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## 2012-13 Furbearer Harvest Survey

## Prepared by Matt Peek, Furbearer Biologist

The Furbearer Harvest Survey (FHS) is mailed to furharvesters at the end of the trapping season. Since 2001, $70 \%$ of the furharvester license holders from each of nine physiographic provinces in Kansas have been surveyed. This season, given the high number of license sales, we surveyed $60 \%$ from each physiographic province. Recipient names are randomly selected from an online database of all furharvester license buyers.

Survey questions are divided into 5 sections: general information, trapping activities, hunting activities, running activities, and a special section (Appendix 1). Questions were the same from 1983-2008. However, in 2009, a change in question structure in the trapping section was made in an attempt to collect more accurate catch-per-unit-effort data (see questions 8-12 in Appendix 1).

Also beginning in 2009, the Kansas Department of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism (KDWPT) began using SurveyMonkey ${ }^{\text {TM }}$ to facilitate web-based surveys. Online surveys are cheaper and more efficient than paper. They save on paper, printing, postage, and data entry fees, plus they reduce human error associated with bulk data entry. However, not everyone is adequately equipped for online surveys, so they have been used in varying combinations with traditional paper surveys. The past few years, we offered a prize drawing as an incentive for completing the survey. We did not offer prizes for completing the survey this year.

There were a total of 7874 furharvester licenses sold in 2012, including 7524 resident licenses, 263 junior resident licenses, and 87 nonresident licenses. From these, a sample of 4715 license holders ( $60 \%$ ) was selected. The online database contained e-mails for 1278 of these individuals. An initial e-mail was sent to these individuals on April 4, 2013 containing a request for participation and a link to the survey. A reminder e-mail was sent out on April 9, 2013.

A single mailing consisting of an 8.5 "x11" paper survey (Appendix 2) was sent out on April 15, 2013 to furharvesters without a deliverable e-mail on file and to the nonrespondents of our email request $(\mathrm{n}=4292)$. The survey directed recipients online to a survey link, but could also be completed and returned in an enclosed postage paid envelope. A summary of the survey effort including response rates can be found in Table 1. The number of responses and the response rate of furharvesters within each physiographic province can be found in Figure 1.

E-mailing a survey request and a direct link to the survey has proven to be an efficient and economical way to conduct the survey. There is minimal expense in this technique, the response rate is higher than by paper, and the quality of data is generally better since some response requirements are incorporated into the online survey. The main issue with this technique is that most license holders do not have an e-mail associated with their contact information.
Consequently, respondents are asked to provide an e-mail address for future surveys ( 254 new emails were received). It will still be necessary to offer paper surveys until questions about the biases between furharvesters with and without e-mails can be answered, but for now, the e-mail option represents an efficient alternative to be used in conjunction to paper.

Information provided by furharvesters is an estimate of their harvest and activities during the season. Results from bobcat and swift fox pelt tagging have always been lower than the harvest
estimates derived from the FHS, suggesting an overestimate by the FHS. Consequently, harvest figures obtained from this survey should be considered representative of annual harvest indices rather than parameters.

Survey results were extrapolated to represent total harvest and activity. Seventy-one percent of respondents indicated they participated in furharvesting activities during the 2012-13 season (i.e. were active). This is up from $63 \%$ last season. Estimated furharvester distribution based on the county in which they conducted most of their furharvesting activities can be found in Figure 2.

Furharvesters spent an estimated 266,059 user days in pursuit of furbearers, including 158,039 days trapping, 78,491 days hunting, and 29,529 days running. These figures represent a $39 \%$ increase in combined user days from the previous season. Average days afield by trappers, hunters, and runners were similar to last season (40, 20 and 39 last season versus 42, 20 and 49 this season, respectively) but more furharvesters reportedly afield led to the increase in total user days. Participation in various combinations of furharvesting activities is presented in Table 2.

Harvest, participation, and activity levels for trapping, hunting and running are presented in Tables 3-5, respectively. As is typically the case, trappers accounted for the majority of harvest of most furbearer species. Though far more coyotes are taken by hunters than trappers, most hunters who take coyotes by hunting do not have a furharvesting license, so take by these individuals isn't represented in this survey.

Historical furbearer harvest in Kansas based on the Furbearer Harvest Survey can be found in Table 6. Harvest was up for most species from last year, as well as 5 -year averages. In fact, this was the most total furbearers harvested since the 1987-88 season. Notably, each of our three most important furbearers saw sizeable increases in harvest from 5-year averages (bobcat-32\%, coyote- $72 \%$, and raccoon- $44 \%$ ).

Table 1. Sample size and response rate of survey methods used to conduct the Furbearer Harvest Survey.

|  |  |  | Response Rate |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Number | Non-deliverables | Number | Percent |
| E-mail | 1299 | 150 | 458 | 39.9 |
| Paper survey | $4292^{\mathrm{a}}$ | 99 | $1429^{\mathrm{b}}$ | 34.1 |
| Total | 4715 | 99 | 1929 | 41.8 |

Sent to those without e-mails and e-mail nonrespondents.
${ }^{\mathrm{b}}$ Included 42 online responses and 1387 responses to the paper survey.


Figure 1. The number of survey respondents (number) and the response rate of furharvesters (percent) within each physiographic province in Kansas.


Figure 2. Estimated furharvester distribution in Kansas based on the county in which active survey respondents conducted most of their furharvesting activities.

Table 2. Estimated number and percent of furharvesters who participated in various furharvesting activities, and total estimated participation in trapping, hunting and running by furharvesters in 2012-13.

| Activity | Number of Furharvesters | Percent of Furharvesters |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Inactive | 2265 | 28.8 |
| Trap only | 1616 | 28.9 |
| Hunt only | 1400 | 25.1 |
| Run only | 57 | 1.0 |
| Trap and hunt | 1943 | 35.8 |
| Trap and run | 0 | 0.0 |
| Hunt and run | 331 | 5.9 |
| Trap, hunt and run | 237 | 4.2 |
| Total Participation | 2557 |  |
| Total trappers | 2630 | 45.6 |
| Total hunters | 421 | 46.9 |
| Total runners | 7.5 |  |

Table 3. Harvest, participation, and activity levels for trappers in Kansas during the 2012-13 harvest season.

| Species | Number of Trappers <br> Who Pursued (n) | Estimated <br> Harvest | Total Days <br> Traps Set | Ave <br> Traps/Day | Captures/100 <br> Trap Days | Maximum <br> Harvest | Ave Harvest/ <br> Trapper |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Badger | 236 | 1,735 | 6,582 | 11.6 | 4.4 | 15 | 1.8 |
| Beaver | 325 | 9,495 | 5,981 | 5.04 | 12.4 | 70 | 7.2 |
| Bobcat | 603 | 6,866 | 22,193 | 10.9 | 1.3 | 40 | 2.8 |
| Coyote | 615 | 30,251 | 21,864 | 12.4 | 4.5 | 307 | 12.1 |
| Red Fox | 103 | 784 | 1,754 | 8.61 | 5.3 | 13 | 1.9 |
| Gray Fox | 20 | 82 | 326 | 8 | 0.0 | 11 | 1 |
| Swift Fox | 22 | 555 | 437 | 7.72 | 8.2 | 34 | 6.2 |
| Mink | 53 | 225 | 942 | 5.38 | 4.5 | 18 | 1 |
| Muskrat | 167 | 5,364 | 2,611 | 6.52 | 13.9 | 105 | 7.9 |
| Opossum | 692 | 41,350 | 21,681 | 12.1 | 5.5 | 250 | 14.6 |
| Otter | 48 | 518 | 615 | 4.48 | 3.7 | 32 | 2.6 |
| Raccoon | 849 | 90,455 | 33,114 | 14.9 | 8.5 | 335 | 26.1 |
| Skunk | 480 | 16,924 | 15,554 | 12.9 | 3.6 | 250 | 8.6 |
| Weasel | 4 | 0 | 129 | 3.25 | 0.0 | 0 | 0 |

Table 4. Harvest, participation, and activity levels for hunters in Kansas during the 2012-13 harvest season.

| Species | Number of Hunters <br> Who Pursued (n) | Estimated <br> Harvest | Harvest/100 <br> Days | Maximum <br> Harvest | Ave Harvest// <br> Hunter |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Badger | 50 | 282 | 38.5 | 12 | 1.4 |
| Bobcat | 432 | 1,278 | 10.3 | 17 | 0.7 |
| Coyote | 801 | 22,332 | 51.5 | 180 | 6.8 |
| Red Fox | 51 | 98 | 12.3 | 4 | 0.5 |
| Gray Fox | 24 | 8 | 0.0 | 2 | 0.1 |
| Swift Fox | 20 | 65 | 16.3 | 6 | 0.8 |
| Opossum | 96 | 2,486 | 77.2 | 45 | 6.3 |
| Raccoon | 402 | 29,818 | 94.5 | 200 | 18.2 |
| Skunk | 50 | 580 | 41.0 | 15 | 2.8 |

Table 5. Treeing success, participation, and activity levels for furharvesters in Kansas during the 2012-13 running season.

| Species | Number of Runners <br> Who Pursued (n) | Estimated <br> Take* | Take/100 <br> Days* | Maximum <br> Take* | Ave Take/ <br> Runner* |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bobcat | 10 | 53 | 9.5 | 5 | 1.3 |
| Red Fox | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Gray Fox | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Opossum | 25 | 694 | 70.5 | 34 | 6.8 |
| Raccoon | 144 | 28,777 | 116.3 | 600 | 48.75 |

*Take refers to the number of animals "seen or treed" while running.

Table 6. Historical harvest of furbearers in Kansas based on furbearer harvest survey.

| Seasons | Badger | Beaver | Bobcat Tagging * | Bobcat | Coyote | Gray Fox | Red Fox | Swift Fox Tagging * | Swift Fox | Mink | Muskrat | Opossum | Otter <br> Tagging* | Otter | Raccoon | Striped <br> Skunk | Weasel |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1969-70 | 311 | 8583 |  | 373 | 9758 | 81 | 193 |  |  | 2189 | 43773 | 10452 |  |  | 63004 | 2466 | 28 |
| 1970-71 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1971-72 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1972-73 | 305 | 5178 |  | 458 | 13385 | 102 | 508 |  |  | 1508 | 27828 | 11421 |  |  | 46101 | 3174 |  |
| 1973-74 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1974-75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1975-76 | 1202 | 6484 |  | 1454 | 30150 | 539 | 638 |  |  | 1875 | 51083 | 45994 |  |  | 102760 | 8703 |  |
| 1976-77 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 1977-78 | 4054 | 5826 |  | 1705 | 35138 | 141 | 703 |  |  | 1764 | 38167 | 45625 |  |  | 74731 | 9824 |  |
| 1978-79 | 4530 | 5315 | 825 | 1705 | 50195 | 193 | 533 |  |  | 2192 | 36639 | 51156 |  |  | 101450 | 15184 |  |
| 1979-80 | 5882 | 19140 | 1050 | 1955 | 51380 | 245 | 888 |  |  | 3378 | 75962 | 56937 |  |  | 133311 | 23297 |  |
| 1980-81 | 2501 | 14939 | 1027 | 1966 | 35238 | 274 | 645 |  |  | 3304 | 59063 | 49741 |  |  | 94754 | 16495 |  |
| 1981-82 | 2673 | 5440 | 882 | 1730 | 32310 | 171 | 672 |  |  | 2342 | 30703 | 59916 |  |  | 93823 | 15917 |  |
| 1982-83 | 3708 | 7653 | 1014 | 1686 | 36526 | 247 | 795 |  | 1000 | 3583 | 49528 | 58138 |  |  | 87425 | 11453 |  |
| 1983-84 | 1754 | 8908 | 1334 | 2471 | 31466 | 93 | 1193 |  | 740 | 1600 | 21791 | 19347 |  |  | 67042 | 4985 |  |
| 1984-85 | 1774 | 11814 | 1869 | 3212 | 33066 | 122 | 876 |  | 426 | 1937 | 24863 | 31142 |  |  | 108694 | 6806 |  |
| 1985-86 | 1348 | 15543 | 1916 | 2837 | 34418 | 117 | 487 |  | 314 | 1507 | 15241 | 30955 |  |  | 96708 | 6909 |  |
| 1986-87 | 3009 | 14732 | 2720 | 4522 | 40999 | 107 | 961 |  | 1161 | 2571 | 25561 | 59190 |  |  | 119488 | 10460 | 21 |
| 1987-88 | 2402 | 12474 | 3192 | 4805 | 41460 | 123 | 1113 |  | 650 | 2619 | 33814 | 54714 |  |  | 118878 | 8847 | 23 |
| 1988-89 | 1417 | 13989 | 2878 | 4492 | 25387 | 235 | 672 |  | 442 | 1545 | 22822 | 24117 |  |  | 72028 | 4233 | 5 |
| 1989-90 | 476 | 9607 | 1560 | 2482 | 15314 | 30 | 462 |  | 264 | 630 | 7114 | 9775 |  |  | 38274 | 2043 | 4 |
| 1990-91 | 442 | 5214 | 1409 | 1694 | 11968 | 34 | 242 |  | 76 | 423 | 4083 | 5493 |  |  | 27137 | 1258 | 0 |
| 1991-92 | 571 | 5429 | 2043 | 2453 | 15941 | 77 | 509 |  | 93 | 713 | 3043 | 12427 |  |  | 43977 | 3576 | 0 |
| 1992-93 | 687 | 3044 | 1618 | 2307 | 16076 | 59 | 328 |  | 64 | 252 | 2115 | 8101 |  |  | 33710 | 3125 | 2 |
| 1993-94 | 649 | 5288 | 2413 | 2900 | 16595 | 55 | 731 |  | 73 | 368 | 2571 | 12727 |  |  | 48203 | 2610 | 146 |
| 1994-95 | 781 | 12123 | 3590 | 5352 | 17022 | 204 | 1003 | 48 | 34 | 746 | 6215 | 19692 |  |  | 64951 | 4131 | 9 |
| 1995-96 | 522 | 8089 | 3020 | 3932 | 14009 | 99 | 753 | 33 | 45 | 291 | 3598 | 16120 |  |  | 58600 | 2877 | 2 |
| 1996-97 | 874 | 10653 | 4296 | 7041 | 19794 | 179 | 1232 | 33 | 144 | 473 | 5451 | 29980 |  |  | 93190 | 8065 | 40 |
| 1997-98 | 876 | 13337 | 3347 | 6233 | 14398 | 71 | 823 | 17 | 25 | 718 | 9679 | 49437 |  |  | 108727 | 9323 | 101 |
| 1998-99 | 958 | 8606 | 2385 | 3938 | 12125 | 152 | 490 | 7 | 15 | 419 | 7445 | 26512 |  |  | 71709 | 6375 | 107 |
| 1999-00 | 451 | 8845 | 2121 | 3578 | 11920 | 191 | 455 | 5 | 0 | 257 | 7252 | 13051 |  |  | 51307 | 3887 | 11 |
| 2000-01 | 1094 | 9388 | 2731 | 4018 | 15054 | 97 | 559 | 6 | 24 | 164 | 3964 | 14294 |  |  | 56143 | 5460 | 0 |
| 2001-02 | 434 | 9617 | 3597 | 5286 | 15329 | 35 | 584 | 32 | 0 | 180 | 3348 | 17080 |  |  | 72918 | 5559 | 0 |
| 2002-03 | 910 | 7716 | 5054 | 6521 | 18577 | 62 | 578 | 86 | 203 | 246 | 4596 | 32595 |  |  | 79538 | 10255 | 0 |
| 2003-04 | 1760 | 7250 | 5963 | 9654 | 25407 | 64 | 625 | 178 | 470 | 303 | 2823 | 42125 |  |  | 94506 | 10952 | 40 |
| 2004-05 | 1469 | 7737 | 5353 | 7062 | 23322 | 140 | 783 | 86 | 129 | 230 | 4845 | 43356 |  |  | 84132 | 10910 | 0 |
| 2005-06 | 1312 | 7186 | 6021 | 7458 | 21861 | 89 | 459 | 58 | 135 | 206 | 5733 | 38909 |  |  | 66458 | 12730 | 3 |
| 2006-07 | 1882 | 11028 | 7234 | 9998 | 32494 | 179 | 774 | 70 | 309 | 439 | 8150 | 46965 |  |  | 87241 | 15583 | 0 |
| 2007-08 | 2020 | 6658 | 5668 | 9381 | 29305 | 84 | 976 | 65 | 136 | 209 | 5120 | 51138 |  |  | 93687 | 17669 | 4 |
| 2008-09 | 1619 | 6855 | 4080 | 5944 | 27100 | 84 | 707 | 98 | 27 | 177 | 5767 | 46113 |  |  | 85061 | 16748 | 0 |
| 2009-10 | 1109 | 4572 | 1944 | 3210 | 21554 | 67 | 426 | 39 | 130 | 179 | 5681 | 18763 |  |  | 41355 | 7384 | 0 |
| 2010-11 | 1898 | 9774 | 4809 | 8098 | 39152 | 43 | 988 | 43 | 126 | 371 | 15193 | 48296 |  |  | 97858 | 12755 | 5 |
| 2011-12 | 1591 | 9191 | 5918 | 7412 | 36460 | 54 | 732 | 113 | 325 | 210 | 8282 | 43758 | 127 | 139 | 101924 | 14060 | 8 |
| 2012-13 | 2017 | 9535 | 5926 | 8164 | 52681 | 90 | 898 | 246 | 620 | 225 | 5396 | 43844 | 128 | 527 | 121232 | 17504 | 0 |
| 5 yr trend | 22.4\% | 28.7\% | 32.2\% | 19.9\% | 71.5\% | 35.5\% | 17.3\% | 243.6\% | 316.7\% | -1.8\% | -32.6\% | 5.4\% | 0.8\% | 279.1\% | 44.4\% | 27.6\% | 100.0\% |

* Bobcat, otter and swift fox "tagging" values are based on pelt tagging records


## Special Section

The "Special Section" of the Furbearer Harvest Survey changes annually and is used to collect information and opinions from furharvesters on a diversity of topics that relate to furharvesting or furbearers. Past surveys have addressed subjects such as wildlife diseases, trap ownership and use, and regulatory preferences. This year, we took a closer look at raccoon hunting techniques with a specific interest in comparing calling of dens with other hunting techniques. We also asked several questions relating to recruitment and participation in the furharvesting activity. Similar questions were asked to furharvesters five years ago and reported in the 2007-08 Furbearer Harvest Survey.

Results from the question assessing raccoon hunting participation and harvest can be found in Table 7 below. Hunting with hounds was the most popular and effective raccoon hunting technique based on total, average, and maximum harvests, followed by calling of dens. During the season, hound hunters averaged about twice as many coons and a little over twice the total harvest as den callers. Other raccoon hunting techniques were far less popular and/or effective, with no other technique resulting in more than $7.4 \%$ of the total harvest.

Table 7. Comparison of participation and harvest in various raccoon hunting techniques.

| harvest technique | n | \% of raccoon <br> hunters | reported <br> harvest | \% of raccoon <br> harvest | Harvest per <br> hunter | maximum <br> harvest |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| hounds | 48 | 39.7 | 1199 | 57.8 | 25 | 120 |
| calling den | 42 | 34.7 | 569 | 27.4 | 13.5 | 112 |
| other calling | 16 | 13.2 | 153 | 7.4 | 9.6 | 50 |
| shot while hunting | 23 | 19.0 | 65 | 3.1 | 2.8 | 13 |
| $\quad$ other species | 17 | 14.0 | 47 | 2.3 | 2.8 | 5 |
| salvage | 6 | 5.0 | 41 | 2.0 | 6.8 | 25 |
| other | 121 | 100 | 2074 | 100 | 17.1 | 120 |

To assess current furharvester participation characteristics, furharvesters were first asked what year they began furharvesting. Results are presented in Figure 3, and separated by whether or not the respondent furharvested during the 2012-13 season. A lot of our current furharvesters began furharvesting in the 1970 's, but we also have a lot of new furharvesters who began in the last several years. Year at which furharvesting began appears to have very little influence on whether or not the person was active last season.

Furharvesters were also asked how many of the past five seasons they furharvested in Kansas or in some other state. Results of this question for resident furharvesters is presented in Figure 4 below. Almost $60 \%$ of resident furharvesters indicated they furharvested in Kansas each of the past five seasons. Eighty-five percent of resident furharvesters have not furharvested in any other state in the past five seasons. Among nonresidents, half of the 42 respondents who furharvested in Kansas in the past five seasons were active either four or five of those seasons.


Figure 3. Year at which furharvesters who did (active; $\mathrm{n}=1298$ ) and did not (inactive; $\mathrm{n}=484$ ) furharvest during the 2012-13 furharvesting season first began furharvesting. (Data smoothed: $y_{(\mathrm{i})}=.5 \mathrm{y}_{(\mathrm{i})}+.25 \mathrm{y}_{(\mathrm{i}+1)}+.25 \mathrm{y}_{(\mathrm{i}-1)}$.)


Figure 4. Number of years of the past five in which resident furharvester license buyers were active (did furharvest) in Kansas or in some other state.

Furharvesters were also provided a list of participation categories and asked to select which one best represents their participation in furharvesting. Results are differentiated for those who did and did not furharvest during the 2012-13 season, and presented in Figure 5 below. Of particular note: almost $45 \%$ of inactive furharvesters purchase a license in case they see a furbearer while hunting other species, $55 \%$ of active furharvesters are active every or nearly every season, and over $25 \%$ of active furharvesters recently began furharvesting (either after years of inactivity or for the first time ever).

Similar questions were asked to furharvesters five years ago and provided in the 2007-08
Furbearer Harvest Survey Report. The "age at which furharvesting began" results are similar in terms of high recruitment in the 1970's and during the most recent seasons, but the current jump in participation is much more pronounced than that of five years ago (almost 400 new furharvesters in the three most recent seasons currently, whereas there were only about 220 in the previous survey). On the other two questions, additional analysis is needed to make a comparison.


Figure 5. Percent of furharvester license buyers who did (active; $\mathrm{n}=1334$ ) and did not (inactive; $\mathrm{n}=525$ ) furharvest during the 2012-13 furharvesting season, represented by various categories of participation.

Appendix 1.
2012-13 Paper Version of the Furbearer Harvest Survey

## 2012-13 Furbearer Harvest Survey

Dear Kansas Furharvester:
You have been selected to participate in the Kansas Furbearer Harvest Survey. Your name was randomly chosen from the list of furharvesters who purchased a license in 2012. This survey provides our best estimate of furharvester activity, and is used to guide furbearer management decisions in Kansas.
Please complete the survey within 7 days and return in the postage paid envelope. Or if you have internet access, we would rather you completed this survey online at: https://www.survevmonkev.com/s/Fur12.

> Thank you for your participation!
> Matt Peek, furbearer biologist
> Kansas Dept. of Wildlife, Parks and Tourism

## Instructions:

- Please complete the survey even if you did not furharvest this year.
- Estimate your harvest activities even if you can't remember the exact numbers.
- Include your harvest information only. Do not include a hunting/trapping partner's catch.

1. Did you hunt or trap furbearers during the 2012-13 season, or did you pursue furbearers with dogs during the running season in 2012?

$$
\text { O Yes } \quad \text { O No (If no, skip to question 21.) }
$$

2. In which county did you do most of your furharvesting in 2012-13? $\qquad$

## 3. Did you TRAP for furbearers in Kansas during the 2012-13 season? O Yes <br> O No (If no, skip to question 13.)

4. How many of each did you harvest by TRAPPING in Kansas during the 2012-13 season? (Enter " 0 " if none were harvested.)

| Badger: | Gray Fox: | Beaver: | Opossum: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bobcat: | Red Fox: | Muskrat: | Raccoon: |
| Coyote: | Swift Fox: | Mink: | Striped Skunk: |
|  |  | Otter: | Weasel: |

5. How many total calendar days did you TRAP furbearers or coyotes in Kansas during the 2012-13 season? The trapping season was 94 days (Nov 14-Feb 15) for all furbearers except beaver, which was 138 days (Nov 14-Mar 31).
Total days:
$\qquad$
6. How many calendar DAYS did you trap for each species? (Enter " 0 " if none.) Count any day you had sets out that were intended or likely to catch that species. For example, if you caught opossums in your raccoon sets, record your raccoon trapping days for opossum also.

| Badger: ___ days | Opossum: |
| :--- | :--- |
| Bobcat:_________ days | Raccoon: days |
| Coyote:_____ days |  |

7. During the time you trapped each species, how many TRAPS did you have set per day on average? Count any trap that was intended or likely to catch that species. For example, if you caught opossums in your raccoon sets, record your raccoon trap numbers for opossum also.

| Badger: | traps | Opossum: |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bobcat: | traps | Raccoon: |
| Coyote: | traps | Striped Skunk: |

## 8. Did you set traps specifically for BEAVER?

O Yes
O No (If no, skip to question 9.)
a. How many DAYS did you trap for BEAVER? $\qquad$ days
b. During this time, how many BEAVER TRAPS did you have set per day on average? $\qquad$ traps

## 9. Did you set traps specifically for OTTER?

O Yes O No (If no, skip to question 10.)
a. How many DAYS did you trap for OTTER? $\qquad$ days
b. During this time, how many OTTER TRAPS did you have set per day on average? $\qquad$ traps

## 10. Did you set traps specifically for RED FOX, GRAY FOX, or SWIFT FOX?

O Yes O No (If no, skip to question 11.)
a. How many DAYS did you trap for each FOX species? (Enter " 0 " if none.) Count any day you had sets out that were intended or likely to catch that species.

Red fox: $\qquad$ days
Gray fox: $\qquad$ days
Swift fox: $\qquad$ days
b. During the time you trapped each species, how many TRAPS did you have set per day on average? Count any trap that was intended or likely to catch that species.

Red fox: $\qquad$ traps
Gray fox: $\qquad$ traps
Swift fox: $\qquad$ traps

## 11. Did you set traps specifically for MUSKRAT or MINK?

O Yes $\quad$ O No (If no, skip to question 12.)
a. How many DAYS did you trap for MUSKRAT or MINK? (Enter " 0 " if none.) Count any day you had sets out that were intended or likely to catch that species.
Muskrat: ___ days
Mink: $\quad$ days
b. During the time you trapped MUSKRAT or MINK, how many TRAPS did you have set per day on average? Count any trap that was intended or likely to catch that species.
Muskrat: $\qquad$ traps
Mink: $\qquad$ traps
12. Did you set traps specifically for WEASEL?

O Yes
O No (If no, skip to question 13.)
a. How many DAYS did you trap for WEASEL? $\qquad$ days
b. During this time, how many WEASEL TRAPS did you have set per day on average? $\qquad$ traps

## 3. Did you HUNT for furbearers or coyotes in Kansas during the 2012-13 season? <br> O Yes <br> O No (If no, skip to question 17.)

14. How many of each did you harvest by HUNTING in Kansas during the 2012-13 season? (Enter " 0 " if none were harvested.)

| Badger: | Gray Fox: | Opossum: |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Bobcat: | Red Fox: | Raccoon: |
| Coyote: | Swift Fox: |  |

15. How many total calendar days did you HUNT furbearers or coyotes in Kansas during the 2012-13 season? The furbearer hunting season was 94 days (Nov 14-Feb 15).

Total days: $\qquad$ -
16. How many calendar DAYS did you HUNT for each species? (Enter " 0 " if none.)

| Badger: | days | Gray Fox: | days | Opossum: | days |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Bobcat: | days | Red Fox: | days | Raccoon: | days |
| Coyote: | days | Swift Fox: | days | Striped Skunk: | days |

## 17. Did you RUN furbearers in Kansas during the 2012 running season (Mar1-Nov1, 2012)?

O Yes O No (If no, skip to question 21.)
18. How many of each did you "tree" during the 2012 running season in Kansas? (Enter " 0 " if none were treed.)
Bobcat:
Gray Fox:
Red Fox $\qquad$ Raccoon: $\qquad$
Gray Fox $\qquad$ Opossum: $\qquad$
19. How many total calendar days did you RUN furbearers in Kansas during the 2012 season? The furbearer running season was 246 days (Mar1-Nov1).

Total days: $\qquad$
20. How many calendar DAYS did you RUN each species? (Enter " 0 " if none.)

| Bobcat: ___ days | Red Fox: ____ days |
| :--- | :--- |
| Gray Fox:______ days | Opossum: $\quad$ days |

## Special Section - Furharvesting Participation

21. Approximately what year did you first begin furharvesting (hunting, trapping or running furbearers)?

Year: $\qquad$
22. Of the last 5 years, how many have you hunted, trapped or ran furbearers

|  | 0 years | 1 year | 2 years | 3 years | 4 years | 5 years |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| in Kansas? | O | O | O | O | O | O |
| in some other state? | O | O | O | O | O | O |

23. Which one of the following best describes your furharvesting participation?

O I furharvest every season
O I furharvest nearly every season.
O I started furharvesting within the last 3 years.
O I recently started furharvesting again after years of inactivity.
O I furharvest some years without any consistent pattern.
O I rarely furharvest.
O I buy a license only in case I see a furbearer while hunting other species.
O Other (please describe)
24. If you have an e-mail address and are willing to receive a direct link to surveys such as this in the future, should your name be selected, please include it here:

The results of this survey will be posted on the KDWPT website once the report has bee completed. Last year's Furbearer Harvest Survey report and several other furbearer-related reports are currently posted on the site. From the "Furharvesting" page, just click on the "Furbearer Reports" link. Thank you for your time.

