MISSISSIPPI NON-RESIDENT MAIL SURVEY OF

GAME HARVEST AND HUNTER EFFORT FOR

1998-99

by

Catherine C. Shropshire

Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks
P. O. Box 451
Jackson, Mississippi 39205

TABLE OF CONTENTS

			Page
TABLE OF CONTENTS	 	 	2
LIST OF TABLES	 	 	3
LIST OF FIGURES	 	 	5
INTRODUCTION	 	 	6
METHODS	 	 	7
RESULTS	 	 	9
DISCUSSION	 	 	10
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	 	 	11
REFERENCES CITED	 	 	12
TABLES	 	 	13
FIGURES			38

LIST OF TABLES

PAGE	TABL
TOTAL 1998-99 DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS 13	1
TOTAL 1998-99 DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY WEAPON TYPE	2
1998-99 GUN DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 40 - ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	3
1998-99 GUN DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 41 - 5 DAY ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	4
1998-99 ARCHERY DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 40 - ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	5
1998-99 ARCHERY DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 41 - 5 DAY ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	6
1998-99 PRIMITIVE WEAPON DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 40 - ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	7
1998-99 PRIMITIVE WEAPON DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 41 - 5 DAY ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	8
1998-99 DOVE HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	9
1998-99 QUAIL HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	10
1998-99 WOODCOCK HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	11

TABL	PAG	ìΕ
12	1998-99 RABBIT HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	23
13	1998-99 SQUIRREL HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	24
14	1998-99 RACCOON HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	25
15	1998 SPRING TURKEY HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	26
16	1998 FALL TURKEY HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	27
17	1998-99 DUCK HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	28
18	1998-99 GOOSE HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	29
19	1998-99 RED FOX HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	30
20	1998-99 GRAY FOX HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	31
21	1998-99 BOBCAT HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	32
22	1998-99 COYOTE HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE AND DISTRICT HUNTED MOST	33
23	SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS	34

FIGURES

FIGUI	RE	PAGE
1.	QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR THE 1998-99 NON-RESIDENT MAIL SURVEY OF GAME HARVEST AND HUNTER EFFORT IN MISSISSIPPI .	36

INTRODUCTION

The purpose of the non-resident game harvest survey is to establish indices of harvest and hunter effort for each game species taken by non-residents. These indices will provide trend data which will allow staff to monitor changes in harvest and effort through time. When interpreting these data, it is important to consider habitat changes, species abundance, the current socio-economic climate of the state as well as changes in management strategies.

The Mississippi Department of Wildlife Fisheries and Parks (MDWFP) used a mail survey to obtain data on total harvest, average daily kill, average seasonal harvest, and total man-days hunted for each game species hunted by non-residents. The estimates obtained for each of these categories contain serious sampling, response and nonresponse biases, therefore the accuracy of these estimates is unknown. Filion (1980) provided a good review of these biases and their effect on the estimates. Recognizing that these biases exist and assuming all biases remain constant, the estimates obtained from the survey provide adequate indices for monitoring trends in non-resident hunter harvest and effort.

The primary objective of the non-resident mail survey for the 1998-99 hunting season was to obtain a reliable set of <u>statewide</u> indices for each game species in Mississippi. Harvest estimates were calculated for each district as well. The survey also will be used as a tool to monitor hunter attitudes and perceptions on specific issues. The results of the survey will be used to help guide future management decisions.

METHODS

The sampling frame for the survey consisted of non-resident holders of a Type 40 - All Game Hunting, Type 41 - 5 Day All Game Hunting, Type 33 Small Game Hunting or Type 34 - 5 Day Small Game Hunting license purchased during the 1998-99 license year.

An approximate 0.185 percent random sample of these hunting license buyers was selected from the 26,743 licenses processed from July 1, 1998 - January 31, 1999.

An initial sample of 2,854 Type 40 - All Game Hunting, 779 Type 41 - 5 Day All Game Hunting, 511 Type 33 - Small Game Hunting and 803 Type 34 - 5 Day Small Game Hunting licenses holders was selected. All types were combined into a single computer file for mailing purposes. A final list of 4,947 hunters was produced.

The initial mailing consisting of the questionnaire (Figure 1), a cover letter and a No. 9 postage-paid business reply envelope was mailed in a No. 10 window envelope on March 29, 1999 to the 4,947 sampled hunters. Three weeks after the initial mailing reminder post cards were mailed to 2,698 sampled hunters who had not returned their questionnaire. The final 2,413 piece mailing, composed of the identical questionnaire, cover letter and business reply envelope was mailed approximately three weeks after the reminder post card mailing to the remaining nonrespondents. First mailing questionnaires were given identification numbers from 100,001 to 104,947, while the final mailing was given a 200,000 numbering sequence to differentiate responses between mailings.

Questionnaire design and mailing procedures were outlined by Steffen (1981).

Procedures for editing and data entry of returned questionnaires were also identical to Steffen

hunters who were successful, total man-days spent hunting, average days afield per hunter and the average daily kill. These indices were calculated on a statewide basis.

The 1997-98 survey obtained information about two different license years. Turkey harvest indices were partially calculated from hunters who hunted during the spring 1998 turkey season, which was the 97/98 license year. Indices for other species were determined for the 1998-99 season alone. Spring 1998 turkey indices were calculated based on the respondents who also purchased a big game license during the previous July 1, 1997 - June 30, 1998 fiscal year (Question 11 on survey).

RESULTS

Based on all three mailings, 504 (10.2%) of the 4,947 questionnaires were returned as non-deliverable by the post office. Therefore 4,443 individuals were assumed to have been contacted to participate in the survey. Of these 3,083 (69.4%) returned their questionnaires for possible analysis. Of those returned, 59 (0.2%) were returned too late for analysis, therefore 3,024 (68.1%) were available for use. Nonresponses were 1,360 (30.6%).

Statewide expansions were calculated based on the total hunting licenses sold for each type and accounted for by the middle of July 1998. There existed 16,319 individuals licensed to hunt all game, 7,611 licensed for 5 day all game hunting, 3,191 licensed for small game hunting and 6,394 licensed for 5 day small game hunting. The spring, 1998 turkey hunting estimates were based on the 15,591 All Game Hunting and 7,036 5-day All Game Hunting licence holders accounted for in the 1997-98 license sales totals.

The expanded statewide summaries of total harvest, average daily kill, average seasonal kill, the percent of hunters and the percent of total licenses that hunted are provided in Table 1 - 22 for all game species included in the survey.

Table 23 summarizes the responses to the additional questions in Part B.

DISCUSSION

This was the fifth year this survey was conducted. Response rates were good, indicating a willingness on the part of non-residents to report their hunting activities.

Total deer harvest increased by over 10% from the 1997-98 season harvest. Nearly twice as many does than bucks were harvested. This shift to greater doe harvest was first recorded three years ago and may be due to the four-point rule for buck harvest along with more days available to harvest antierless deer. It should be noted that not all districts had the same doe opportunity during the deer season. In District 1, doe hunting was closed from December 24 - January 20 in Tippah, Alcorn, Prentiss, Tishomingo, Union, Pontotoc, Lee, and Itawamba counties. In District 4, doe hunting was closed from December 24 - January 20 in Covington, Scott and Smith counties. All of District 6 which includes the counties of Lamar, Forrest, Perry, Greene, Pearl River, Stone, George, Hancock, Harrison, and Jackson was closed to doe harvest from December 24 - January 20. Other districts were open for doe hunting during all deer seasons.

Response and nonresponse biases exist with the survey as previously noted. Therefore discretion must be used when considering these data as absolute estimates. Assuming the biases remain consistent over time, the best uses of these data are as indices for trend determinations. For management purposes, it should be reemphasized that the hunting data provided are only indices to harvest and effort.

The survey should be continued with a sample of 3,000-5,000 non-resident hunters. To avoid changes in biases, attention to the consistency of survey methodology should be continued in future surveys.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A CHELLINE

This survey could not have been accomplished without the conscientious efforts of many MDWFP personnel from all divisions. Special thanks goes to Dene Smith for data entry, mailing preparation and record maintenance. Appreciation is extended to J. Gambel, D. Hardison, B. Sessums, C. Thomas and C. Thornhill for technical expertise and S. Adcock, M. Berry, B. Ellison, R. Norell, R. Spencer, and J. Tindall for help with mailing preparation.

REFERENCES CITED

- Filion, F.L. 1980. Human surveys in wildlife management. Pages 441-453 in S.D. Schemnitz, ed. Wildlife techniques manual. 4th ed. rev. The Wildl. Soc., Washington, D.C. 686 pp.
- Steffen, D.E. 1981. Mississippi mail survey of game harvest and hunter effort for 1980-81. Miss. Dept. Wildl. Cons., Fed.Aid Proj. No. W-48-28, Job VI-a. 87 pp.

TABLE 1. TOTAL 1998-99 DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS

TABLE 2. TOTAL 1998-99 DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY WEAPON TYPE

TOTAL HARVEST GUN	TOTAL	TOTAL HARVEST ARCHERY	TOTAL	TOTAL HARVEST PRIMITIVE	TOTAL
35.144	226,875	3,742	53,114	2,249	22,998
BUCK		BUCK		BUCK	
11.500		1,316		096	
DOE		DOE		DOE	
23 644		2,426		1,289	

TABLE 3. 1998-99 GUN DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 40 - ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS

TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
20,770				206,096	14.19	14,524 (1,667)	89.0
BUCK							
9,441	0.05	99:0	51.6				
DOE	3. T					. me	
11,329	9.0	0.78	46.8				

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	2.6%
DISTRICT 5	74.4%
DISTRICT 4	8.6%
DISTRICT 3	4.8%
DISTRICT 2	4.5%
DISTRICT 1	2.1%

TABLE 4. 1998-99 GUN DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 41 - 5 DAY ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS

TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
4,274				20,779	3.5	5,937 (341)	78.0
BUCK							
1,959	60.0	0.33	31.0				
DOE				-			
2.315	0.08	0.29	25.0				

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6 5.8%	DISTRICT 5 33.4%	DISTRICT 4 19.6%	DISTRICT 3 20.9%	DISTRICT 2	DISTRICT 1
			-	271.01	100
5.8%	33.4%	19.6%	20.9%	13.2%	7 1%
					DISTRICT 1
DISTRICT 6	DISTRICT 5	DISTRICT 4	DISTRICT 3	RICT 2	DISTRICT

TABLE 5. 1998-99 ARCHERY DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 40 - ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS

AVERAGE TOTAL % TOTAL SEASONAL HUNTERS LICENSEES DAYS	9.38 5,385 33.0 (621)				
# SUCCESSFUL TOTAL AV HUNTERS MANDAYS SEA	50,511		15.8		32.5
AVERAGE % S SEASONAL HARVEST			0.21		0.42
AVERAGE DAILY KILL			0.02		0.05
TOTAL HARVEST	3,393	BUCK	1,131	DOE	2,262

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	6.9%
DISTRICT 5	69.2%
DISTRICT 4	7.4%
DISTRICT 3	6.2%
DISTRICT 2	8.5%
DISTRICT 1	1.8%

TABLE 6. 1998-99 ARCHERY DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 41 - 5 DAY ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS

		Т	T		
% TOTAL LICENSEES	9.0	-			
TOTAL HUNTERS	685 (41)				
AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	3.8				
TOTAL	2,603				
% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS			24.0		22.0
AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST		-	0.27		0.24
AVERAGE DAILY KILL			0.07		90.0
TOTAL	349	BUCK	185	DOE	161

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

-	_
9	
RICT	.1%
DIST	6
5	
RICT	30.3%
DIST	3(
SICT.	5.2%
DIST	15
ICT 3	1%
DISTR	39.4%
CT 2	%
ISTRI	6.13
9	
T 1	
STRK	
ā	

TABLE 7. 1998-99 PRIMITIVE WEAPON DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 40 - ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS

	AVERAGE	AVERAGE	% SUCCESSFUL	TOTAL	AVERAGE	TOTAL	% TOTAL
HARVEST	DAILY KILL	SEASONAL	HUNTERS	MANDAYS	SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	HUNTERS	LICENSEES
2,021				21,573	4.59	4,700 (538)	28.8
BUCK							
846	0.04	0.18	17.8				
DOE						-	
1,175	0.05	0.25	22.0	- 4		-	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	5.2%
DISTRICT 5	72.1%
DISTRICT 4	4.6%
DISTRICT 3	6.5%
DISTRICT 2	10.7%
DISTRICT 1	1.0%

TABLE 8. 1998-99 PRIMITIVE WEAPON DEER HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENT TYPE 41 - 5 DAY ALL GAME HUNTING LICENSE BUYERS

AVERAGE % SUCCESSFUL TOTAL AVERAGE TOTAL % TOTAL LI SEASONAL HUNTERS MANDAYS SEASONAL HUNTERS LICENSEES DAYS HARVEST HUNTING HUNTING	1,425 3.74 381 5.0 (23)		30.0	
			0.00	
TOTAL AV	228	AOIId	BOCK	114

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	4.3%		
DISTRICT 5	34.8%		
DISTRICT 4	17.4%		
DISTRICT 3	17.4%	77:11	
DISTRICT 2	ØF ic	71.170	
DISTRICT 1		4.3%	

TABLE 9. 1998-99 DOVE HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40						1.0	-
32,376	7.05	22.04	95.4	4,598	3.13	1,469 (173)	0.6
TYPE 41							
069	9.20	23.00	100.0	75	2.50	30 (2)	0.4
TYPE 33							
31,197	89.8	26.71	5'96	3,597	3.08	1,168 (115)	36.6
TYPE 34							
21,307	8.09	13.89	92.0	2,638	1.72	1,534 (99)	24.0
TOTAL							
85,570				10,908		4,201	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	6.4%
DISTRICT 5	15.2%
DISTRICT 4	5.3%
DISTRICT 3	29.4%
DISTRICT 2	37.2%
DISTRICT 1	6.1%

TABLE 10. 1998-99 QUAIL HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL HARVEST	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
1,513	1.9	9.28	5'06	792	4.86	163 (21)	1.0
TYPE 41							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYPE 33	-						
4,530	4.27	24.89	0.68	1,061	5.83	182 (18)	5.7
TYPE 34							
480	2.67	10.67	100.0	180	4.00	45 (3)	0.7
TOTAL							
6,523				2,033		390	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	14.6%
DISTRICT 5	9.8%
DISTRICT 4	4.9%
DISTRICT 3	7.3%
DISTRICT 2	43.9%
DISTRICT 1	19.5%

TABLE 11. 1998-99 WOODCOCK HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL HARVEST	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40						-	-
104	1.18	9.9	100.0	88	5.5	16 (2)	0.1
TYPE 41						. 43	
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYPE 33							
01	0.20	0.5	50.0	47	2.5	19 (2)	9.0
TYPE 34							
0	0	0	0	13	1	13	0.2
TOTAL							
114				148		48	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

- 11	****	
Ш		
- 11		
Ш		
Ш	vo:	
Ш		
II	DISTRICT	
. II		
- II		
- !!	~~	
Ш		
- 11	i on	
- 11	44	
- 11		
- 11	**********	
П		
H		
- 11		
ŧI		
- ii	*********	
II		i
- II		
II		
II		
II	*******	
- 11		
Ш	₩	
- 19		20
- 11	₩	6
- 11		0
H	DISTRICT 5	20.0%
ł		\approx
1		
_ [l		
_ [l		
II.		
I)		
I		
Į		
I		
	**	
II.	DISTRICT	.0
- II	·	20.0%
Ш	80 - 17 80	0
Ш	***	~
II		\simeq
- II	S	(1
II	₩₩	
II	×××	
- 11		
- II		
Ш		
Ш		
II	******	
H		
н	000000000	
ı		
	3	
	3	
	Т3	
	CT 3	%
	ICT 3	%
	RICT 3	.2%
	TRICT 3	0.2%
	STRICT 3	20.2%
	ISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	2 DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	2 DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	T 2 DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	CT 2 DISTRICT 3	20.2%
	ICT 2 DISTRICT 3	0% 20.2%
	RICT 2 DISTRICT 3	.0%
	TRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	0.0%
	STRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	NSTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0% 20.2%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0% 20.2%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	T 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	OT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	ICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0% 20.2%
	RICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	TRICT 1 DISTRICT 3	40.0% 20.2%
	STRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0% 20.2%
	MSTRICT I DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0% 20.2%
	DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 3	40.0%
	DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	40.0%

TABLE 12. 1998-99 RABBIT HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL HARVEST	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
6,442	1.80	85'9	8.68	3,554	3.6	979 (118)	0.9
TYPE 41	-						
75	1.67	2.5	0.001	45	1.5	30 (2)	0.4
TYPE 33							
212	1.95	8.6	80.0	449	4.4	102 (10)	3.2
TYPE 34				***			
300	2.22	6.67	67.0	135	3.0	45 (3)	7.0
TOTAL							
7,711				4,183		1,156	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	10.2%
DISTRICT 5	20.8%
DISTRICT 4	7.0%
DISTRICT 3	7.8%
RICT 2	.1%
DIST	21

TABLE 13. 1998-99 SQUIRREL HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL MANDAYS	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
45,343	2.96	14.25	93.1	13,301	4.81	3,182 (364)	19.5
TYPE 41							
1,081	3.37	7.11	0.68	321	2.11	152 (9)	2.0
TYPE 33							
702	2.38	6.27	82.0	596	2.64	112 (11)	3.5
TYPE 34							
1,056	3.30	8.25	75.0	320	2.5	128 (8)	2.0
TOTAL							
48,182				14,238		3,574	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	9.1%
DISTRICT 5	66.1%
DISTRICT 4	2.0%
DISTRICT 3	7.3%
DISTRICT 2	11.5%
DISTRICT 1	1.0%

TABLE 14. 1998-99 RACCOON HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

J 83		1.3		0.7	1.0	,	7.0		
% TOTAL LICENSEES				Ü					
TOTAL		212 (24)		53	32 (4)	-	(1)		310
AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING		1.75		2	2.75		3		
TOTAL		371		106	1,376		39		1,892
% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS		87.5		100.0	75.0		100.0		
AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST		3.12		1	6.25		2.00		
AVERAGE DAILY KILL		1.78		s:	0.58		0.67		
TOTAL	TYPE 40	199	TVDE 41	53	TYPE 33 200	TYPE 34	26	I V LLOW	101AL 940

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	16.1%
DISTRICT 5	29.0%
DISTRICT 4	
DISTRICT 3	22.6%
DISTRICT 2	32.3%
DISTRICT 1	

TABLE 15. 1998 SPRING TURKEY HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
1,172	0.08	0.56	34.0	13,144	6.28	2,093 (321)	17.0
TYPE 41							
114	0.27	06:0	0.09	419	3.30	127 (10)	2.3
TOTAL							
1,286				13,563		2,220	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	5.7%
DISTRICT 5	59.3%
DISTRICT 4	8.1%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 2	11.4%
DISTRICT 1	2.1%

TABLE 16. 1998 FALL TURKEY HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL MANDAYS	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
279	60:0	0.34	23.0	1,125	3.63	310 (35)	1.9
TYPE 41							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL					W		
279				1,125		310	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

200000000000000000000000000000000000000	
l	
ျပ	
H-	
~	
2	
1	
NO.	
18. 	
∞ ∞	
TR	%
	1.2%
‱∠₩	=
	4
₩ ₩	
III	
≥	
1	
II	
II	
ll 🏻 🚟	
.3	
T.3	
ICT 3	9
RICT 3	%
STRICT 3	%9 ′′
ISTRICT 3	17.6%
DISTRICT 3	17.6%
DISTRICT 3	17.6%
DISTRICT 3	17.6%
DISTRICT 3	17.6%
DISTRICT 3	17.6%
JIG DIS	17.6%
DISTRICT 3	17.6%
JIG DIS	17.6%
JIG DIS	17.6%
JIG DIS	1
JIG DIS	1
JIG DIS	1
SIG DE	1
JIG DIS	26.5% 17.6%
JIG DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
JIG DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1
DISTRICT 2 DIS	1

TABLE 17. 1998-99 DUCK HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

77 1,122 8.88 72.8 9,482 539 0.74 5.39 5.39 9,482 36 0.141 4.07 81.0 2,148 37 0.25 0.72 72.0 2,148 25 0.89 2.58 87.0 2,148 80 1.42 14.20 87.0 23,786 80 0.21 8.78 49.0 23,786 80 0.21 8.78 47.3 88.35 14,564 80 0.37 0.39 41.0 78.0 78.0 691 1.19 3.79 78.0 49,980	TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	# SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL	% TOTAL LICENSEES
Harmonia	TYPE 40							
PE 41 d 3.036 d 3.036 d 3.036 l 1.41			8.88 2.26 5.39	72.8 49.0 58.0	9,482	7.26	1,306 (151)	8.0
3.036 1.41 4.07 81.0 2,148 2.8 746 5.37 0.25 2.58 72.0 87.0 2,148 8 746 1.925 0.25 2.58 8.70 87.0 23,786 9.94 2,393 3.049 0.21 4.70 87.0 72.0 23,786 9.94 2,393 21,010 0.88 8.78 72.0 4.60 23,786 23,786 2,393 1 22,080 1.49 4.73 83.5 14,564 3.12 4,668 17,691 1.19 3.79 78.0 78.0 9,113 9,113 15,17 1.517 49,980 9,113 9,113 1,13	PE 4							
PE 33 1420 87.0 23,786 9.94 2,393 rd 33,980 0.21 2.11 49.0 23,786 9.94 2,393 21,010 0.88 8.78 72.0 23,786 9.94 2,393 PE 34 rd 22,080 1.49 4,73 83.5 14,564 3.12 4,668 rd 4,621 0.37 3.79 78.0 78.0 9,113 OTAL 9,113			4.07 0.72 2.58	81.0 72.0 56.0	2,148	2.8	746 (43)	8.6
33.980 1.42 14.20 87.0 23,786 9.94 2,393 5.049 0.21 2.11 49.0 72.0 49.0 72.0 72.0 72.0 4,621 4,688 4,688 4,688 4,688 4,688 4,688 4,688 4,688 4,688 4,688 7,691 4,688 7,697	PE 3.							
PE 34 rd 22,080			14.20 2.11 8.78	87.0 49.0 72.0	23,786	9.94	2,393 (236)	75.0
22,080 4,621 1,69 1,69 1,69 1,69 1,19 1,19 1,69 1,19 1,69 1,19 1,69 1,19 1,68 1,68 1,297 1,80 1,68 1,68 1,68 1,68 1,697 1	PE 3							
OTAL 49,980			4.73 0.99 3.79	83.5 41.0 78.0	14,564	3.12	4,668 (297)	73.0
49,980	OTA							
	131.517				49,980		9,113	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	1.7%
DISTRICT 5	9.3%
DISTRICT 4	2.6%
DISTRICT 3	46.7%
DISTRICT 2	35.2%
DISTRICT 1	3.8%

TABLE 18. 1998-99 GOOSE HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

					401,444.	TOTAL	Ø TOTAI
TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	MANDAYS	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	HUNTERS	LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
1,055	0.85	6.47	79.0	1,236	7.58	163	1.0
TYPE 41							
104	1.00	1.50	75.0	104	1.5	69 (4)	6.0
TYPE 33						-	
2,160	0.54	4.26	0.06	4,026	7.94	507 (50)	1.6
TYPE 34							
863	0.54	1.50	72.0	1,581	2.75	575 (36)	0.6
TOTAL							
4 182				6,947		1,314	
4,102							

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 5 DISTRICT 6		
DISTRICT 4	1.9%	
DISTRICT 3	48.5%	
DISTRICT 2	45.6%	
DISTRICT 1	3.9%	

TABLE 19. 1998-99 RED FOX HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

	DO VOLUM	AVEDAGE	# SHCCESSFUL	TOTAL	AVERAGE	TOTAL	% TOTAL
IOIAL HARVEST	DAILY KILL	SEASONAL HARVEST	HUNTERS	MANDAYS	SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	HUNTERS	LICENSEES
TYPE 40			-				
16	0.22	1.00	50.0	72	4.50	16 (2)	0.1
TYPE 41	,						
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TVDE 33							
66 7111			0	0	0	0	0
0	0						
TYPE 34							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL							
7				72		16	
OI							

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	
DISTRICT 5	20.0%
DISTRICT 4	50.0%
DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	

TABLE 20. 1998-99 GRAY FOX HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL HARVEST	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL MANDAYS	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL	% TOTAL
TYPE 40							
11	0.25	99.0	0.79	43	1.0	16 (3)	0.1
TYPE 41							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYPE 33							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYPE 34							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TOTAL							
11				43		91	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

1		
-		
- 1		
	- C	î l
- 1	7.1	
- 1		
- 1	~~	
- 1	₩₩₩	
- 1	******	1
	Dis	
	ā	
	886m88	
- 1		
1		
		
- 1		
- 1	***********	
		1 1
- 1		
	V7	

1	***	.0
- 1	XXXXX	68
	l 2000	7
	₩ ₩	9.
	88.*****	9
- 1		_
	-	
	‱‱	
	₩ ₩ ₩	
	W & W	
	88	
	S	
	- W	
- 1		1

		l i
	3	
	T 3	
	CT3	
	ICT 3	
	RICT 3	
	TRICT 3	
	STRICT 3	
	HSTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	DISTRICT 3	
	2 DISTRICT 3	
	2 DISTRICT 3	
	T 2 DISTRICT 3	
	CT 2 DISTRICT 3	%
	UCT 2 DISTRICT 3	3%
	RICT 2 DISTRICT 3	3.3%
	TRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	ISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	T 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	TI DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	ICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	ACT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	TRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	TRICT I DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	ISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%
	DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	33.3%

TABLE 21. 1998-99 BOBCAT HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL HARVEST	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
321	0.21	1.16	87.5	1,532	5.53	277 (32)	1.7
TYPE 41							
15	0.05	0.20	20.0	304	4.00	76 (5)	1.0
TYPE 33							
0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0
TYPE 34							
13	1.00	1.00	100.0	13	1.00	13	0.2
TOTAL							
349				1,849		366	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

Victoria de la composición dela composición de la composición de la composición dela composición de la composición de la composición dela composición dela composición de la c	_
1	,
	- 1
l o	- 1
₩ ₩₩	
STRICT	
22	
က	
	1
1	
	1
888888888	
1	
	1
	~0
	56.8%
	∞.
1887	9
1882	S
1	
II SOUR	
100000	
	1%
	Ğ
1882	00
ă	

1	

3	
F.3	
T3	2
ICT 3	%
RICT 3	.5%
TRICT 3	13.5%
STRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
DISTRICT 3	13.5%
2 DISTRICT 3	13.5%
T.2 DISTRICT 3	13.5%
T 2	13.5%
T 2	9% 13.5%
RICT 2 DISTRICT 3	3.9%
T 2	18.9%
T 2	18.9%
T 2	13.5%
T 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
T 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	18.9%
DISTRICT 2	%5.81 %6.81
DISTRICT 2	18.9% 13.5%
DISTRICT 2	.7% 18.9% 13.5%
DISTRICT 2	2.7% 18.9% 13.5%
DISTRICT 2	2.7% 18.9% 13.5%
DISTRICT 2	2.7% 18.9% 13.5%
DISTRICT 2	2.7% 18.9% 13.5%

TABLE 22. 1998-99 COYOTE HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TOTAL	AVERAGE DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	TOTAL HUNTERS	% TOTAL LICENSEES
TYPE 40							
816	0.27	1.39	92.0	3,041	5.18	587 (67)	3.6
TYPE 41							
35	0.15	0.50	50.0	224	3.25	69 (4)	0.0
TYPE 33							
6	1.00	1.00	100.0	6	1	9 (1)	^{بن} 0.3
TYPE 34							
13	0.50	1.00	100.0	26	2.00	13 (1)	0.2
TOTAL							
864			A8,85, 10.10 Basel B. 10.10 10.10	3,291		699	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

I	1
RICT 6	
880.C48	
1888 WAS	
	5.6%
BB BB	6
~	9
	,I
100 a.u.	S
U	
1 000 × 100	
7	
W	
	i 1
18888888	
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	1
- CONTRACTOR - CON	

	1
10000000	1 1
· *********	
800000000000000000000000000000000000000	
	!
0.000	i 1
1000.838	
200	١ ١
	امرا
	l % l
	49.3%
C.	1 : 1
DISTR	6
1	4
	, i
	-
88000000	
1000 300 000	1 1
	20
883 88	0
1 ∞∠	9
188 3348	5.6%
	יט
2000000	
8888888	!!
100000000000000000000000000000000000000	
(7)	
2	
T.3	
CT 3	%
ICT 3	%
RICT 3	7%
TRICT 3	9.1%
TRICT 3	19.7%
STRICT 3	19.7%
SISTRICT 3	19.7%
DISTRICT 3	19.7%
2 DISTRICT 3	19.7%
2 DISTRICT 3	19.7%
T 2 DISTRICT 3	19.7%
T 2 DISTRICT 3	2 19.7%
ICT 2 DISTRICT 3	% 19.7%
UCT 2 DISTRICT 3	3% 19.7%
RICT 2 DISTRICT 3	3.3% 19.7%
TRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
STRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
T 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3%
TT DISTRICT DISTRICT 3	18.3%
CT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	7.61 18.3% 19.7%
UCT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	18.3% 19.7%
RICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	.4% 18.3% 19.7%
TRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%
STRICT I DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%
ISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%
DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%
DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%
DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%
DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%
DISTRICT 1 DISTRICT 2 DISTRICT 3	1.4% 18.3% 19.7%

TABLE 22. 1998-99 COYOTE HARVEST IN MISSISSIPPI BY NON-RESIDENTS BY LICENSE TYPE

TVBE 40	DAILY KILL	AVERAGE SEASONAL HARVEST	% SUCCESSFUL HUNTERS	TOTAL MANDAYS	AVERAGE SEASONAL DAYS HUNTING	HUNTERS	LICENSEES
816	0.27	1.39	92.0	3,041	5.18	587 (67)	3.6
TYPE 41							
35	0.15	0.50	50.0	224	3.25	69	6.0
TYPE 33							
6	1.00	1.00	100.0	6	1	9 (1)	0.3
TYPE 34							
13	0.50	1.00	100.0	26	2.00	13	0.2
TOTAL							
864				3,291		699	

DISTRICT HUNTED MOST

DISTRICT 6	2.6%	
DISTRICT 5	49.3%	
DISTRICT 4	5.6%	
DISTRICT 3	19.7%	
DISTRICT 2	18 3%	9/5:01
DISTRICT 1	1 10	1.470

TABLE 23. SUMMARY OF RESPONSES TO ADDITIONAL QUESTIONS

- 1. Why do you hunt in Mississippi? Choose the ONE best answer.
 - 5.6 170 Prefer the season framework here
 - 61.5 1855 To hunt with friends/family
 - 11.9 359 More successful hunting here
 - 12.5 378 Better wildlife populations
 - 8.4 254 No response
- 5. Do you deer hunt on public land in Mississippi?
 - 9.3 280 Yes
 - 88.3 2664 No
 - 2.4 72 No response

If not, why? How important are these factors in deciding not to hunt public land. Circle one number beside each phrase with 1=Very important (VI), 2=Important (I), 3=Neutral (N), 4=Not important, 5=Not very important (NVI)

Too far to public land

- 5.2 157 Very important
- 4.2 128 Important
- 21.9 661 Neutral
- 11.7 353 Not important
- 30.4 918 Not very important
- 26.5 799 No response

Management areas too dangerous

- 23.0 695 Very important
- 14.3 432 Important
- 18.8 566 Neutral
- 5.2 158 Not important
- 14.3 431 Not very important
- 24.3 734 No response

Joined a club

- 30.3 914 Very important
 - 7.0 210 Important
- 15.5 466 Neutral
- 5.4 163 Not important
- 17.6 531 Not very important
- 24.3 732 No response

Too many restrictions

- 8.0 241 Very important
- 7.5 226 Important
- 26.4 795 Neutral
- 9.4 285 Not important
- 22.1 666 Not very important
- 26.6 803 No response

No designated stands

12.9	388	Very important
9.0	270	Important
20.6	621	Neutral
8.8	265	Not important
22.4	677	Not very important
26.4	795	No response

Cannot harvest antlerless deer

- 14.3 432 Very important 7.2 218 Important 19.4 585 Neutral 8.2 248 Not important 24.7 745 Not very important 788 26.1 No response
- 4. Would you be more likely to hunt on wildlife management areas if you could harvest an antlerless deer through special hunts?
 - 17.0 512 Much more likely 12.1 364 Somewhat likely 490 16.2 Same 38.7 1167 Not likely 8.5 255 Don't know 7.6 228 No response
- 5. Would you be more likely to hunt on wildlife management areas if you could harvest an antlerless deer during archery and primitive weapon seasons?
 - 18.9 571 Much more likely 10.4 315 Somewhat likely 13.8 415 Same 40.9 1234 Not likely 8.6 260 Don't know 7.3 221 No response
- 6. How do you feel about a tagging system for all deer killed in Mississippi?
 - 25.1 758 Strongly approve 9.2 277 Mildly approve 29.4 887 Neither approve nor disapprove 6.9 208 Mildly disapprove 12.2 369 Strongly disapprove 10.8 326 Don't know 6.3 191 No response

If you support a tagging system, would you be willing to pay an additional \$10 to implement this program?

14.3 432 Strongly approve 185 Mildly approve 6.1 14.6 441 Neither approve nor disapprove 6.7 202 Mildly disapprove 1005 Strongly disapprove 33.3 9.2 278 Don't know 473 No response 15.7

- 6. How do you feel about a tagging system for all turkeys killed in Mississippi?
 - 22.5 678 Strongly approve
 - 6.5 196 Mildly approve
 - 29.9 903 Neither approve nor disapprove
 - 4.5 135 Mildly disapprove
 - 11.6 349 Strongly disapprove
 - 18.7 564 Don't know
 - 6.3 191 No response

If you support a tagging system, would you be willing to pay an additional \$10 to implement this program?

- 13.3 402 Strongly approve
- 5.1 153 Mildly approve
- 17.8 537 Neither approve nor disapprove
- 6.0 182 Mildly disapprove
- 31.3 943 Strongly disapprove
- 10.7 322 Don't know
- 1.7 50 Don't understand
- 14.2 427 No response
- 8. How many years have you hunted in Mississippi?

Average 10.5 years

9. How many years have you purchased a license?

Average 10.0 years

- 10. If you hunted in Mississippi last year without a license, why did you buy one this year?
 - 1.8 54 Increased law enforcement effort
 - 0.5 15 Just turned sixteen years of age
 - 97.9 2947 No response
- 11. Were you checked by a Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks conservation officer during the 1998-99 hunting season?
 - 19.6 592 Yes
 - 79.1 2387 No
 - 1.2 37 No response
- 12. Did you buy a license to hunt deer and/or turkey in the 1997-98 hunting season?
 - 66.5 2007 Yes
 - 31.6 953 No
 - 1.9 56 No response

To enable up to meet federal aid reporting requirements and to better serve our user groups, please mark the appropriate response. This information is voluntary and will be used for statistical purposes only.

13. Age

Average 44.3 years

14.	Sex		
	97.0	2925	Male
	2.1	63	Female
	0.9	28	No response
14.	Race		
	1.1	33	African American
	97.3	2935	White
	0.2	5	Hispanic
	0.1	4	American Indian
	0.1	2	Asian
	0.1	2	Other
	1.2	35	No response



1998-99 Mississippi Hunter Questionnaire Non-Residents

A. Please fill in the blocks below for each game species you hunted during the 1998-99 hunting season (even if you were unsuccessful). If you hunted more than one kind of game on a particular day, count a day for each type of game you hunted. Report only game taken by you. Your answers will be kept confidential. Please answer the questions in part B., whether you hunted or not.

Spe	ecies	Total Kill	Total Days Hunted	District Hunted Most	Determine DISTRICT HUNTED MOST from map.
1	Dove				TURE MENTINE DE LE CONTROL DE
2	Quail				
3	Woodcock				CONCORD B Q LAWRETTE ACRITOTICE LEE TRANSPORT
4	Rabbit				TALLANGONE WILDERSM COLICEM CHECKEN
5	Squirrel				
6	Raccoon				UROSE POST.
		Bucks Does			COMOL
7	Deer (archery)				ALTON PARTIES NOTICE NO
8	Deer (prim.weap.)				THE WARD LEWIS TO SERVER.
9	Deer (gun)				WOOD WOOD LEWE MENCEN ABAPTA
					NOOTT NEWTON LADSEDALE
10	Turkey (Spring 98)				/ (
11	Turkey (Fall 98)				QUEENE (4) and
	Mai	liard Wood Othe	r		
12	Ducks				(5)
13	Geese				LINCOUN LINCOUN LINCOUN PERMY
					VALUDACIA AMPTE PAGE WALTON LAMAN GO GREEKE
14	Red Fox				PEARL STORE GEORGE
15	Gray Fox				/
16	Bobcat				/ J
17	Coyote				

FIGURE 1. QUESTIONNAIRE USED FOR THE 1998-99 MAIL SURVEY OF NON-RESIDENT GAME HARVEST AND HUNTER EFFORT IN MISSISSIPPI

3. 1.	Why do you hunt in Mississippi? Choose the ONE best answer.						
	 □ Prefer the season framework here □ To hunt with friends/family □ More successful hunting here □ Better wildlife populations 						
2.	Do you deer hunt on public land in Mississippi?						
	□ Yes □ No						
3. If not, how important are these factors in deciding not to hunt public land. Circ beside each phrase with 1=Very important (VI), 2=Important (I), 3=Neutral (N) important, 5=Not very important (NVI).							iber
		VI	1	N	NI	ŃVI	
	Too far to public land	1	2	3	4	5	ļ İ
	Management areas too dangerous	1	2	3	4	5	
	Joined a club	1	2	3	4	5	
	Too many restrictions	1	2	3	4	5	
	No designated stands	1	2	3	4	5	
	Cannot harvest antierless deer	1	2	3	4	5	
4.	Would you be more likely to hunt on wildlife mandeer through special hunts?	nagement	areas if	f you co	uld ham	est an ar	ntlerle
	☐ Much more likely☐ Somewhat likely☐ Same☐ Not likely☐ Don't know						

5.	Would you be more likely to hunt on wildlife management areas if you could harvest an antlerless deer during archery and primitive weapon seasons?						
	 □ Much more likely □ Somewhat likely □ Same □ Not likely 						
	☐ Don't know						
6.	How do you feel about a tagging system for all deer killed in Mississippi?						
	☐ Strongly approve ☐ Mildly approve ☐ Neither approve nor disapprove ☐ Mildly disapprove ☐ Strongly disapprove ☐ Don't know						
	If you support a tagging system, would you be willing to pay an additional \$10.00 to implement this program?						
	☐ Strongly approve ☐ Mildly approve ☐ Neither approve nor disapprove ☐ Mildly disapprove ☐ Strongly disapprove ☐ Don't know						
7.	How do you feel about a tagging system for all turkeys killed in Mississippi?						
	□ Strongly approve □ Mildly approve □ Neither approve nor disapprove □ Mildly disapprove □ Strongly disapprove □ Don't know						

OVER

		If you support to implement the		•	e willing to pay an additional \$10.00		
			trongly approvidently approvidently disapprovidently disa	ve ove nor disapprove orove pprove			
8.	How man	y years have you	ı hunted in N	Mississippi?	Years		
9.	How man	y years have you	ı purchased	a license?	Years		
10.	If you hur	ited in Mississip	pi last year v	without a license, v	why did you buy one this year?		
				enforcement effor 5 years of age	t		
11.	Were you checked by a Mississippi Department of Wildlife, Fisheries and Parks conservation officer during the 1998-99 hunting season?						
		0 Y					
12.	Did you b	uy a license to h	nunt deer and	Vor turkey in the 1	997-98 hunting season?		
		0 Y					
		-			erve our user groups, please mark the for statistical purposes only.		
13.	Age:	Years					
14.	Sex:	☐ Male	☐ Female				
15.	Race:	☐ African Am	erican	☐ White	☐ Hispan		
		☐ American Ir	dian	☐ Asian	☐ Other		