms in Colorado.

Organization	Public Comment Form	Big Game Attitude Survey
Colorado Bowhunters Association	28%	8%
Safari Club International	14%	15%
Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep Society	15%	6%
Mule Deer Foundation	19%	10%
Colorado Mule Deer Association	8%	3%
Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation	80%	72%
Muzzleloader Association	2%	2%
Boone and Crockett	8%	8%

Telephone Town Halls

Two telephone town halls contacted 25,000 nonresident licensed big game hunters and 25,000 resident licensed big game hunters. A total of 4,169 individuals participated in the town hall meetings. The results were very similar for each call. Just over 2,000 people participated in each call for an average of 22 minutes. CPW staff responded to between 25 and 28 questions asked by participants during each call. Six polling questions were asked during each call. Callers were asked to select which one of the seven BGSS issue areas was the biggest concern for them. Most residents responded with deer and elk Seasons (39%) and preference points (32%). Most nonresidents responded with preference points (44%) and deer and elk seasons (36%). For the final polling question, we asked participants how valuable and informative they found the telephone town hall. For resident callers, 43 percent found the call very valuable/informative and 53 percent somewhat valuable/informative. Non residents responded 39 percent and 52 percent respectively. The day of the first town hall meeting, the number of page-views for the BGSS webpage climbed by more than 200 views to 1,000 and stayed high through the following day when we held the second telephone town hall.

Focus groups

From three focus group discussions with hunters holding different levels of preference points, the BGSS team heard that there was a strong interest in changing the current preference point system.

Issues with the system: Among the three focus groups one of the largest concerns with the current system was the inflation of points or “point creep”; the continuous climb in points required to draw

high-demand hunts each year. Another common message for all three groups was that hunters do not understand the complexities with the preference point system. There was a lot of confusion around the hybrid draw and a perception that either the system is unfair or that CPW is making mistakes when hunters with fewer points outdraw someone with higher points.

There were also some distinct differences between the groups. For the two focus groups whose participants held more than four points, a top concern was losing all points on one hunt, regardless of how many points are needed to draw that hunt, and that “banking” of points was a solution to this problem. For the focus group with participants holding three or fewer preference points, this issue was not brought up by the participants. When staff communicated with the low point holders that other hunters felt strongly about the issue of losing all points on one hunt, they were understanding and agreed in general with the concept of banking. The two focus groups where hunters held fewer points identified youth hunting as an issue with the current system. The group with the fewest points stressed youth as their number one concern and the highest priority for reforming the system. This same focus group, based in Delta, also emphasized the importance of access to local areas. The Pueblo focus group, whose participants held the mid range of points, put emphasis on concerns with the allocation of licenses between residents and nonresidents and selected this as a top issue of concern. Staff communicated that the allocation issue is being addressed through a separate process later this year.

Possible Changes: When asked about possible changes to the preference point system, all groups agreed that we should not leave the system as it is. The two groups who held the most points supported an alternative that included banking and eliminated or reduced the hybrid draw.

The Denver focus group, whose members held ten or more points, unanimously supported a change to the system that would implement banking and reduce the percentage of licenses allocated toward the hybrid draw.

The Pueblo group, whose participants held between four and nine points, largely supported an alternative that they designed to implement banking, eliminate the hybrid draw, and split the allocation of limited hunts. This split would result in 50 percent allocated by straight preference points (using the current system) and 50 percent allocated through a bonus draw which operates the same as a raffle drawing or “names in a hat” where the more points one has the more opportunities they have to be drawn. Hunters would have the option of entering into both the bonus and the standard draw. The bonus draw would be for residents only.

The focus group participants in Delta, who held the fewest amount of points, unanimously supported a change to implement a youth-only quota in every unit, including high-quality units with access to bull and buck tags. The group put an emphasis on creating an opportunity for youth to have one quality hunt before turning 18. This group was asked if they supported point banking. Their collective response was either that they supported this change or that they would not oppose it.

V. CONCLUSION

In support of the 2015-2019 Big Game Structure, CPW held an extensive public outreach effort that used a multitude of tools to get a broad understanding of stakeholder and other public opinions. Public information is critical to the formulation of the draft alternatives and to demonstrate the agency's transparency and commitment to an open public process with the desire to provide hunting opportunity to the citizens and visitors of Colorado.

The methods used to collect input and the multiple types of information collected through this process, including public comments, the Big Game Attitude Survey and focus groups offer complementary techniques for better understanding the opinions of big game hunters in Colorado. The Big Game Season Structure team is utilizing this information to help develop alternatives for the next five-year Big Game Season Structure that will be presented to the Parks and Wildlife Commission in June 2014.

VII. APPENDIX I



COLORADO PARKS & WILDLIFE

6060 Broadway • Denver, Colorado 80216

Phone (303) 297-1192 • FAX (303) 291-7109

wildlife.state.co.us • parks.state.co.us

Big Game Hunter Attitude Survey

Results Summary

All Response Data



THANK YOU FOR YOUR COOPERATION!

All of your responses will be kept confidential.

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

STATE OF COLORADO

John W. Hickenlooper, Governor • Mike King, Executive Director, Department of Natural Resources

Bob Broscheid, Director, Colorado Parks and Wildlife

Parks and Wildlife Commission: Robert Bray • Chris Castilian, Secretary • Jeanne Home

Bill Kane, Chair • Gaspar Perricone • Jim Pribyl • John Singletary, Chair

Mark Smith, Vice-Chair • Jim Vigil • Dean Wingfield • Michelle Zimmerman

Ex Officio Members: Mike King and John Salazar

Big Game Hunter Attitude Survey

This questionnaire is part of a study to help wildlife managers learn what hunters think about their experiences hunting big game in Colorado. This survey is your chance to tell Colorado Parks and Wildlife (CPW) how and where you hunt and how you would like to see Colorado's big game herds managed. Results of this study will be used to help managers provide the type of hunting experience you seek while sustaining Colorado's big game populations. Your views are important and give us a better understanding of how hunters feel about these issues. Please keep in mind that we are interested in everyone's responses, not just frequent hunters or those from a certain area or state.

You are part of a random sample of Colorado big game license purchasers we have selected to provide opinions about our big game management. Your input is crucial for this evaluation. Even if you do not hunt regularly, we still need to hear from you. Please complete this survey as soon as possible. When you are finished, please return it in the postage-paid envelope provided, **no later than March 1, 2014**. The survey should take about 25 minutes to complete. The final question provides you with an opportunity to share with us any additional comments you may have about hunting in Colorado.

Your responses will remain confidential and at no time will your name be associated with any of your responses.

If you have any questions or comments about this study, please contact Stacy Lischka at 970/472-4329 or by email at DNR_CPWsurveys@state.co.us.

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ASSISTANCE!

If you choose not to complete the questionnaire, please make a note in question 53 and return the survey in the postage-paid envelope included.

Your Hunting Activities in Colorado. We are interested in learning where you hunt in Colorado and what your experience is like. Please answer these questions about your time hunting big game in Colorado. *For the purposes of this survey, please consider elk, deer, pronghorn, black bear and mountain lions to be big game.*

1. For how many years, in total, have you hunted big game in Colorado? *(Please indicate.)*

$\bar{x} = 17, n=2,997$ years

2. For which of the following species have you hunted in Colorado between 2010 and 2013? *(Check all that apply.) n=3,060*

- 87% Elk
- 65% Deer
- 13% Pronghorn
- 31% Black bear
- 10% Mountain lion

3. Please check the box next to the method of take that you most prefer to hunt big game in Colorado. *(Please check one.) n= 2,964*

- 71% Rifle
- 21% Archery
- 8% Muzzleloader

4. Have you ever used a voucher from a landowner to hunt big game in Colorado? *(Please check one.) n=3,056*

- 17% Yes
- 83% No

5. Did you pay a guide or outfitter during any of your big game hunts in Colorado between 2010 and 2013? *(Please check one.) n=3,062*

- 18% Yes
- 82% No

6. Did you act as a paid or unpaid guide or outfitter for big game hunting in Colorado between 2010 and 2013? *(Please check one.) n=3,063*

- 4% Yes
- 96% No

7. Did you hunt big game in Colorado in 2013? *(Please check one.) n=3,017*

- 54% Yes
- 46% No *Please skip to question 14.*

8. Please tell us about your hunting activities in Colorado in 2013 by filling in the following table. Skip any species for which you did not hunt. (*Please indicate.*)

<i>Species</i>	<i>Days hunted</i>		<i>Number harvested</i>	
	<i>n</i>	\bar{x}	<i>n</i>	\bar{x}
Elk	1,275	6.6	1,275	0.3
Deer	560	4.8	560	0.4
Pronghorn	155	1.2	155	0.3
Black bear	389	6.3	389	0.1
Mountain lion	218	7.0	218	0.8

9. On what type of land did you hunt in Colorado during the 2013 big game seasons? (*Please check one for each season in which you hunted.*)

Species	<i>n</i>	Private land only	Public land only	Both public and private land	I am not sure.	I did not hunt this species.
Elk	1,403	16%	63%	14%	0%	7%
Deer	891	14%	37%	9%	0%	40%
Pronghorn	591	9%	4%	2%	9%	86%
Black bear	783	10%	30%	7%	0%	53%
Mountain lion	638	4%	13%	9%	1%	73%

10. With whom did you hunt big game during 2013? (*Please check all that apply.*) ***n*=1,617**

- 15% No one; I hunted alone. ***Please skip to question 14.***
- 51% Family
- 59% Friends
- 1% A mentor or hunt master through a learn-to-hunt program
- 8% A guide or outfitter
- 2% Others I did not know before hunting with them

11. With how many people did you hunt big game in Colorado in 2013? *(Please indicate.)*
n=1,729

_____ \bar{x} = 4 _____ people were in my hunting party

12. How many of your hunting partners in 2013 were Colorado residents? *(Please indicate.)*
n=1,339

_____ \bar{x} = 2 _____ people in my hunting party were Colorado residents

13. How many of your hunting partners in 2013 purchased over-the-counter (OTC) licenses?
(Please indicate.) n=1,776

_____ \bar{x} = 2 _____ people in my hunting party purchased OTC licenses

14. Compared to your other recreational activities, how important to you is big game hunting?
(Please check one.) n=3,022

- 38% My most important recreational activity
- 44% One of my more important recreational activities
- 14% Equally important to my other recreational activities
- 3% Less important than my other recreational activities
- 0% Not at all important as a recreational activity

Big Game Hunting Seasons in Colorado. Hunters desire a variety of experiences in Colorado. Please help us understand what you would like in a hunting season by answering the following questions. *When we use the term "season structure," we are referring to the arrangement of hunting seasons within the calendar year.*

15. How satisfied were you with your overall hunting experience for each big game species listed below between 2010 and 2013? *(Please check one for each species you hunted.)*

	<i>n</i>	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	I did not hunt this species.
Elk	2,731	27%	33%	11%	12%	9%	7%
Deer	2,209	22%	28%	10%	10%	7%	23%
Pronghorn	1,343	6%	7%	4%	4%	2%	78%
Black bear	1,667	11%	13%	12%	7%	6%	50%
Mountain lion	1,349	8%	5%	4%	2%	2%	79%

16. How satisfied were you with your ability to draw a limited license or purchase an over-the-counter license for each of the following species between 2010 and 2013? (Please check one for each species you hunted.)

	<i>n</i>	Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	I did not hunt this species.
Elk	2,724	44%	26%	9%	8%	7%	6%
Deer	2,243	22%	23%	10%	13%	13%	19%
Pronghorn	1,348	6%	6%	4%	5%	7%	71%
Black bear	1,640	23%	15%	6%	3%	4%	48%
Mountain lion	1,324	15%	2%	3%	1%	2%	77%

17. Please rank the following items to tell us which is most important you in terms of your big game hunting opportunity in Colorado. Rank the items from 1 to 5, where 1 is most important to you and 5 is least important to you. Give each item a number and do not use any numbers more than once. *n*=2,621

\bar{x} = 3.5 Hunt every year

\bar{x} = 2.8 Hunt in an area with a high success rate

\bar{x} = 3.0 Be able to harvest an animal for meat

\bar{x} = 2.9 Hunt in an area with fewer hunters

\bar{x} = 2.9 Have the chance to harvest a mature animal

18. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements describing general aspects of big game hunting seasons in Colorado. (Please check one for each item.)

	<i>n</i>	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	I am not sure.
a. Early big game seasons should provide unique hunting opportunities with a more controlled number of participants, methods, and locations.	3,014	31%	12%	12%	7%
b. Regular big game seasons should be designed to have harvest rates appropriate to achieved herd size objectives.	3,015	83%	13%	2%	2%
c. Late big game seasons should be designed to maximize harvest in areas where damage from big game is a problem.	2,994	69%	19%	8%	4%
d. Licenses should be set aside for private landowners to increase hunting opportunity on their land and allow them to deal with problems caused by big game.	3,001	46%	25%	25%	4%

e. Licenses should be set aside for youth hunters to give them big game hunting opportunities and encourage participation. 3,003 72% 19% 7% 2%

19. Please read the descriptions below. Which of the following options for the length of big game hunting seasons would you most prefer? (Please check one.) n=2,997

69% Multiple seasons (ranging from 5 days to 40 days in length, depending on the method of take), with multiple opening days and fewer hunters in the field on each opening day. *This is the way seasons are currently structured.*

14% Few, longer seasons with few opening days but more hunters in the field on each opening day. *This would involve combining current seasons into longer seasons.*

16% I am not sure.

20. Please tell us how **important** the following items were, in general, to your big game hunting experience in Colorado between 2010 and 2013. (Please check one for each item.)

	n	Important	Neither important, nor unimportant	Unimportant	I am not sure.
Number of animals I saw	3,014	86%	12%	2%	0%
Number of trophy animals I saw	2,994	42%	40%	18%	1%
Ability to obtain a license to harvest a male	3,002	65%	26%	9%	0%
Ability to obtain game meat to eat	3,008	68%	22%	10%	0%
Ability to purchase an over-the-counter license	3,010	67%	24%	8%	1%
Access to private hunting land	3,000	43%	34%	21%	2%
Access to public hunting land	3,008	89%	8%	3%	1%
Price of hunting licenses	3,008	73%	20%	7%	0%
Ability to hunt every year	2,995	77%	17%	5%	0%
Ability to hunt in trophy units	2,997	43%	38%	18%	1%
Number of hunters I saw	3,001	65%	29%	5%	1%
Length of seasons	3,000	59%	34%	6%	1%
Arrangement of the seasons in the calendar year	2,999	63%	30%	5%	2%
Ability to hunt in the same unit/area most years	3,012	78%	18%	3%	1%

Availability of guides/outfitters in the area	2,990	13%	27%	57%	2%
---	-------	-----	-----	-----	----

21. Please tell us how **satisfied** you were, in general, with the following aspects of big game hunting in Colorado between 2010 and 2013. *(Please check one for each item.)*

	<i>n</i>	Satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied	Unsatisfied	I am not sure.
Number of animals I saw	3,009	45%	21%	33%	0%
Number of trophy animals I saw	2,994	22%	41%	37%	1%
Ability to get a license to harvest a male	2,986	56%	29%	14%	1%
Ability to obtain game meat to eat	3,007	48%	30%	21%	1%
Ability to purchase an over-the-counter license	2,995	56%	31%	11%	2%
Access to private hunting land	2,984	26%	47%	23%	4%
Access to public hunting land	2,991	69%	20%	9%	1%
Price of hunting licenses	3,001	44%	28%	27%	1%
Ability to hunt every year	2,990	60%	26%	14%	1%
Ability to hunt trophy animals	2,983	28%	51%	19%	1%
Number of hunters I saw	2,987	38%	39%	22%	1%
Length of seasons	2,991	61%	26%	12%	1%
Arrangement of the seasons in the calendar year	2,982	60%	28%	10%	2%
Ability to hunt in the same unit/area most years	2,992	66%	25%	9%	1%
Availability of guides/outfitters in the area	2,985	21%	63%	8%	9%

License Distribution in Colorado. We use several methods to award big game licenses in areas where there is more demand than the number of licenses available. For most units, a drawing system that uses preference points determines who is awarded a license, but in the highest demand hunts (less than 3% of limited license hunts), we also use a hybrid draw which includes a small number of randomly drawn licenses. Please help us understand how well these systems provide the opportunity you'd like by answering the following questions.

22. In Colorado, demand for hunting opportunity is higher than the number of licenses we can supply for some species, in some areas. Please tell us what sort of opportunity you would prefer in these situations. *(Please check one for each species for which you hunt.)*

<i>I would prefer...</i>	<i>n</i>	to hunt every year, and harvest smaller, younger animals.	to hunt every 3 to 5 years and harvest larger, older animals.	to hunt every 6 to 10 years, and harvest trophy animals.	I am not sure.
Elk	2,887	47%	40%	6%	7%
Deer	2,598	37%	47%	8%	8%
Pronghorn	1,956	23%	35%	8%	35%
Black bear	2,073	29%	30%	5%	36%
Mountain lion	1,902	23%	23%	7%	47%

23. Do you collect or use preference points to increase your chance of a drawing a license to hunt big game in Colorado? *(Please check one.) n=2,976*

64% Yes
35% No ***Please skip to question 28.***

24. How satisfied are you with the way preference points are used to award big game licenses to hunters in Colorado? *(Please check one.) n=1,925*

Very satisfied	Somewhat satisfied	Neither satisfied, nor unsatisfied	Somewhat unsatisfied	Very unsatisfied	I am not sure.
16%	44%	13%	15%	9%	3%

25. Which of the following reasons best describes why you collect preference points for elk in Colorado? ***If you do not collect preference points for elk, please skip to question 26.***
n=1,474

- 12% I am not sure where I would like to hunt elk in CO, so having preference points gives me more locations where I could hunt.
- 13% I am saving points for a once-in-a-lifetime hunt.
- 46% I would like to hunt elk in a specific unit which requires preference points to draw.
- 2% I may want to hunt elk in CO someday and am saving my points for that opportunity.
- 15% I am able to collect preference points each year and still hunt with another license.
- 3% I am saving my points to apply as a part of a group.
- 9% Other *(Please indicate. _____)*

26. Which of the following reasons best describes why you collect preference points for deer in Colorado? ***If you do not collect preference points for deer, please skip to question 27.***
n=1,513

- 13% I am not sure where I would like to hunt deer in CO, so having points give me more locations where I could hunt.

- 10% I am saving points for a once-in-a-lifetime hunt.
- 61% I would like to hunt deer in a specific unit which requires preference points to draw.
- 3% I may want to hunt deer in CO someday and am saving points for that opportunity.
- 4% I am saving my points to apply as a part of a group.
- 9% Other (*Please indicate.* _____)

27. In 2010, CPW added a “ hybrid draw” to the limited license drawing system. It allows individuals who have more than 5 preference points to enter a random drawing for hunts which require 10 or more preference points to draw. Do you feel that you or any of your hunting companions will benefit from the hybrid draw system? (*Please check one.*) **n=1,922**

- 27% Yes
- 40% No
- 33% I am not sure.

28. How do you believe CPW allocates big game hunting licenses in areas where there are more applicants than permits available? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,986**

- 11% All resident and non-resident applicants are put into a single pool and names are drawn at random.
- 11% Half of the available licenses are awarded to residents, and half are awarded to non-residents.
- 42% Resident applicants are awarded more than half of the available licenses, and non-residents are awarded less than half.
- 6% Non-resident applicants are awarded more than half of the available licenses, and residents are awarded less than half.
- 30% I am not sure.

29. How do you believe CPW allocates big game hunting licenses across the state of Colorado? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,992**

- 11% Permits are allocated in the same way in every unit of the state.
- 49% In some high demand units, permits are allocated differently than in other, lower demand areas of the state.
- 40% I am not sure.

30. Which of the following methods do you think would be the fairest way to distribute licenses in units where demand is higher than the number of licenses available? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,974**

- 15% *Random* - The drawing should be random with no preference of any type.
- 33% *Preference points* - Those with the most points are issued a license first.
- 17% *Weighted draw* - An individual's position in the draw order changes based on how many years they have applied to hunt in that unit.
- 18% *Hybrid* - A portion of the licenses are drawn in a random draw, and a portion issued to those with the most preference points.
- 5% *Banking* - Preference points may be split up to be used in multiple years, but more points will be required to draw if an individual splits their points.
- 12% I am not sure.

31. If non-resident hunters were allocated up to 20% of the licenses in units which require more than 6 preference points to draw a license, how fair do you believe that would be? (These units make up less than 3% of all limited license hunts.) *(Please check one.)* **n=3,007**

Very fair	Somewhat fair	Neither fair, nor unfair	Somewhat unfair	Very unfair	I am not sure.
19%	27%	11%	13%	13%	17%

32. If non-resident hunters in Colorado were allocated up to 35% of the licenses in units which require 0-5 preference points to draw a license, how fair do you believe that would be? *(Please check one.)* **n=3,002**

Very fair	Somewhat fair	Neither fair, nor unfair	Somewhat unfair	Very unfair	I am not sure.
18%	26%	11%	15%	15%	15%

Hunting Big Game Species in Colorado. The following section includes questions about hunting specific species in Colorado. Please help us understand your preferences for seasons and opportunity for each species by answering these questions.

33. Did you hunt for elk in Colorado between 2010 and 2013? *(Please check one.)* **n=3,000**

85% Yes

14% No ***Please skip to question 37.***

34. Your willingness to harvest elk of different types may change over the course of your hunting season. To help us understand these choices, please indicate when you would be willing to harvest elk of the following types. Please assume that you have valid hunting licenses to legally harvest the described elk. *(Please check one for each item.)*

I would harvest an...	n	any time during my hunt.	when 25% of my hunt has passed.	when 75% of my hunt has passed.	I would not harvest this elk.	I am not sure.
adult bull with ≥ 6 antler points per side	2,441	92%	2%	2%	2%	2%
adult bull with between 4 and 6 antler points per side	2,461	63%	15%	13%	6%	2%
antlerless elk (cow or calf)	2,443	49%	7%	27%	13%	4%

35. Imagine you had applied for an elk license in a specific area of the state, but were not drawn to receive a license. If an over-the-counter license to hunt elk in a different part of the state were available, would you purchase one? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,537**

- 46% Yes
- 29% No
- 26% I am not sure.

36. Did you hunt for deer in Colorado between 2010 and 2013? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,991**

- 59% Yes
- 41% No *Please skip to question 40.*

37. Your willingness to harvest deer of different types may change over the course of your hunting season. To help us understand these choices, please indicate when you would be willing to harvest deer of the following types. Please assume that you have valid hunting licenses to legally harvest the described deer. (*Please check one for each item.*)

I would harvest a(n)...	n	any time during my hunt.	when 25% of my season has passed.	when 75% of my hunt has passed.	I would not harvest this deer.	I am not sure.
mature, adult buck with ≥ 4 antler points per side	1,720	87%	5%	5%	1%	1%
adult buck with < 4 antler points per side	1,692	45%	17%	21%	14%	2%
yearling buck with 1-3 antler points per side	1,667	21%	6%	22%	48%	3%
antlerless deer (doe or fawn)	1,667	30%	4%	18%	43%	5%

38. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements describing aspects of **elk hunting seasons** in Colorado. (*Please check one for each item.*)

	n	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	I am not sure.
a. Antlerless, either sex and some antlered, rifle season elk licenses should remain limited in Colorado.	2,936	69%	16%	8%	7%
b. Over-the-counter antlered elk license should continue to be offered during the 2 nd and 3 rd rifle seasons.	2,948	72%	14%	6%	6%

c. Antler point restrictions should be used to protect young and immature bulls from harvest.	2,943	81%	10%	4%	4%
---	-------	-----	-----	----	----

39. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statement describing an aspect of deer hunting seasons in Colorado. (Please check one for each item.)

	<i>n</i>	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	I am not sure.
a. Licenses to hunt deer should remain limited across all of Colorado.	2,962	46%	22%	21%	10%

40. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements describing aspects of pronghorn hunting seasons in Colorado. (Please check one for each item.)

	<i>n</i>	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	I am not sure.
a. Licenses to hunt pronghorn by muzzleloader or rifle should remain limited across all of Colorado.	2,859	40%	22%	10%	28%
b. Licenses to hunt pronghorn by archery should remain unlimited across most of Colorado, with some over-the-counter opportunity.	2,809	46%	20%	26%	26%

41. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements describing aspects of moose hunting seasons in Colorado. (Please check one for each item.)

	<i>n</i>	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	I am not sure.
a. Licenses to hunt moose should remain limited in Colorado.	2,868	70%	10%	2%	18%
b. Where harvest goals cannot be achieved with limited licenses, the number of licenses should be increased.	2,837	63%	13%	7%	17%
c. Rifle seasons for moose should occur before the regular rifle seasons for deer and elk.	2,834	30%	29%	12%	29%
d. Moose licenses should allow the hunter to choose the season in which they would like to participate.	2,838	45%	22%	11%	22%

42. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements describing aspects of **bear hunting seasons** in Colorado. *(Please check one for each item.)*

	<i>n</i>	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	I am not sure.
a. The September rifle bear hunting season should remain limited across all of Colorado.	2,850	44%	20%	14%	22%
b. During archery, muzzleloader and regular rifle deer and elk seasons, over-the-counter bear licenses should be available up to a maximum number of permits.	2,839	61%	15%	5%	19%
c. The September rifle bear hunting season should be broken up into multiple, shorter seasons.	2,832	11%	31%	31%	28%
d. Hunters should be able to purchase and use a bear-only hunting license without the requirement to also have a deer or elk license for the same season.	2,844	60%	14%	8%	18%

43. Please indicate your level of agreement with the following statements describing aspects of **mountain lion hunting seasons** in Colorado. *(Please check one for each item.)*

	<i>n</i>	Agree	Neither agree, nor disagree	Disagree	I am not sure.
a. Mountain lion hunting seasons should occur after regular rifle deer and elk seasons have closed.	2,834	39%	21%	12%	29%
b. A pursuit-only season should be offered in areas that have been closed to mountain lion harvest.	2,808	30%	26%	9%	35%
c. An April season should be offered in areas where quotas have not been met via the regular seasons.	2,815	52%	15%	6%	27%

Your Views about Wildlife. CPW is interested in learning how you think about wildlife and how that shapes your hunting activities in Colorado. Please help us learn about your views about wildlife by answering the following questions.

44. Below are statements representing different ways that people might think about wildlife.

We're interested in how big game hunters view wildlife, in general. To help us do so, please check one response for each item below.

	Strongly disagree	Neither disagree, nor agree	Strongly agree
Humans should manage wildlife populations so that humans benefit.			
Animals should have rights similar to the rights of humans.			
We should strive for a world where there's an abundance of wildlife for hunting and fishing.			
I view all living things as part of one family.			
Hunting does not respect the lives of animals.			
I feel a strong emotional bond with animals.			
The needs of humans should take priority over wildlife protection.			
I care about animals as much as I do other people.			
Wildlife are on earth primarily for people to use.			
Hunting is cruel and inhumane to animals.			
We should strive for a world where humans and wildlife can live side by side without fear.			
I value the sense of companionship I receive from animals.			
Wildlife are like my family and I want to protect them.			
People who want to hunt should be provided the opportunity to do so.			

Value Orientation Dimensions
 range = 1-7, where 1 is low, 7 is high
 \bar{x} (wildlife use dimension) = 4.2
 \bar{x} (hunting dimension) = 6.2
 \bar{x} (social affiliation dimension) = 2.9
 \bar{x} (caring for wildlife dimension) = 3.9

Value Orientation Types
 Utilitarian $n = 1,889$, 63%
 Distanced $n = 485$, 16%
 Pluralist $n = 390$, 13%
 Mutualist $n = 230$, 8%

Background Information. The following questions will help us understand more about the people who hunt big game in Colorado. All responses are confidential.

45. Are you a resident of Colorado? (Please check one.) $n=3,000$

47% Yes

53% No **Please skip to question 47.**

46. For how many years have you lived in Colorado? (Please indicate.) $n=1,398$

_____ \bar{x} = 35 _____ years

7. Have you ever hunted big game in Colorado as a non-resident? (*Please check one.*) **n=1,416**

12% Yes
89% No

48. Do you belong to any of the following big game-related organizations? (*Please check all that apply.*) **n=1,339**

8% Colorado Bowhunters Association
15% Safari Club International
6% Rocky Mountain Bighorn Sheep Society
10% Mule Deer Foundation
3% Colorado Mule Deer Association
72% Rocky Mountain Elk Foundation
2% Muzzleloader Association
8% Boone and Crockett
27% Other (*Please indicate.*_____)

49. Are you 95% male or 5% female? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,991**

50. In what year were you born? (*Please indicate the 4-digit year.*) **n=2,973** \bar{x} = 1955 _____

51. How would you describe your racial or ethnic background? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,956**

93% White, non-Hispanic/Latino
3% Hispanic/Latino
0% Black or African American
1% American Indian or Native Alaskan
0% Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
0% Asian
2% Other (*Please indicate.*_____)

52. How would you describe the area where you currently live? (*Please check one.*) **n=2,969**

24% Rural setting, on a farm/ranch
21% Rural setting, not on a farm/ranch
11% Rural subdivision
4% Within a village (Population less than 5,000)
11% Suburban area on the edge of a town or city
9% Within a small town (Population between 5,000 and 25,000)
9% Within an urban area (Population between 25,000 and 100,000)
12% Within a metropolitan area (Population more than 100,000)

53. Please use the space below to provide any additional comments you may have about big game hunting in Colorado.

n=1,527

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