

COPY

**HUNTING ACCESS ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES OF  
LANDOWNERS IN NEW YORK: A PILOT STUDY IN  
SARATOGA AND SULLIVAN COUNTIES**

by

**William F. Siemer, Tommy L. Brown, and Daniel J. Decker**



**HDRU Series No. 90-8**

**July 1990**



**Human Dimensions Research Unit  
Department of Natural Resources  
New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences  
A Statutory College of the State University  
Cornell University, Ithaca, N. Y.**



## HUMAN DIMENSIONS RESEARCH UNIT PUBLICATION SERIES

This publication is part of a series of reports resulting from investigations dealing with public issues in the management of wildlife, fish, and other natural resources. The Human Dimensions Research Unit (HDRU) in the Department of Natural Resources at Cornell University is a nationally-recognized leader in the study of the economic and social values of wildlife, fish, and other natural resources and the application of such information in management planning and policy. A list of HDRU publications may be obtained by writing to the Human Dimensions Research Unit, Department of Natural Resources, Fernow Hall, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853.



**HUNTING ACCESS ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES OF  
LANDOWNERS IN NEW YORK: A PILOT STUDY IN  
SARATOGA AND SULLIVAN COUNTIES**

**by**

**William F. Siemer, Tommy L. Brown, and Daniel J. Decker**

**HDRU Series No. 90-8**

**July 1990**



## **\*\* STUDY HIGHLIGHTS \*\***

### **STUDY PURPOSES**

- (1) To evaluate the potential of fee-access policies for wildlife-related recreation (especially fee-access arrangements for hunting) as a supplemental revenue source for private landowners.
- (2) To assess possible needs for extension education programs.

### **OBJECTIVES OF STUDY PHASE II**

- Determine the incidence of access leasing among rural landowners and landowner interest in leasing hunting access in key areas.
- Determine the characteristics of lessors and any business activities associated with or complementary to access leasing.

### **PURPOSES OF THE REPORT**

- (1) Present findings from a pilot implementation of study phase II.
- (2) Discuss their implications for (a) public policy regarding access to private lands, (b) extension education related to developing personal access policies, and (c) further implementation of this study.

### **METHODS**

- A preliminary survey of key informants was conducted to identify New York counties where a general survey might yield a high number of contacts with landowners charging hunting-access fees (Siemer et al. 1988). Leasing appeared high enough to warrant further study in several counties and regions of the state. In view of funding constraints the investigators implemented study phase II as a pilot study in 1 county in 2 Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) administrative regions. Based on the findings from study phase I (Siemer et al. 1988), the counties selected as study sites were Saratoga and Sullivan.
- Current tax rolls and a telephone number listing service were used to draw names, addresses, and phone numbers of private nonindustrial landowners. In each township of both counties names and addresses were collected for all owners of parcels classified as agricultural, residential, forested, or vacant, and 100 or more acres in size.
- In December 1989 and January 1990, 4 trained telephone interviewers questioned members of the sample on: land use, landowner characteristics, hunting and hunting-access policies, and factors affecting personal hunting-access policies. Landowners who were receiving monetary compensation for hunting access were asked to

participate in a second interview. The second interview was designed to assess the terms of their access agreement, services provided to hunters, wildlife management activities, characteristics of hunters involved, and actions taken to address landowner liability.

## RESULTS

- From an original set of 644 landowner names, 389 telephone numbers were obtained, 214 landowners completed useable interviews, and 71 landowners refused to be interviewed (82% response rate). Nonresponse bias was not assessed.

### Landowner Behavior

- The majority (64%) of landowners of all property types posted their land with "No Hunting" signs.
- Some hunting seems to occur on most private land; 75% of the landowners permitted hunting by friends and family.
- About 1 in 3 (38%) landowners personally used their land to hunt.

### Landowner compensation

- About 10% of respondents had received monetary compensation from hunters in the past. An additional 13% had been offered, but had never accepted monetary compensation.
- Less than 6% were interested in offering fee-access hunting in 1990.
- Monetary compensation and interest in receiving monetary compensation was low in both counties and on all property types. Less than 3% (n=6) had received monetary compensation from hunters in 1989.

### Characteristics of lessors and leasing

- Because only 6 lessors were identified, the investigators did not conduct follow-up interviews to characterize lessors and leasing in the study areas.

### Reasons landowners did not want to offer fee hunting

- Concern about liability (76%) and possible property damage by hunters (61%) were the most common reasons landowners were not interested in providing fee-access to hunters.
- Traditions of free access and conflict with personal recreation were disincentives to offer fee access for about 4 in 10 landowners.
- Individual landowners listed a wide variety of disincentives to leasing, including concerns about: personal privacy, property security, human

safety, attracting or protecting wildlife, conflict with their land-use goals, and administration of an access lease.

## CONCLUSIONS

- Among private nonindustrial landowners in the counties surveyed, the practice of charging hunters an access fee appears to be very uncommon. Based on these findings, a statewide study of fee-access arrangements for hunting at this time does not seem to be warranted.
- Interest in permitting access to hunters for a fee in the coming year also appears to be low in these areas (<6% of all landowners). Based on this, there would not seem to be a large need for extension education related to fee-access arrangements for hunting in the counties studied.
- Because leasing access involves personal income, and perhaps income that may not have been reported for purposes of taxation, under-reporting of the activity may be common. Thus, it may not be possible at this time to accurately assess leasing activity through voluntary landowner reports.
- Perceived liability, hunter problems, and conflicts with landowner attitudes and practices were cited as powerful disincentives to allowing hunting access, fee or free. Unless market, legal, or regulatory activities occur which effectively reduce or remove these disincentives, it is not likely that access to private land for hunting will increase.

## THE NEXT STEP

- Further independent analyses of fee-access activity appear to be unwarranted, so remaining study objectives will be addressed by integrating phase III as a subcomponent of other research projects. The investigators have already utilized statewide surveys of waterfowl hunters, deer hunters, and trappers to assess the access practices of these wildlife user groups. These will be analyzed and compared to obtain a first approximation of demand for fee-access in New York. Depending on the results, more inquiry into the demand side of fee-access may be pursued.



## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We would like to express our appreciation to the New York State Fish and Wildlife Management (FWMA) State Board, Cornell Cooperative Extension agents, and wildlife biologists and conservation officers in the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) for their involvement in the preceding stage of this study. Special thanks are extended to Roger Cole (New York State Conservation Council), Robert Ewald (FWMA Board), Wayne Jones (DEC), and Robert Sanford (DEC) for their ongoing assistance throughout the study. We also thank the private landowners in Saratoga and Sullivan Counties who cooperated in this study.

Nancy Connelly, Jody Enck, and Renée Shiffler, in the Human Dimensions Research unit (HDRU), assisted in a variety of ways during the course of this study. Margie Peech provided word-processing support. Chris Furst, Tanis Furst, Margie Peech, and Diana Wotherspoon conducted telephone interviews.

This study was sponsored by Hatch Project 147-7412 from the Cornell University Agricultural Experiment Station, New York State College of Agriculture and Life Sciences.



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
STUDY HIGHLIGHTS . . . . .	i
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS . . . . .	iv
LIST OF TABLES . . . . .	vi
BACKGROUND AND NEED . . . . .	1
PURPOSE . . . . .	2
Objectives by Study Phase . . . . .	3
METHODS . . . . .	3
Selecting Study Sites . . . . .	3
Sampling Procedure . . . . .	4
Telephone Interviews . . . . .	5
Analysis . . . . .	5
RESULTS . . . . .	6
Land and Landowner Characteristics . . . . .	6
Hunting and Posting Behavior . . . . .	6
Landowner Compensation . . . . .	6
Disincentives to Offering Fee Hunting Opportunities . . . . .	13
DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS . . . . .	16
Future Research . . . . .	19
LITERATURE CITED . . . . .	19
APPENDIX A . . . . .	22
APPENDIX B . . . . .	23

LIST OF TABLES

<u>Number</u>		<u>Page</u>
1	Acreege in parcel identified from tax rolls, reported by landowners, by property type . . . . .	7
2	Acreege in parcel identified from tax rolls, reported by landowners, by county . . . . .	8
3	Number of years landowners had owned the parcel of land in question, reported by landowners, by property type . . . . .	9
4	Number of years landowners had owned the parcel of land in question, reported by landowners, by county . . . . .	10
5	Residence practices reported by landowners by property type . . . . .	11
6	Hunting access practices reported by landowners, by property type . . . . .	12
7	Hunting access practices reported by landowners, by county . . . . .	13
8	History of hunting access compensation reported by landowners, by property type . . . . .	14
9	History of hunting access compensation reported by landowners, by county . . . . .	15
10	Reasons a landowner was not interested in offering fee-access opportunities to hunters, reported by landowners, by property type . . . . .	17
11	Disincentives to offering fee-access opportunities to hunters, reported by landowners, by county . . . . .	18

## HUNTING ACCESS ATTITUDES AND PRACTICES OF LANDOWNERS IN NEW YORK: A PILOT STUDY IN SARATOGA AND SULLIVAN COUNTIES

### BACKGROUND AND NEED

Throughout the northeastern U.S., access to private lands plays a crucial role in meeting demands for hunting and other wildlife-related recreational activities (Wright 1988, Wright et al. 1989, Yahn 1989). In recent years the amount of private lands available for wildlife-related recreation has decreased due to changing land-use and access practices. Development of open land, especially conversion of agricultural land to nonagricultural uses, has reduced the absolute availability of private huntable land (Resources for the Future 1983). In New York State, further acreage has been lost to the recreational hunter as the access policies of private landowners have become more restrictive (Brown 1974; Brown et al. 1983, 1984).

Reductions in the amount of private land open to public hunting access may be creating a demand for hunting access leases or other fee-access arrangements in New York and other eastern states (Wright and Kaiser 1986, Wright et al. 1988). In many areas of New York State the potential demand for hunting access would represent a new market for landowners interested in increasing the economic return from the natural resources on their land.

Some studies have documented access practices by private landowners in New York State, including the prevalence of fee-hunting or leasing activity (Brown and Thompson 1976; Brown et al. 1983, 1984). Continued efforts to monitor changes in access practices throughout New York State will provide valuable information to decision makers in public agencies who must plan for changes in public hunting access to private lands. Public policymakers could benefit from accurate information on how access leasing affects remaining

public access to private lands, and whether access leasing is compatible with existing land-use patterns and landowner goals in a given region of the state (Kellert 1981, Sheriff et al. 1981). Local and regional assessments of the factors affecting landowners access decisions may provide important insights for decision makers attempting to address the factors that impact public access to private lands. Such an information base could facilitate the development of informed public policy and programs related to public access to private lands (Langer 1987). Better information on access leasing may also facilitate the efforts of public agencies to encourage conservation, creation, or enhancement of wildlife habitat on private lands (Langer 1987).

Additional information on access practices in New York State could also provide baseline information needed by Cornell Cooperative Extension to evaluate potential needs for landowner education programs related to fee-access activities on private lands. To date, limited effort has been made in New York to collect or provide basic information needed to develop education programs that will help private landowners make informed decisions about developing a personal hunting-access policy. Baseline studies are needed to assess the level of demand for access leases for hunting in various regions of the state. Information is needed on the elements of fee access arrangements that appeal to wildlife recreationists. If areas exist where demand is sufficiently high to warrant further market research, information will also be needed on suppliers of fee-access opportunities. This report presents the results of a study to address these information needs.

## **PURPOSE**

The overall purpose of this study is to: (1) evaluate the potential of fee-access policies for wildlife-related recreation (especially fee-access

arrangements for hunting) as a supplemental revenue source for landowners, and (2) assess possible needs for extension education programs. The project has 4 phases, identified below by their respective objectives.

#### **Objectives by Study Phase:**

Phase I: Assess qualitatively the key characteristics and prevalence of access leasing for wildlife-related recreation in each county of New York.

Phase II: Determine the incidence of access leasing among rural landowners and landowner interest in the practice of access leasing for hunting for one or more key areas of the state.

Determine the characteristics of lessors and any business activities associated with or complementary to access leasing.

Phase III: Determine the key characteristics and attitudes of hunting lessees in one or more key areas of the state.

Phase IV: Synthesize information from phases I-III to evaluate the potential of hunting leases as an alternative revenue source for landowners.

In this report we present findings from a pilot implementation of study phase II and discuss their implications for (a) public policy on access to private lands, (b) extension education related to developing personal access policies, and (c) further implementation of this study.

## **METHODS**

### **Selecting Study Sites**

In preparation for study phase II, a preliminary survey of key informants was conducted to identify New York counties where a general landowner survey might yield a high number of contacts with landowners who charge hunting-access fees (Siemer et al. 1988). Some evidence emerged from this survey to suggest that existing levels of access-leasing activity might warrant further research on this practice in several counties and administrative regions of the New York State Department of Environmental

Conservation (DEC). However, funds for study phase II were sufficient for further study in only 2 counties.

Given our funding constraints, we decided to pursue volunteer support from the members of a statewide fish and wildlife advisory council with a special interest in hunting access on private lands (i.e., the Fish and Wildlife Management Act [FWMA] State Board). We also decided to implement study phase II as a pilot study in at least 1 county in 2 NYSDEC administrative regions, and in 1 county of all remaining administrative regions where volunteer support was available. This approach was pursued as a means of pretesting the research design and as an attempt to build volunteer support for additional studies.

Efforts to develop volunteer support did not result in a sufficient pool of volunteers in any county, however, so original plans to conduct the study in only 2 counties, without volunteer support, were implemented. The counties were chosen from NYSDEC administrative regions 3 and 5 because volunteer interest was indicated and support was anticipated in those regions. The counties selected as study sites were Saratoga and Sullivan. Saratoga was chosen because key informants believed it to be one of the best candidates for further study (Siemer et al. 1988). Sullivan County was chosen because of its proximity to Delaware County, where key informants believed leasing was occurring at a high level and would increase in the next 5 years (Siemer et al. 1988).

#### Sampling Procedure

Current tax rolls in each county office of Real Property Tax Services were used as sampling frames from which to draw names and addresses of the target group landowners (e.g., private nonindustrial landowners). Names and

addresses were collected for all landowners in each township of each county who owned at least 1 parcel of 100 or more acres and had classified their property as agricultural, residential, forested, or vacant. A criterion of 100 acres was used to reduce the likelihood of sampling landowners with too little land to consider leasing access rights to hunters. Parcels owned by nonfamily corporations (e.g., realty and development corporations) were excluded from the sample where possible. Telephone numbers for members of the sample were obtained from New York Telephone Listing Services.

### **Telephone Interviews**

Each member of the sample was asked to consent to a 10- to 12- minute telephone interview regarding their attitudes and practices related to hunters and hunting on their property. The interview contained questions pertaining to land-use, landowner characteristics, hunting and hunting-access policies, and factors affecting personal hunting-access policies. Landowners who were receiving monetary compensation for hunting access were asked to participate in a second interview. A second interview instrument was developed for interviews with leasing landowners to assess the terms of their access agreement, services provided to hunters, wildlife management activities, characteristics of hunters involved, and actions taken to address landowner liability.

### **Analysis**

Landowner interviews were conducted by 4 trained interviewers during December 1989 through January 1990. Descriptive and comparative statistics were computed using the Statistical Package for Social Science software (SPSS Inc. 1986, 1988).

## RESULTS

We identified 644 landowners in the target population. Telephone numbers were obtained for 389 landowners, 214 landowners consented to an interview, and 71 landowners refused to be interviewed (82% response rate) (Appendix A). Nonrespondent bias was not assessed.

### Land and Landowner Characteristics

To characterize landowners in the sample, and interpret their decisions related to access for hunting, we collected information on several attributes of the parcel and the landowner. These included: parcel size, years of parcel ownership, residence practices, land-use practices, and hunting and posting of the parcel.

The majority of landowners owned parcels of 100-150 acres (Tables 1-2). About 40% had owned their parcel 30 years or less (Table 3-4). The majority of respondents with agricultural or residential properties were year-round residents on the parcel in question. Most owners of forest or vacant land were absentee landowners (Table 5).

### Hunting and Posting Behavior

Most respondents were found to have restrictive access policies, but did not prohibit hunting on their property. The majority (64%) of landowners posted their land with "No Hunting" signs (Table 6-7), yet the majority (about 75% in both counties) also permitted hunting by friends and family, and about 1 in 3 (38%) personally used their land to hunt.

### Landowner Compensation

About 10% of the landowners had received monetary compensation from hunters in the past. An additional 13% had been offered, but refused monetary compensation. Monetary compensation and interest in receiving monetary

Table 1. Acreage in parcel identified from tax rolls, reported by landowners, by property type.

Parcel size (acres)	Percent by land classification				
	Total (n=214)	Agricul. <sup>a</sup> (n=83)	Resident. <sup>b</sup> (n=79)	Forested <sup>c</sup> (n=40)	Vacant <sup>d</sup> (n=11)
100-125	45.8	49.4	49.4	30.0	45.5
126-150	23.4	25.3	21.5	25.0	18.2
151-175	11.7	8.4	13.9	15.0	9.1
176-200	7.9	6.0	7.6	10.0	18.2
201 or more	11.2	10.8	7.6	20.0	9.1
Mean acreage	161	143	145	190	308

<sup>a</sup>Property used for the production of crops or livestock (e.g., livestock products, truck and orchard crops, fruits, nursery and greenhouse stock, fur products, and fish and wildlife preserves).

<sup>b</sup>Property used for human habitation (e.g., year-round residences, seasonal residences, rural residences, estates, individual mobile homes).

<sup>c</sup>Forested or reforested lands.

<sup>d</sup>Property that is not in use, in temporary use, or without permanent improvement (e.g., residential, rural, commercial, industrial, and urban development or slum clearance).

Table 2. Acreage in parcel identified from tax rolls, reported by landowners, by county.

Parcel Size (acres)	Percent by county		$\chi^2$	D.F.	P
	Saratoga (n=133)	Sullivan (n=81)			
100-125	42.1	51.9	5.44	4	0.24
126-150	24.8	21.0			
151-175	15.0	6.2			
176-200	8.3	7.4			
201 or more	9.8	13.6			

Table 3. Number of years landowners had owned the parcel of land in question, reported by landowners, by property type.

Years of land ownership	Percent by land classification				
	Total (n=214)	Agricul. <sup>a</sup> (n=83)	Resident. <sup>b</sup> (n=79)	Forested <sup>c</sup> (n=40)	Vacant <sup>d</sup> (n=11)
1-10	22.8	19.6	23.1	25.0	27.3
11-20	22.4	23.2	19.2	27.5	18.2
21-30	22.9	21.9	28.2	20.0	9.1
31-40	18.2	17.1	16.7	20.0	36.4
41-50	6.5	8.5	6.4	2.5	9.1
51 or more	7.0	0.0	9.8	5.0	0.0

<sup>a</sup>Property used for the production of crops or livestock (e.g., livestock products, truck and orchard crops, fruits, nursery and greenhouse stock, fur products, and fish and wildlife preserves).

<sup>b</sup>Property used for human habitation (e.g., year-round residences, seasonal residences, rural residences, estates, individual mobile homes).

<sup>c</sup>Forested or reforested lands.

<sup>d</sup>Property that is not in use, in temporary use, or without permanent improvement (e.g., residential, rural, commercial, industrial, and urban development or slum clearance).

Table 4. Number of years landowners had owned the parcel of land in question, reported by landowners, by county.

Years of ownership	Percent by county		$\chi^2$	D.F.	P
	Saratoga (n=133)	Sullivan (n=81)			
1-10	27.3	13.8	13.53	5	<0.025
11-20	22.7	22.6			
21-30	17.4	32.6			
31-40	16.6	21.3			
41-50	6.0	7.6			
51 or more	9.8	2.5			

Table 5. Residence practices reported by landowners, by property type.

Use of Parcel as a residence	Percent by land classification				
	Total (n=214)	Agricul. <sup>a</sup> (n=83)	Resident. <sup>b</sup> (n=79)	Forested <sup>c</sup> (n=40)	Vacant <sup>d</sup> (n=11)
Year-round resident on the property	59.9	80.7	63.3	7.5	18.2
Seasonal resident on the property	6.5	1.2	6.3	7.5	27.3
Total	66.3	81.9	69.6	15.0	45.5

<sup>a</sup>Property used for the production of crops or livestock (e.g., livestock products, truck and orchard crops, fruits, nursery and greenhouse stock, fur products, and fish and wildlife preserves).

<sup>b</sup>Property used for human habitation (e.g., year-round residences, seasonal residences, rural residences, estates, individual mobile homes).

<sup>c</sup>Forested or reforested lands.

<sup>d</sup>Property that is not in use, in temporary use, or without permanent improvement (e.g., residential, rural, commercial, industrial, and urban development or slum clearance).

Table 6. Hunting access practices reported by landowners, by property type.

Access Practice	Percent by land classification				
	Total (n=214)	Agricul. <sup>a</sup> (n=83)	Resident. <sup>b</sup> (n=79)	Forested <sup>c</sup> (n=40)	Vacant <sup>d</sup> (n=11)
Property posted by landowner	63.6	56.6	69.2	61.5	90.9
Hunting permitted to family, friends	74.8	80.7	69.6	72.5	72.7
Landowner hunts land personally	37.9	42.2	22.8	47.5	72.7

<sup>a</sup>Property used for the production of crops or livestock (e.g., livestock products, truck and orchard crops, fruits, nursery and greenhouse stock, fur products, and fish and wildlife preserves).

<sup>b</sup>Property used for human habitation (e.g., year-round residences, seasonal residences, rural residences, estates, individual mobile homes).

<sup>c</sup>Forested or reforested lands.

<sup>d</sup>Property that is not in use, in temporary use, or without permanent improvement (e.g., residential, rural, commercial, industrial, and urban development or slum clearance).

Table 7. Hunting access practices reported by landowners, by county.

Access practice	% by county	$\chi^2$	D.F.	P
<b>Property posted by landowner</b>				
Saratoga County (n=131)	50.4	26.72	1	0.00
Sullivan County (n=81)	86.4			
<b>Hunting permitted to family, friends</b>				
Saratoga County (n=133)	74.4	0.00	1	1.00
Sullivan County (n=81)	75.3			
<b>Landowner hunts land personally</b>				
Saratoga County (n=133)	33.8	1.97	1	0.16
Sullivan County (n=81)	44.4			

compensation was low in both counties and all property types (Tables 8-9). Less than 6% of all respondents were interested in offering hunting access for a fee in 1990. Less than 3% (n=6) had received monetary compensation from hunters in 1989.

The second objective of this study was to determine the characteristics of lessors and any business activities associated with or complementary to access leasing. However, because only 6 leasing landowners were identified, the investigators did not implement follow-up interviews to assess the characteristics of lessors. Reporting the results of follow-up interviews would not have been possible without compromising respondent confidentiality.

#### Disincentives to Offering Fee Hunting Opportunities

The most common reasons landowners were not interested in providing fee-access to hunters was concern about liability (76%) and possible property

Table 8. History of hunting access compensation reported by landowners, by property type.

Hunting access history	Percent by land classification				
	Total (n=214)	Agricul. (n=83)	Resident. (n=79)	Forested (n=40)	Vacant (n=11)
Had received compensation in the past.	10.3	12.0	9.0	7.5	9.1
Had been offered, but had not accepted compensation.	12.7	17.2	15.3	0.0	9.1
Received compensation* in last year (1988-89).	4.7	6.0	2.5	5.0	9.1
Interest in offering hunting access for a fee in 1989-90.**	5.6	3.8	1.3	2.6	0.0
Received monetary compensation in 1988-89***	2.3	1.2	1.3	5.0	9.1

\*Landowner received gifts, services, or money in exchange for hunting access privileges.

\*\*Interest in offering hunting access for a fee among landowners who had never received any compensation from hunters.

\*\*\*One additional landowner received "gifts" of money up to \$100 per party. Another landowner leased access to hunters on another property. A third (corporate landowner) had leased land to hunters, but not in 1989-90.

Table 9. History of hunting access compensation reported by landowners, by county.

Fee access practice	% by county	$\chi^2$	D.F.	P
<b>Had received compensation in the past.</b>				
Saratoga County (n=133)	9.0	0.33	1	0.56
Sullivan County (n=80)	12.5			
<b>Had been offered, but had not accepted compensation.</b>				
Saratoga County (n=133)	4.5	9.69	1	<0.005
Sullivan County (n=81)	17.3			
<b>Received compensation* in last year (1988-89).</b>				
Saratoga County (n=133)	3.8	0.66	1	<0.50
Sullivan County (n=81)	6.1			
<b>Interest in offering hunting access for a fee in 1989-90.**</b>				
Saratoga County (n=133)	6.7	0.89	1	<0.50
Sullivan County (n=81)	3.7			
<b>Received monetary compensation in 1988-89***</b>				
Saratoga County (n=133)	0.007	3.87	1	<0.05
Sullivan County (n=81)	4.9			

\*Landowner received gifts, services, or money in exchange for hunting access privileges.

\*\*Interest in offering hunting access for a fee among landowners who had never received any compensation from hunters.

\*\*\*One additional landowner received "gifts" of money up to \$100 per party. Another landowner leased access to hunters on another property. A third (corporate landowner) had leased land to hunters, but not in 1989-90.

damage by hunters (61%) (Tables 10-11). Traditions of free access and conflict with personal recreation were perceived as disincentives to offer fee access for about 4 in 10 landowners.

When asked if there were additional reasons why they were not interested in providing fee hunting opportunities, landowners listed a wide variety of disincentives, including concerns about: personal privacy, property security, human safety, attracting or protecting wildlife, conflict with their land-use goals, and administration of an access lease (Appendix B).

## DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

Based on preliminary research with key informants, we expected to find that 5-10% of the landowners in Saratoga and Sullivan Counties charged a fee for hunting access. The fact that so few landowners (<3%) said they offered fee hunting may be a result of inaccurate information from key informants, under-reporting of the activity, or both. Comments by respondents and those who refused to be interviewed indicated that many landowners were mistrustful of the interviewers. The sensitive nature of questions related to income, especially income that may not have been reported for purposes of taxation, appeared to contribute to response bias and under-reporting of leasing activity. Due to the sensitive nature of the topic, it may not be possible at this time to assess accurately leasing activity through voluntary landowner reports.

The frequency of access leasing among private nonindustrial landowners in the 2 counties surveyed was similar to that found by Wright et al. (1988) in a national landowner study. Interest in permitting access to hunters for a fee in the coming year was also found to be low in these areas (<6% of all landowners). These findings do not support a need for a statewide study of

Table 10. Reasons a landowner was not interested in offering fee-access opportunities to hunters, reported by landowners, by property type.

Reasons for disinterest in offering fee access	Percent by land classification				
	Total (n=214)	Agricul. <sup>a</sup> (n=83)	Resident. <sup>b</sup> (n=79)	Forested <sup>c</sup> (n=40)	Vacant <sup>d</sup> (n=11)
Liability considerations	75.6	81.0	77.9	60.5	63.6
Anticipated property damage	61.0	72.2	59.7	47.4	27.3
Tradition of free access	45.4	43.0	49.4	47.4	18.2
Conflict with personal recreation	42.4	51.9	33.8	39.5	36.4
Not enough information about practice	33.2	32.9	36.4	31.6	9.1
Anticipated income too low to create interest	34.1	32.9	37.7	28.9	27.3
Conflict with business practice	29.3	54.4	15.6	13.2	9.1
Ethical opposition to hunting	27.3	27.8	31.2	23.7	9.1
Wildlife populations too low for practice	19.5	22.8	18.2	15.8	9.1

<sup>a</sup>Property used for the production of crops or livestock (e.g., livestock, products, truck and orchard crops, fruits, nursery and greenhouse stock, fur products, and fish and wildlife preserves).

<sup>b</sup>Property used for human habitation (e.g., year-round residences, seasonal residences, rural residences, estates, individual mobile homes).

<sup>c</sup>Forested or reforested lands.

<sup>d</sup>Property that is not in use, in temporary use, or without permanent improvement (e.g., residential, rural, commercial, industrial, and urban development or slum clearance).

Table 11. Disincentives to offering fee-access opportunities to hunters, reported by landowners, by county.

Reasons for disinterest in offering fee access	% by county	$\chi^2$	D.F.	P
<b>Liability considerations</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	74.4	0.12	1	0.72
Sullivan County (n=76)	77.6			
<b>Anticipated property damage</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	65.9	2.99	1	0.08
Sullivan County (n=76)	52.6			
<b>Tradition of free access</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	51.2	4.10	1	0.04
Sullivan County (n=76)	35.5			
<b>Conflict with personal recreation</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	38.8	1.54	1	0.21
Sullivan County (n=76)	48.7			
<b>Not enough information about practice</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	46.5	26.33	1	0.00
Sullivan County (n=76)	10.5			
<b>Anticipated income too low to create interest</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	45.0	16.82	1	0.00
Sullivan County (n=76)	15.8			
<b>Conflict with business practice</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	33.3	2.27	1	0.13
Sullivan County (n=76)	22.4			
<b>Ethical opposition to hunting</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	31.8	2.91	1	0.08
Sullivan County (n=76)	19.7			
<b>Wildlife populations too low for practice</b>				
Saratoga County (n=129)	26.4	9.23	1	0.00
Sullivan County (n=76)	7.9			

fee-access arrangements for hunting at this time. Neither do the data from this study indicate or document a large need for extension education related to fee-access arrangements for hunting in the counties studied.

As have others (Wright et al. 1988), we found that perceived liability, hunter problems, and conflicts with landowner attitudes and practices are powerful disincentives to allowing hunting access, fee or free. Unless market, legal, or regulatory activities occur which effectively reduce or remove these disincentives, it is not likely that access to private land for hunting will increase.

#### Future Research

In study phase III we will attempt to characterize some of the groups who pay access fees for wildlife-related recreation in New York State. Because study phase II did not indicate that further independent analyses of fee-access activity were warranted, the objectives of study phase III will be addressed by utilizing opportunities to do so through other studies examining wildlife-related recreation. The Human Dimensions Research Unit (HDRU) will use statewide surveys of waterfowl hunters, deer hunters, and trappers to assess their access practices. The results of these analyses will be analyzed and compared to obtain a first approximation of demand for fee-access in New York. Depending on the results, more inquiry into the demand side of fee-access may be pursued.

#### LITERATURE CITED

- Brown, T. L. 1974. New York landowners' attitudes toward recreation activities. *Trans. N. Am. Wildl. and Nat. Resour. Conf.* 39:172-179.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and D. Q. Thompson. 1976. Changes in posting and landowner attitudes in New York State, 1963-1973. *N.Y. Fish and Game J.* 23:101-137.

- \_\_\_\_\_, D. J. Decker, and J. W. Kelley. 1984. Access to private lands for hunting in New York: 1963-1980. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.* 12:344-349.
- \_\_\_\_\_, \_\_\_\_\_, S. J. Tuttle, and J. W. Kelley. 1983. Posting in New York: 1980 update. *N.Y. Fish and Game J.* 30(2):121-139.
- Kellert, S. R. 1981. Wildlife and the private landowner. Pages 18-34 in R. T. Dumke, G. V. Burger and J. R. March (eds.), *Proc. of symposium: wildlife management on private lands.* LaCrosse Printing Co., Inc., La Crosse, Wisc. 568 pp.
- Langer, L. L. 1987. Hunter participation in fee access hunting. *Trans. N. Am. Wildl. and Nat. Resour. Conf.* 52:475-482.
- Resources for the Future. 1983. *Outdoor Recreation for America 1983.* Washington D.C.: Resources for the Future, Inc. 42 pp.
- Ruff, L. R., and T. A. Isaac. 1987. Public access and fee hunting on private nonindustrial forests in Wisconsin. *Trans. N. Am. Wildl. and Nat. Resour. Conf.* 52:483-496.
- Sheriff, S. L., D. J. Witter, S. B. Kirby, and K. M. Babcock. 1981. Missouri's landowners: how they perceive the importance of wildlife. *Trans. N. Am. Wildl. and Nat. Resour. Conf.* 46:118-124.
- Siemer, W. F., T. L. Brown, and D. J. Decker. 1988. Key informants' perceptions of access leasing for hunting on private lands in New York. *Human Dimensions Res. Unit Publ.* 88-9. Dep. Nat. Resour., N.Y.S. Coll. of Agric. and Life Sci., Cornell Univ., Ithaca, N.Y. 17 pp.
- SPSS, Inc. 1986. *Statistical package for the social sciences user's guide.* 2nd ed. McGraw-Hill, Chicago. 988 pp.
- SPSS, Inc. 1988. *SPSS Data Entry II.* McGraw-Hill, Chicago.
- Wright, B. A. 1989. Toward a better understanding of recreational access to the nation's private lands: supply, determinants, limiting factors. Pages 208-221 in W. N. Grafton, A. Ferrise, D. Colyer, D. K. Smith, and J. E. Miller (eds.), *Proc. first conf. on income opportunities for private landowners through management of natural resources and recreational access.* R.D. No. 740. W. Va. Univ, Ext. Serv., Morgantown, W. Va.
- Wright, B. A., H. K. Cordell, and T. L. Brown. 1988. *National private land ownership study.* USDA Forest Service Technical Publication.
- Wright, B. A., and R. A. Kaiser. 1986. Wildlife administrator's perceptions of hunter access problems: a national overview. *Wildl. Soc. Bull.* 14:30-35.

Yahn, L. R. 1989. The future of access to private lands. Pages 3-9 *in* W. N. Grafton, A. Ferrise, D. Colyer, D. K. Smith, and J. E. Miller (eds.), Proc. first conf. on income opportunities for private landowners through use of natural resources and recreational access. W. Va. Univ. Ext. Serv., Morgantown, W. Va. R.D. No. 740.



## APPENDIX A

### A Breakdown of the Study Sample by Location, Response Category, and Land Classification.

	<u>Number</u>
Total number of landowner names collected:	644
Saratoga County	382
Sullivan County	262
Landowner telephone numbers obtained	389
Completed telephone interviews	244
Useable returns*	214
Incompleted telephone interviews:	175
interview refused	71
wrong number, nonworking number	33
5 calls, no contact	26
respondent not available; 5 calls	15
Land classifications:	214 (total)
Agricultural	83
Residential	79
Vacant land	11
Forested land	40

\*Twenty-six respondents were no longer landowners; 4 respondents were corporate land development organizations.

## APPENDIX B

### Additional Reasons Landowners Were Not Interested in Leasing Access Opportunities to Hunters.

#### Liability Concerns:

Legal statutes are not adequate to protect landowner  
Insurance unavailable or prohibitively expensive

#### Past Problems with Hunters:

Livestock shot, shot at, harassed  
Buildings, other property shot  
Hunters left litter, garbage  
Hunters disrespectful to landowner  
Hunters damaged land, property (not shot)  
Hunters disregard signs and trespass  
Hunters have poached wildlife from my land  
Landowner sued by a hunter  
Hunters cut fences

#### General Concerns About Wildlife:

I love animals  
I'm concerned about the safety of wildlife on my land  
Hunters sometimes waste wildlife (i.e., can't track wounded animals)  
Some hunters intentionally shoot and leave animals  
Deer population on my land has decreased, so I want to limit hunting  
Wildlife should be left alone

#### Personally Opposed to Hunting:

Hunting is immoral  
Hunting is cruel  
Hunting is unethical  
I don't believe in hunting  
I don't like to see animals killed

#### Feehunting Incompatible with Landowner Goals:

Vacation home; want to retain privacy  
Land will be sold for development  
Landowner doesn't want any people on the property  
Landowner believes hunting should be free  
Landowner does not want to offend local hunters  
Landowner retains hunting rights for friends, family  
Hunting might drive wildlife off my land--I want wildlife to stay on  
the land  
Hunting would reduce my opportunities to view wildlife  
Already have desired level of access control  
Landowner trying to increase wildlife populations

## APPENDIX B (cont.)

### Concerned About Human Safety:

Worried about the safety of our young children  
Worried about safety of tenants  
Worried about neighbors' children  
Property is too close to home, roads, to be safe for hunting  
Hunters may break the law and shoot in a safety zone  
Concerned some hunters cannot/do not identify game before shooting  
Land not big enough to support safe hunting by multiple hunters

### Landowner Wants to Exclude Nonlocals:

Nonlocal, urban hunters are believed to be careless  
Nonlocal hunters are not trusted  
Wants to exclude hunters who consume alcohol while hunting

### Perceived Impediments to Leasing Hunting Access:

Little information on starting lease-hunting arrangements  
Lease-hunting administration would be too much bother  
Not possible to effectively limit access to the property  
Not possible to collect fees from all hunters  
Lease would decrease long-term value of the property  
No demand for hunting leases  
Not possible to collect enough money to justify effort  
Leasing cannot give desired level of access control

