

# Indiana's Forests and Woodlands

## Public Opinion Survey Results



*In collaboration with Purdue  
University Department of  
Forestry and Natural Resources*

Cynthia Longmire, DJ Case & Associates  
Erica Kronenberger, Purdue University  
Zhao Ma, Purdue University

PREPARED FOR

**DNR**

Indiana Department  
of Natural Resources

*Forestry*

**JULY 23, 2025**

# Executive Summary

---

This report summarizes findings from a statewide public opinion survey conducted in 2024 to understand Hoosiers' attitudes toward, familiarity with, and use of Indiana's forests and forest management. Developed by Purdue University's Department of Forestry and Natural Resources in collaboration with DJ Case & Associates, the survey was administered using a stratified, address-based sampling frame and a mixed-mode approach (mail and push-to-web) to ensure broad geographic and demographic representation.

**Forest Use and Identity:** Nearly all respondents (99%) have lived in Indiana for over a year, and most (87%) engaged in non-motorized forest activities like hiking. Hoosiers identify strongly as nature lovers, gardeners, and wildlife watchers; fewer identify as hunters or anglers.

**Public Lands:** While 69 percent of respondents visited state parks in the past year, only 29 percent visited state forests and 23 percent visited fish and wildlife areas. Most visits were to locations near or within the geographic region where respondents live.

**Values and Management Preferences:** Hoosiers highly value forests for recreation, biodiversity, and environmental benefits. Most (80%) favor a balanced management approach. Most support harvesting trees for forest health, wildlife, or wildfire prevention, but not for development. Over half (58%) believe Indiana's forests are shrinking.

**Awareness and Trust:** While awareness of Indiana DNR is high among respondents (96%), 30 percent say they have never heard of the Division of Forestry. Despite respondents' limited familiarity with the Division, they indicate fairly high trust in Division employees. This trust appears to be primarily based on respondents' perception of Division staff as knowledgeable. Secondly, it appears to be based on a perception of shared values. It is less clear whether it is based on knowledge of the Division's procedures and degree of fairness and transparency.

**Information Gaps:** Most Hoosiers rarely seek or receive information about forests. Friends, news media, and television shows/documentaries are the most commonly used sources, although they are not considered the most trustworthy. Respondents' initial awareness of programs offered by the Division of Forestry is low, but they broadly support such programs once explained.

Indiana residents widely appreciated the state's forests, but enhanced outreach is needed to bolster visibility and trust in public forestry programs. Strengthening communication, especially around management practices and opportunities for input, can help build affinitive and systems-based trust, ensuring more informed and constructive public support for Indiana's forest conservation goals.





# Table of Contents

---

Executive Summary.....	i
Table of Contents .....	ii
List of Figures .....	iii
List of Tables .....	iv
Background.....	1
Results.....	3
Indiana Residents and Forests .....	4
Public Land Visitation .....	6
Forest Products and Woodland Ownership .....	8
Attitudes About Forests and Woodlands .....	9
Forest Values and Current Management .....	11
Forest Management Expectations.....	12
Attitudes Toward Indiana’s Department of Natural Resources .....	13
Conservation Behaviors .....	17
Information Sources .....	18
Trust .....	20
Methods .....	23
Sample Design and Administration .....	23
Weighting .....	23
Appendix A. Tables.....	25
Appendix B. Survey Questions .....	129



# List of Figures

---

Figure 1. Sampling Design Strata .....	3
Figure 2. Respondents' Self-Identity .....	5
Figure 3. Recent Forest-Based Activities .....	5
Figure 4. Indiana State Forest Visitation .....	6
Figure 5. State Park Visitation .....	7
Figure 6. State Fish & Wildlife Area Visitation .....	8
Figure 7. Lumber or Wood Product Purchases .....	8
Figure 8: Perceptions of the Amount of State-Owned Forestland in Indiana .....	9
Figure 9: Attributes of a Healthy Forest .....	10
Figure 10. Current Threats to Indiana's Forests .....	11
Figure 11. Perceived Forest Value Compared with Current Management Opinions .....	12
Figure 12. Forest Management Expectations .....	13
Figure 13. Activities Associated with the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry .....	14
Figure 14. Division of Forestry Advising Landowners on Timber Harvests .....	15
Figure 15. Residents' Rating of the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry's Performance .....	16
Figure 16. Residents' Awareness of Forest Management Programs in Indiana .....	16
Figure 17. Residents' Support of Forest Management Programs in Indiana .....	17
Figure 18. Likelihood of Residents Engaging in Supportive Behaviors .....	18
Figure 19. Frequency of Receiving Information About Trees or Forests .....	19
Figure 20. Trustworthiness of Information Sources .....	19
Figure 21. Information Sources Used Recently .....	20
Figure 22. Indiana Residents Dispositional Trust .....	21
Figure 23. Beliefs About the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry .....	22





# List of Tables

---

Table 1. Indiana Residency .....	25
Table 2. Average Length of Indiana Residency .....	25
Table 3. Self-Reported Identities .....	26
Table 4. Recent Outdoor Recreation on Forests in Indiana .....	28
Table 5. Recent State Forest Visitation .....	29
Table 6. Average Number of State Forests Visited in Past 12 Months .....	31
Table 7. Likelihood of Visiting State Forest in Next 12 Months .....	32
Table 8. Recent State Park Visitation .....	33
Table 9. Average Number of State Parks Visited in Past 12 Months .....	36
Table 10. Likelihood of Visiting State Park in Next 12 Months .....	36
Table 11. Recent State Fish & Wildlife Area Visitation .....	37
Table 12. Average Number of Visits to State Fish & Wildlife Areas in Past 12 Months .....	40
Table 13. Likelihood of Visiting a State Fish & Wildlife Area in Next 12 Months .....	40
Table 14. Wood Product Purchases in Last 5 Years .....	41
Table 15. Forestland Ownership .....	41
Table 16. Average Length of Forestland Ownership .....	41
Table 17. Forest Landowner Timber Harvests .....	42
Table 18. Opinions About the Amount of State-Owned Forestland .....	42
Table 19. Characteristics of a Healthy Forest .....	43
Table 20. Current Level of Threat: Insects and Diseases .....	44
Table 21. Current Level of Threat: Cutting Trees for Wood Products .....	45
Table 22. Current Level of Threat: Cutting Trees to Create Wildlife Habitat .....	45
Table 23. Current Level of Threat: Unplanned Fires of Wildfires .....	46
Table 24. Current Level of Threat: Planned or Prescribed Fires .....	46
Table 25. Current Level of Threat: Climate Change .....	47
Table 26. Current Level of Threat: Wind or Ice Storms .....	47
Table 27. Current Level of Threat: Drought or Lack of Water .....	48
Table 28. Current Level of Threat: Air Pollution .....	48
Table 29. Current Level of Threat: Water Pollution .....	49
Table 30. Current Level of Threat: Spread of Non-Native Plants and Animals .....	49
Table 31. Current Level of Threat: Land Conversion to Row Crop Agriculture .....	50
Table 32. Current Level of Threat: Land Conversion to Housing Development .....	50
Table 33. Current Level of Threat: Land Conversion to Industrial Development .....	51
Table 34. Current Level of Threat: Misuse of Woodlands (e.g. Vandalism, Dumping) .....	51
Table 35. Current Level of Threat: Trespassing or Poaching .....	52
Table 36. Current Level of Threat: Other .....	52
Table 37. Indiana Forests' Value: Produce Wood Products .....	53
Table 38. Indiana Forests' Value: Provide Jobs and Income .....	54
Table 39. Indiana Forests' Value: Produce Environmental Benefits to People .....	55
Table 40. Indiana Forests' Value: Support Biodiversity .....	56



Table 41. Indiana Forests' Value: Provide Outdoor Recreation for People .....	57
Table 42. Indiana Forests' Value: Just Because Exist .....	58
Table 43. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Wood Products .....	59
Table 44. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Jobs and Income .....	60
Table 45. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Environmental Benefits .....	61
Table 46. Current Management: Sufficiently Support Biodiversity .....	62
Table 47. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Recreational Opportunities .....	63
Table 48. Current Management: Too Much Emphasis on Benefits to People .....	64
Table 49. Management Expectation: Should Be Left Untouched by Humans .....	65
Table 50. Management Expectation: Needs Met by Trees Grown in Indiana .....	66
Table 51. Management Expectation: Growing Trees to Replace Harvested Trees .....	67
Table 52. Management Expectation: Import Wood Products Instead of Harvesting .....	68
Table 53. Management Expectation: Indiana Forests are Shrinking .....	69
Table 54. Management Expectation: Cut Trees for Housing .....	70
Table 55. Management Expectation: Cut Trees to Protect from Insects and Disease .....	71
Table 56. Forest Management: Cut Some Trees for Wildfire Protection .....	72
Table 57. Management Expectation: Cut Some Trees to Support Biodiversity .....	73
Table 58. Management Expectation: Cut Some Trees to Improve Forest Health .....	74
Table 59. Management Expectation: For Carbon Storage, No Trees Should Be Cut .....	75
Table 60. Management Expectation: Balance Management .....	76
Table 61. Management Expectation: Overseen by Professional Forester .....	77
Table 62. Familiarity with Indiana Department of Natural Resources .....	78
Table 63. Met Anyone from Indiana DNR .....	78
Table 64. Familiarity with Division of Forestry .....	79
Table 65. Associations with the Division of Forestry .....	80
Table 66. Division of Forestry Advise Landowners on Timber Harvests .....	82
Table 67. Rating of Division of Forestry on Managing Indiana's Forests .....	83
Table 68. Familiarity with Private Forestland Green Certification Program .....	83
Table 69. Support for Private Forestland Green Certification Program .....	84
Table 70. Familiarity with Classified Forest and Wildlands Program .....	85
Table 71. Support for Classified Forest and Wildlands Program .....	86
Table 72. Familiarity with the Family Forest Carbon Program .....	87
Table 73. Support for Family Forest Carbon Program .....	88
Table 74. Likelihood of Following Division of Forestry on Social Media .....	89
Table 75. Likelihood of Volunteering with Division of Forestry .....	89
Table 76. Likelihood of Attending Division of Forestry Public Meetings .....	90
Table 77. Likelihood of Supporting Fund Raising Initiative .....	90
Table 78. Likelihood of Contacting Elected Officials to Support the Division of Forestry .....	91
Table 79. Likelihood of Voting to Support Forest Management .....	91
Table 80. Frequency of Looking for Information on Forests .....	92
Table 81. Recently Looked for Information on Indiana's Forests .....	93
Table 82. Information Source: DNR Website or Newsletters .....	93
Table 83. Used DNR Website As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	94
Table 84. Information Source: Conservation Officers .....	94



Table 85. Used Conservation Officers As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	94
Table 86. Information Source: District Offices .....	95
Table 87. Used District Offices As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	95
Table 88. Information Source: Private Forestry Professionals .....	96
Table 89. Used Private Forestry Professionals As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	96
Table 90. Information Source: Other Private Natural Resource Professionals .....	97
Table 91. Use of Other Private Natural Resource Professionals As Source .....	97
Table 92. Information Source: Wood Products Companies .....	98
Table 93. Use of Wood Products Companies As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	98
Table 94. Information Source: Indiana Forestry and Woodland Owners Association .....	99
Table 95. Use of Indiana Forestry and Woodland Owners Association As Source .....	99
Table 96. Information Source: Federal Agencies .....	100
Table 97. Use of Federal Agencies As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	100
Table 98. Information Source: Non-Profit Organizations .....	101
Table 99. Use of Non-Profit Organizations As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	101
Table 100. Information Source: Purdue Extension .....	102
Table 101. Use of Purdue Extension As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	102
Table 102. Information Source: University Websites, Videos, and Publications .....	103
Table 103. Used University Materials As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	103
Table 104. Information Source: TV Shows and Documentaries .....	104
Table 105. Used TV Shows and Documentaries As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	104
Table 106. Information Source: News Media .....	105
Table 107. Used News Media As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	105
Table 108. Information Source: Social Media .....	106
Table 109. Used Social Media As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	106
Table 110. Information Source: YouTube Videos .....	107
Table 111. Used YouTube Videos As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	107
Table 112. Information Source: Podcasts .....	108
Table 113. Used Podcasts As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	108
Table 114. Information Source: Sporting Magazines .....	109
Table 115. Used Sporting Magazines As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	109
Table 116. Information Source: Friends and Family .....	110
Table 117. Used Friends and Family As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	110
Table 118. Information Source: Nearby Landowners .....	111
Table 119. Used Nearby Landowners As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	111
Table 120. Information Source: Other .....	112
Table 121. Used Other As Source in Previous 12 Months .....	112
Table 122. Hard to Trust Others .....	113
Table 123. People are Honest .....	114
Table 124. Careful Dealing with Others .....	115
Table 125. Trust Others .....	116
Table 126. Scientific Expertise of Division of Forestry .....	117
Table 127. Division of Forestry Knows How to Manage Forests .....	118
Table 128. Division of Forestry Cares About Indiana's Forests .....	119





Table 129. Division of Forestry has Shared Values .....	120
Table 130. Division of Forestry is Approachable .....	121
Table 131. Division of Forestry Helps People .....	122
Table 132. Division of Forestry Listens .....	123
Table 133. Division of Forestry Equal Treatment .....	124
Table 134. Division of Forestry Input Processes .....	125
Table 135. Division of Forestry Considers Public Input .....	126
Table 136. Division of Forestry Has Unbiased Communication .....	127
Table 137. Sampling Strata .....	128
Table 138. Normalized Weights .....	128



# Indiana's Forests and Woodlands: Public Opinion Survey Results

This report presents the results of the 2024 survey of Hoosiers' attitudes toward, familiarity with, and interest in forests and forest management in Indiana. For this survey, forestland (sometimes referred to as woods or woodlands) is defined as *a land area at least 1 acre in size, where trees are the predominant vegetation type, and that is not maintained as a lawn, Christmas tree farm, orchard, or nursery*. Building on similar research from 2009, this survey was a collaboration between the Purdue University Department of Forestry and Natural Resources and DJ Case & Associates.

## Background

Approximately 1 in 5 acres in Indiana is covered by forest, totaling around 4.8 million acres of forestland. Roughly 83 percent of these forests are owned by an estimated 85,000 private landowners, the majority of whom own fewer than 50 acres.<sup>1</sup> Southern Indiana hosts the largest proportion of Indiana's forests, while historical land conversion into agricultural and urban development has led to Northern and Central Indiana having fewer forested acres. In these less forested regions, wooded riparian corridors, urban woodlots, and reforested mine lands contribute to landscape-scale connectivity. Located within the Central Hardwoods Region of the United States, Indiana's forests comprise oak-hickory forests, maple-beech forests, as well as bottomland hardwoods and mixed mesophytic forest types. Indiana's forests have an estimated annual economic impact of \$17 billion in the state.<sup>2</sup>

Indiana's forests constitute a significant and diverse natural resource that reflects the state's varied topography, climate, and ecological history. The state's forests are renowned for producing high-quality hardwood products while also providing wildlife habitats, environmental services, and recreational opportunities, enhancing Hoosiers' quality of life. The forest products industry supports an estimated 70,000 jobs throughout the state. In many cases, these jobs are with small, family-owned businesses with fewer than 50 employees and play an essential role in rural communities.<sup>3</sup>

The state's forests support a diverse array of wildlife, including white-tailed deer, wild turkeys, squirrels, raccoons, pollinators, and myriad forest songbirds including iconic species such as the

---

<sup>1</sup> Indiana Department of Natural Resources Division of Forestry 2025-2029 Strategic Direction.

<https://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/files/fo-State-Forest-Strategic-Plan-2025-2029.pdf>

<sup>2</sup> Mayer, W. (2024, August). Researchers Aim to Support Hardwood Industry with Formation of Wood Utilization Team. Forestry and Natural Resources News. Purdue University.

<https://ag.purdue.edu/news/departments/fnr/2024/08/researchers-aim-to-support-hardwood-industry.html>

<sup>3</sup> Indiana Department of Natural Resources. (2025) Indiana Forest Industry Overview. Accessed at:

<https://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/forest-industry-overview/>



wood thrush and cerulean warbler. They are also home to species that are threatened, endangered, or of special concern, including the Indiana bat and eastern box turtle.

Indiana's forests provide critical green infrastructure, which aids in ecological functions such as carbon storage, air quality improvement, water filtration, watershed protection, soil stabilization, and erosion control. Additionally, they play a central role in outdoor recreation and aesthetic enjoyment, contributing to quality of life and supporting the state's \$15.7 billion outdoor recreation economy. Forests offer a diverse range of recreational opportunities, supporting physical activity, mental health, and tourism. Many Hoosiers associate forests with family traditions, solitude and relaxation, as well as artistic inspiration in photography, painting, writing, and music.<sup>4</sup>

The multiple uses of Indiana's forests reveal a broader picture of how healthy, well-managed forests contribute to both working landscapes and natural amenities. Understanding Indiana residents' attitudes toward, familiarity with, and interest in forests and forest management is crucial for shaping effective conservation strategies. Forestry's significant impact on the state's economy and Hoosiers' lives underscores the importance of understanding what people think and feel about this important resource. The findings reported here can help inform the tailoring of outreach efforts and foster trust in science-based management.

---

<sup>4</sup> Indiana Department of Natural Resources. (2020). Indiana Forest Action Plan. Division of Forestry. <https://www.in.gov/dnr/forestry/forest-action-plan/>.

U.S. Bureau of Economic Analysis. (2024, November). Outdoor Recreation Satellite Account: Indiana, 2023 [PDF summary sheet]. U.S. Department of Commerce. <https://apps.bea.gov/data/special-topics/orsa/summary-sheets/ORSA%20-%20Indiana.pdf>





# Results

An address-based, stratified sampling design was employed, drawing approximately equal-sized samples from each of four geographic regions (Figure 1). After removing undeliverable addresses, deceased and ineligible individuals, the final sample size was approximately 12,000. A total of 2,780 responses were received for an estimated response rate of 22.5%.




Figure 1. Sampling Design Strata

To ensure that the survey results accurately reflect the adult population of Indiana, weighting adjustments are applied to correct for sampling design and demographic imbalances. To adjust for over- or under-representation due to disproportionate regional sampling, a design weight was first calculated. To further align the sample with known population distributions, raking weights were created using variables for gender, age group, and region. All estimates reported in the analysis reflect these final weights. All standard errors and confidence intervals reported in this study account for the design effect using SPSS Complex Samples variance estimation. The global design effect is approximately 1.83, and the estimated margin of error at the 95% confidence level is  $\pm 2.7\%$ .

For more detailed information on the study methodology, please refer to the methods section at the end of this report.

The following discussion highlights the key takeaways from survey responses. Tables listing the full response breakouts for each survey question are in Appendix A.



## Indiana Residents and Forests

Most respondents (99%) have lived in Indiana for more than one year, with a statewide average length of residency of about 40 years. The average length respondents have lived in Indiana varies from 38 years in the Indianapolis Metro Area to 42 years in Southern Indiana (Tables 1 and 2).

Hoosiers think of themselves in various ways, reflecting diverse interests and lifestyles (Figure 2 and Table 3). Results indicate widespread connections to nature. Nearly three-quarters consider themselves “nature lovers” and enjoy non-motorized outdoor activities (e.g., hiking, biking, paddling). A significant proportion of residents, though relatively fewer, enjoy motorized outdoor recreation (27%). Other identities which resonate with residents are gardener (45%) and birder/wildlife watcher (34%), while hunter and angler were less common among residents, particularly in the Indianapolis Metro Area. Conservation nonprofit membership (e.g., The Nature Conservancy, Audubon Society, Indiana Bowhunter Association) is modest statewide (5%). Respondents reporting a suburban residence make up the largest share (42%), particularly in the Indianapolis Metro Area (63%). About one-third (34%) of respondents indicate rural residence, with the highest proportions in Southern (50%) and Central Indiana (41%). Only 19% of respondents identify as urban residents.

Respondents' self-reported identities reflect their reported engagement in forest-based activities (Table 4). Nature connection and non-motorized recreation activities are dominant statewide (Figure 3). Walking, hiking, or running is the most common forest activity, reported by 87 percent of respondents. Participation in this activity is highest in the Indianapolis Metro Area (92%). Other common activities are birding/wildlife watching (35%), camping (35%), fishing (35%), and picnicking (34%). Less common or more specialized forest uses include collecting firewood (24%), gathering non-timber forest products (23%), and hunting (17%). Respondents in Southern Indiana consistently report higher involvement in resource-use activities such as hunting, fishing, and gathering forest products.






Figure 2. Respondents' Self-Identity

Note: A person can think of themselves in a variety of ways. Please indicate whether or not you are...




Figure 3. Recent Forest-Based Activities

Note: Which of the following have you or any member of your household done in Indiana's forests and woodlands in the past 12 months?





## Public Land Visitation

Most respondents (53%) reported not visiting an Indiana State Forest in the last 12 months (Figure 4). About 3 in 10 (29%) indicated they had visited a state forest. Respondents reported visiting the Morgan-Monroe State Forest the most, followed by the Salamonie River and Yellowwood State Forests. Mountain Tea, Selmier, and Ravinia State Forests have the lowest percentage of respondents who report visiting (Table 5). Overall, residents reported visiting state forests located in the geographic region where they lived, and on average, reported visiting only one state forest (Table 6). Despite a little less than one-third indicating recent state forest visitation, over two-thirds of respondents (69%) say they are likely to visit a state forest in the next 12 months (Table 7).




Figure 4. Indiana State Forest Visitation

Note: In the last 12 months, which Indiana State Forest(s) have you visited?

Residents were more likely to report visiting a state park in the last 12 months than a state forest or state wildlife area. Over two-thirds of respondents (69%) say they visited an Indiana State Park in the previous 12 months (Figure 5). Respondents reported visiting Brown County State Park the most, followed by Indiana Dunes and Turkey Run State Parks (Table 8). Overall, residents tended to report visiting state parks located in the geographic region where they lived, and on average, reported visiting two state parks in the last 12 months (Table 9). While a little more than half indicate recent state park visitation, about 8 in 10 respondents (81%) say they are likely to visit a state park in the next 12 months (Table 10).






Figure 5. State Park Visitation  
 Note: In the last 12 months, which Indiana State Park(s) have you visited?

Residents were less likely to visit Indiana Fish and Wildlife Areas than state forests or state parks. Nearly two-thirds (64%) say they did not visit an Indiana State Fish and Wildlife Area in the previous 12 months (Figure 6). Respondents reported visiting Atterbury Fish and Wildlife Area the most, followed by Jasper-Pulaski and Deer Creek wildlife areas (Table 11). Overall, residents tended to report visiting wildlife areas located in the geographic region where they lived, and on average, reported visiting only one wildlife area in the last 12 months (Table 12). While only about one-quarter (23%) indicate recent state wildlife area visitation, about two-thirds (65%) say they are likely to visit a state wildlife area in the next 12 months (Table 13).






Figure 6. State Fish & Wildlife Area Visitation  
 Note: In the last 12 months, which Indiana State Park(s) have you visited?

## Forest Products and Woodland Ownership

Most Indiana residents (98%) purchased lumber or wood products for personal use in the last five years, while a significantly smaller proportion (13%) purchased them for their work or professional use (Figure 7 and Table 14).



Figure 7. Lumber or Wood Product Purchases  
 Note: In the last five years, have you purchased any lumber or wood products for...?





About 18 percent of respondents indicate they own woodlands in Indiana, with ownership rates varying from 1 in 4 respondents in Southern Indiana to 1 in 10 respondents in the Indianapolis Metro Area (Table 15). Forest landowners reported owning varying amounts of woodland, with approximately half (56%) owning between 1 and 9 acres of woodland. A considerable percentage of woodland owners who responded (53%) have engaged in timber harvesting on their property (Tables 16 and 17).

## Attitudes About Forests and Woodlands

Residents express varying opinions on the adequacy of state-owned forestland in Indiana. About half (56%) believe there is not enough state-owned forestland, 22 percent believe the amount is about right, and only about 1 percent of residents indicate there is too much. However, about 1 in 5 residents (22%) say they have no opinion about the amount of forestland owned by the State of Indiana (Figure 8 and Table 18).




Figure 8: Perceptions of the Amount of State-Owned Forestland in Indiana

Note: Indiana has 4.8 million acres of forests (just over 20% of the state's land base). The State Forest System makes up 3% of Indiana's forests. What do you think about this amount of state-owned forests in Indiana?

Just as opinions vary on how much state-owned forestland is enough, residents also hold differing views on what constitutes a healthy forest in Indiana (Figure 9 and Table 19). Most people believe that a healthy forest should have both mature and young trees (89%), be home to wildlife (84%), be full of native trees and shrubs (74%), and support biodiversity (71%). While most respondents think a healthy forest has both mature and young trees, about one-third (35%) believe a healthy forest is one that has not been harvested. About 1 in 10 residents (11%) believe that a healthy forest is one that has mostly mature trees.






Figure 9: Attributes of a Healthy Forest  
 Note: What do you consider a healthy forest?

When rating the current threat posed to Indiana’s forests by 16 factors, residents generally perceive moderate to high threats to forests statewide (see Tables 20 through 36). Figure 10 shows respondents’ ratings across 16 factors, plus an “other” category and helps visualize how perceived severity varies across different threats. Threats such as *land conversion to industrial and other development* and *land conversion to housing development* have large yellow segments, indicating they are widely seen as “a very big threat.” In contrast, *planned or prescribed fires* and *cutting or harvesting trees to create diverse wildlife habitats* have larger purple segments, showing that most see them as non-threatening. Opinions about the severity of threat posed by climate change are split; 27 percent see it as a very big threat, while 26 percent say it’s not a threat. The perceived threat posed by cutting trees varies based on the purpose of the harvest. Nearly two-thirds (65%) say cutting trees for wood products is somewhat of a threat to a moderate threat, while 52 percent say cutting trees to create wildlife habitat is not a threat.






Figure 10. Current Threats to Indiana's Forests

Note: To what extent do you think the following factors/conditions represent a current threat to Indiana's forests/woodlands?

## Forest Values and Current Management

Indiana forests and woodlands are valued for their recreational opportunities, environmental benefits, and economic benefits. The proportion of residents who agree that forests are valuable if they provide economic benefits of forests, however, is relatively smaller than the proportion who agree that they are valuable if they provide environmental and recreational benefits. (See Tables 37 through 48). Figure 11 shows respondents' level of agreement across 12 statements (6 statements about forests' value and 6 statements about current management of forests in Indiana) and provides a visual representation of how perceived forest value compares with opinions regarding current forest management. Many respondents indicated that they "don't know" whether current forest management produces sufficient wood products, jobs, environmental benefits, biodiversity support, or recreational opportunities. This suggests a lack of clarity regarding the effectiveness of forest management in Indiana. Among those who did have an opinion about current management, perceived current forest management in the state is generally consistent with forest values.






Figure 11. Perceived Forest Value Compared with Current Management Opinions

Note: (1) How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they... (2) How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands are currently managed? The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed...

## Forest Management Expectations

Overall, Hoosiers express support for a balanced approach to forest management (See Tables 49 through 61). Most respondents (80%) agree or strongly agree that Indiana's forests should be managed for a balance of wood products, biodiversity, other environmental benefits, and outdoor recreational benefits (Figure 12). About one-quarter (26%) of respondents, however, agree or strongly agree that Indiana's forests should be untouched by humans. Additionally, 1 in 5 respondents (22%) agree or strongly agree that, to help with carbon sequestration, no trees should be cut.

When it comes to harvesting trees, respondents' perspectives depend on the purpose. A significant majority of residents agree with cutting trees to improve forest health (87%), support biodiversity (78%), protect against wildfires (82%), or protect against insects and disease (91%). However, 53 percent disagree with cutting trees for housing development. Forty-three percent agree that future wood and wood product needs should be met by trees grown in Indiana. In contrast, about one-quarter (26%) agree that Indiana should import wood products instead of harvesting trees within the state. A small majority (58%) believe that Indiana's forests are



shrinking; however, more than one-third (39%) indicate they don't know whether this is the case or not. Additionally, about half (54%) don't know if Indiana is growing enough trees to replace what is harvested.




Figure 12. Forest Management Expectations

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed?

## Attitudes Toward Indiana's Department of Natural Resources

Familiarity with and trust in public agencies that manage forests are key in avoiding conflict and dispelling misinformation, especially during conflict over forest management on public lands. Most respondents (96%) have at least heard of the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (Table 62). A little over one-third (37%) say they are extremely or moderately familiar with the agency, while about 59 percent are slightly or somewhat familiar. Two-thirds of respondents (66%) report having met an Indiana DNR employee. Although there were no regional differences in familiarity with the DNR, a slightly smaller proportion of residents in the Indianapolis Metro Area indicated having met a DNR employee (Table 63).





While most residents are familiar with the DNR, nearly one-third (30%) of respondents report never having heard of the Division of Forestry (Table 64). Only 9 percent say they are extremely or moderately familiar with the Division, while 62 percent report being slightly or somewhat familiar with it. In Northern Indiana and the Indianapolis Metro Area, a larger percentage of residents reported having never heard of the Division of Forestry than in Central or Southern Indiana.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether any of the 17 listed items first come to mind when thinking of the Division of Forestry (Figure 13; see Table 65). The top four items indicated, broadly related to resource management, are forest management (73%), environmental conservation (62%), planting trees (53%), and natural resources (51%). Nearly half of the respondents indicate that parks (49%) and wildlife management (48%) come to mind. Cutting trees (37%) and fighting wildfires (31%) were less commonly selected. While the state's forests are valued for their recreational benefits and many residents believe forests should be managed to provide such benefits, most respondents did not indicate that "outdoor recreation" came to mind when thinking about the Division of Forestry. Various specific types of outdoor recreation were selected by fewer respondents: hunting (30%), outdoor recreation (30%), camping (28%), fishing (26%), and wildlife viewing or birding (21%).




Figure 13. Activities Associated with the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry  
 Note: What first comes to mind when you think of the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry?



While a large majority of respondents (83%) agree that tree harvesting should be overseen by professional foresters, less than half (49%) agree that it is the Division of Forestry's role to advise landowners on timber harvests (Figure 14; Table 66). This gap suggests that, although there is strong support for professional oversight in forest management, the public may lack awareness of the Division's advisory role or may not associate the agency with providing that type of guidance.




Figure 14. Division of Forestry Advising Landowners on Timber Harvests

Note: What do you think of the following statement about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? It is the job of DoF to advise Indiana landowners on how many and what trees they might harvest and sell.

Despite the lower visibility of the Division of Forestry, residents perceive the Division as doing a reasonably good job (6.5 out of 10) managing forests in Indiana (Table 67). On a scale of 1 to 10, where 1 equals very poorly and 10 equals very well, 53 percent rated the Division's performance as seven or higher (Figure 15).






Figure 15. Residents' Rating of the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry's Performance

Note: On a scale of 1 to 10, how poorly or well do you think the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry is doing in terms of managing forests and woodlands in Indiana? (1= Very poorly; 10= Very well)

Residents indicate very low familiarity with existing forestry management programs in the state, but after learning more about them, the public is generally supportive of the programs (Tables 68 through 73). Prior to this survey, most respondents (76% to 89%) had never heard of the three programs discussed (Figure 16). After reading a brief description of each program, many respondents (60% to 68%) were supportive (Figure 17).




Figure 16. Residents' Awareness of Forest Management Programs in Indiana

Note: Before reading this description, what was your level of familiarity with this \_\_\_ in Indiana?







Figure 17. Residents' Support of Forest Management Programs in Indiana

Note: After reading the description about the \_\_\_\_ in Indiana, what is your opinion about this program?

## Conservation Behaviors

Residents were asked to indicate how likely they are to engage in six different actions supporting the Division of Forestry (Tables 74 through 79). More than two-thirds (71%) of respondents indicated that they were likely to vote for candidates or issues to support forest management and conservation (Figure 18). A third (33%) said they were likely to support fund raising initiatives, while just under a quarter (24%) said they were likely to follow the Division of Forestry on social media. More active and time-intensive actions appear less likely, with 90 percent indicating they are unlikely to attend a public meeting and 89 percent saying they are unlikely to volunteer their time to help the Division of Forestry.





*Figure 18. Likelihood of Residents Engaging in Supportive Behaviors*  
*Note: How likely or unlikely are you to do any of the following activities in the next 12 months?*

## Information Sources

Half of respondents (50%) say they rarely (once a year or less frequently) receive information about trees or forests in general (Figure 19; Table 80). About one-third (33%) report receiving information once a month. When it comes to information specific to Indiana’s trees and forests, a little more than one-quarter (29%) say they have looked for it within the previous 12 months, and another 36 percent have looked for it but not in the last 12 months (Table 81).

Regarding information specific to Indiana trees and forests, Purdue Extension, District Offices, the Indiana DNR website or newsletters, and Conservation Officers were considered the most trustworthy (Figure 20); however, these sources were not among the top five sources used in the previous 12 months (Figure 21). Social media was considered the least trustworthy, with half (52%) of respondents saying it was not trustworthy, although one-third (36%) reported using it as an information source in the previous 12 months. The top sources used recently are friends and family (53%), followed closely by news media (42%), TV shows and documentaries (39%), and YouTube videos (39%). See Tables 82 through 121.








Figure 19. Frequency of Receiving Information About Trees or Forests

Note: About how often do you hear or read something about trees, tree-covered areas, woodland, or forests in general?




Figure 20. Trustworthiness of Information Sources

How trustworthy do you consider the following potential information sources about trees, forests, and woodlands in Indiana?





Figure 21. Information Sources Used Recently

Note: Which of the following potential information sources about trees, forests, and woodlands in Indiana have you used in the last 12 months?

## Trust

Figure 22 depicts respondents' level of agreement with a set of positive and cautious attitudes toward trust. In general, respondents demonstrate a moderately high level of trust. They tend to believe people are honest (60% agreement) and generally trustworthy (54% agreement). Many still feel caution is warranted in interactions (70%), which is not necessarily contradictory. Many people simultaneously believe most people are honest and that one should be careful, a pragmatic rather than cynical outlook. The majority do not report distrust as a personal barrier, with only 24 percent indicating that they find it hard to trust others. See Tables 122 through 125.

Two-thirds of respondents (67%) believe Division employees are knowledgeable and have scientific expertise (Figure 23; See tables 126 through 136). Nearly three-quarters (72%) believe employees care about Indiana's forests. Despite many respondents stating they are not familiar with the Division, the majority believe the Division's employees care about Indiana's forests and are knowledgeable about forest management. About half of the respondents agree that Division employees care about helping people (53%) and share their values related to the environment (52%).



The degree of systems-based trust—based on fairness, transparency, and procedures—is less clear. Nearly two-thirds say they don’t know if the Division of Forestry treats all members of the public equally (62%) or if they employ people who are easy to talk to (62%). Over half say they don’t know if the Division listens to the public (59%), generally considers the opinions and needs of people like them (58%), has specific procedures to request input (58%), or communicates unbiased information (54%).




Figure 22. Indiana Residents Dispositional Trust  
 Note: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements?






Figure 23. Beliefs About the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry

Note: What do you think of each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry?



# Methods

---

## Sample Design and Administration

An address-based, stratified sampling design was employed, drawing approximately equal-sized samples from each of four geographic regions (See Figure 1). Data were collected from October 14 to November 22, 2024, using a multi-mode, address-based approach that allowed respondents to complete the survey via the web or mail. The sampling frame is based on the U.S. Postal Service delivery-sequence file (DSF). The DSF provides sample coverage of approximately 97 percent of the U.S. household population. Those excluded from the sample include people with P.O. Box addresses and some newly constructed dwellings. Following the Modified Tailored Design Method<sup>5</sup> all sampled households are mailed a letter inviting them to complete the survey online via a QR code or by returning the completed survey questionnaire in the postage-paid business reply envelope. Survey recipients were offered a monetary incentive for completing the survey. A total of up to four contacts, approximately ten days apart, were used to encourage survey completion:

- 1<sup>st</sup> Wave – Cover letter, survey questionnaire, \$2 bill incentive, postage-paid business reply envelope
- 2<sup>nd</sup> Wave – Reminder postcard
- 3<sup>rd</sup> Wave – Cover letter, survey questionnaire, postage-paid business reply envelope
- 4<sup>th</sup> Wave – Final reminder letter only

After removing undeliverable addresses, as well as deceased and ineligible individuals, the final sample size was 12,369. A total of 2,780 responses were received for an estimated response rate of 22.5%. The design effect is approximately 1.83, and the estimated margin of error at the 95% confidence level is  $\pm 2.7\%$ .

## Weighting

Quality assurance checks were conducted before weighting the dataset. A non-response adjustment and raking process are used to adjust for sample design and differential survey nonresponse along demographic and geographic dimensions. Raking was performed using SPSS Complex Samples to adjust sample weights so that the marginal distributions matched U.S. Census estimates for Indiana's adult population. Population benchmarks for the demographic raking variables are obtained from the 2022 Population Estimates reported by the U.S. Census Bureau and population estimates from the 2019-2023 American Community Survey. The variables were raked in the order of gender, age, and region, to minimize extreme weights. To

---

<sup>5</sup> Dillman, D. A., Smyth, J. D., & Christian, L. M. (2014). Internet, phone, mail, and mixed-mode surveys: The tailored design method. *Hoboken, New Jersey*.



reduce the influence of extreme weights, trimming was applied at the 95<sup>th</sup> percentile of the final weight distribution. Weights above the cap were set to the trimming threshold, and weights were rescaled to preserve the effective sample size. The final weight variable incorporated both the base design weight and the post-stratification adjustment. All estimates reported in the analysis reflect these final weights. All standard errors and confidence intervals reported in this study account for the design effect using SPSS Complex Samples variance estimation. See tables 137 and 138.





# Appendix A. Tables

Table 1. Indiana Residency

	Weighted					Unweighted		
	Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Missing Cases
One or more years	2,188	99.96%	30.854	2,127	2,248	2,189	2,346	44
Less than one year	1	0.04%	0.540	0	2	2,189	1	

Table 2. Average Length of Indiana Residency

Region	Weighted					Unweighted	
	Count	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	2,186	40.32	0.489	39.36	41.28	2,345	1
Northern	753	41.04	0.916	39.25	42.84	567	0
Central	453	40.66	1.054	38.59	42.73	603	1
Indianapolis Metro Area	611	38.09	0.904	36.32	39.87	565	0
Southern	369	42.11	0.990	40.17	44.05	610	0



Table 3. Self-Reported Identities

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Gardener</b>	Statewide	980	44.9%	1.3%	42.4%	47.4%	2,184	1,086	2,350	41
	Northern	318	42.4%	2.4%	37.8%	47.1%	751	250	568	13
	Central	200	44.1%	2.5%	39.2%	49.1%	454	282	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	282	46.3%	2.5%	41.5%	51.1%	609	260	566	8
	Southern	180	48.8%	2.5%	43.8%	53.8%	369	294	612	12
<b>Hunter</b>	Statewide	385	17.6%	0.9%	15.9%	19.6%	2,184	459	2,350	41
	Northern	154	20.5%	2.0%	17.0%	24.7%	751	118	568	13
	Central	86	19.0%	1.9%	15.4%	23.0%	454	123	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	64	10.5%	1.4%	8.0%	13.5%	609	74	566	8
	Southern	81	22.0%	2.1%	18.2%	26.3%	369	144	612	12
<b>Angler</b>	Statewide	600	27.5%	1.1%	25.3%	29.7%	2,184	701	2,350	41
	Northern	222	29.6%	2.2%	25.5%	34.0%	751	189	568	13
	Central	135	29.8%	2.3%	25.4%	34.6%	454	187	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	131	21.6%	2.0%	18.0%	25.8%	609	134	566	8
	Southern	110	29.9%	2.3%	25.5%	34.7%	369	191	612	12
<b>Birder/Wildlife Watcher</b>	Statewide	741	33.5%	1.2%	31.7%	36.3%	2,184	852	2,350	41
	Northern	273	36.4%	2.3%	32.0%	41.0%	751	217	568	13
	Central	153	33.7%	2.4%	29.2%	38.6%	454	215	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	183	30.0%	2.2%	25.9%	34.5%	609	191	566	8
	Southern	132	35.7%	2.4%	31.1%	40.5%	369	229	612	12
<b>Nature Lover</b>	Statewide	1,592	72.9%	1.1%	70.7%	75.1%	2,184	1,656	2,350	41
	Northern	545	72.6%	2.1%	68.3%	76.6%	751	400	568	13
	Central	335	73.8%	2.2%	69.3%	77.8%	454	420	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	445	73.1%	2.2%	68.6%	77.1%	609	402	566	8
	Southern	267	72.2%	2.2%	67.6%	76.4%	369	434	612	12
<b>Enjoys Non-motorized Outdoor Activities</b>	Statewide	1,626	74.5%	1.0%	72.4%	76.5%	2,184	1,584	2,350	41
	Northern	567	75.7%	1.9%	71.7%	79.3%	751	393	568	13
	Central	319	70.1%	2.2%	65.6%	74.3%	454	384	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	478	78.4%	1.9%	74.4%	81.9%	609	415	566	8
	Southern	262	70.9%	2.2%	66.5%	74.9%	369	392	612	12
<b>Enjoys Motorized Outdoor Activities</b>	Statewide	597	26.9%	1.2%	25.1%	29.7%	2,184	576	2,350	41
	Northern	219	29.2%	2.3%	25.0%	33.8%	751	143	568	13
	Central	129	28.3%	2.4%	23.9%	33.2%	454	147	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	127	20.8%	2.0%	17.1%	25.1%	609	109	566	8
	Southern	122	33.1%	2.5%	28.5%	38.2%	369	177	612	12
<b>Member Land-Based Nonprofit</b>	Statewide	55	2.5%	0.4%	1.9%	3.4%	2,184	66	2,350	41
	Northern	19	2.5%	0.7%	1.4%	4.4%	751	15	568	13
	Central	16	3.6%	1.0%	2.1%	6.1%	454	19	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	13	2.2%	0.7%	1.2%	4.1%	609	13	566	8
	Southern	7	1.8%	0.5%	1.0%	3.0%	369	19	612	12
<b>Member Conservation Nonprofit</b>	Statewide	109	5.0%	0.5%	4.1%	6.2%	2,184	134	2,350	41
	Northern	29	3.9%	0.9%	2.5%	6.2%	751	23	568	13
	Central	31	6.8%	1.3%	4.7%	9.9%	454	40	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	29	4.7%	1.0%	3.1%	7.1%	609	30	566	8
	Southern	20	5.5%	1.0%	3.7%	7.9%	369	41	612	12



Table 3 (continued). Self-Reported Identities

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Urban Resident	Statewide	411	18.8%	1.0%	16.9%	20.9%	2,184	419	2,350	41
	Northern	122	16.2%	1.8%	13.0%	20.0%	751	92	568	13
	Central	92	20.3%	2.1%	16.5%	24.7%	454	124	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	131	21.5%	2.1%	17.6%	26.0%	609	107	566	8
	Southern	66	17.9%	2.1%	14.1%	22.4%	369	96	612	12
Suburban Resident	Statewide	910	41.7%	1.2%	39.3%	44.2%	2,184	922	2,350	41
	Northern	281	37.5%	2.3%	33.0%	42.2%	751	208	568	13
	Central	136	30.0%	2.4%	25.6%	34.8%	454	172	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	382	62.7%	2.4%	57.9%	67.2%	609	353	566	8
	Southern	111	30.2%	2.3%	25.8%	34.9%	369	189	612	12
Rural Resident	Statewide	757	34.2%	1.2%	32.4%	37.0%	2,184	905	2,350	41
	Northern	297	39.6%	2.4%	35.1%	44.3%	751	234	568	13
	Central	186	40.8%	2.5%	36.1%	45.8%	454	271	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	91	14.9%	1.7%	11.9%	18.5%	609	97	566	8
	Southern	183	49.6%	2.5%	44.7%	54.6%	369	303	612	12
Forest or Woodland Owner	Statewide	306	14.0%	0.8%	12.5%	15.7%	2,184	404	2,350	41
	Northern	106	14.2%	1.6%	11.3%	17.7%	751	92	568	13
	Central	81	17.9%	1.8%	14.6%	21.8%	454	120	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	46	7.5%	1.2%	5.5%	10.2%	609	54	566	8
	Southern	73	19.7%	1.9%	16.2%	23.8%	369	138	612	12
Farmer or Ag Producer	Statewide	132	6.0%	0.6%	5.0%	7.3%	2,184	172	2,350	41
	Northern	49	6.5%	1.2%	4.6%	9.3%	751	39	568	13
	Central	37	8.2%	1.3%	5.9%	11.2%	454	55	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	15	2.5%	0.7%	1.4%	4.4%	609	18	566	8
	Southern	31	8.3%	1.2%	6.2%	10.9%	369	60	612	12



Table 4. Recent Outdoor Recreation on Forests in Indiana

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Walking, hiking, or running	Statewide	1,799	86.9%	0.8%	85.3%	88.4%	2,070	1,174	2,170	221
	Northern	613	86.0%	1.6%	82.5%	88.9%	713	432	525	56
	Central	356	83.7%	1.8%	79.9%	86.8%	426	428	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	534	92.4%	1.1%	90.0%	94.3%	578	460	523	51
	Southern	296	83.8%	1.8%	79.9%	87.0%	353	454	568	56
Cycling	Statewide	474	22.9%	1.2%	20.7%	25.3%	2,070	411	2,170	221
	Northern	204	28.6%	2.3%	24.3%	33.3%	713	132	525	56
	Central	78	18.4%	2.1%	14.7%	22.9%	426	93	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	140	24.2%	2.3%	20.0%	29.0%	578	109	523	51
	Southern	52	14.6%	1.9%	11.3%	18.8%	353	77	568	56
Having a picnic	Statewide	700	33.8%	1.3%	31.4%	36.4%	2,070	661	2,170	221
	Northern	221	30.9%	2.4%	26.5%	35.7%	713	142	525	56
	Central	146	34.3%	2.6%	29.4%	39.6%	426	174	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	212	36.7%	2.5%	31.9%	41.8%	578	175	523	51
	Southern	121	34.4%	2.6%	29.5%	39.6%	353	170	568	56
Camping	Statewide	713	34.5%	1.3%	32.0%	37.0%	2,070	664	2,170	221
	Northern	236	33.2%	32.1%	36.3%	36.9%	713	147	525	56
	Central	137	32.1%	2.5%	27.4%	37.3%	426	162	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	210	36.3%	2.5%	31.6%	41.4%	578	165	523	51
	Southern	130	36.9%	2.6%	32.0%	42.0%	353	190	568	56
Birding or wildlife watching	Statewide	720	34.8%	1.3%	32.4%	37.3%	2,070	748	2,170	221
	Northern	253	35.5%	2.4%	31.0%	40.3%	713	187	525	56
	Central	145	34.1%	2.5%	29.4%	39.3%	426	183	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	185	31.9%	2.4%	27.5%	36.7%	578	170	523	51
	Southern	137	38.9%	2.6%	34.0%	44.1%	353	208	568	56
Gathering non-timber forest products	Statewide	480	23.2%	1.1%	21.1%	25.5%	2,070	531	2,170	221
	Northern	158	22.2%	2.1%	18.4%	26.6%	713	116	525	56
	Central	108	25.3%	2.2%	21.2%	30.0%	426	152	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	93	16.1%	1.9%	12.8%	20.1%	578	88	523	51
	Southern	121	34.3%	2.6%	29.5%	39.5%	353	175	568	56
Fishing	Statewide	714	34.5%	1.3%	32.1%	37.0%	2,070	742	2,170	221
	Northern	237	33.2%	2.4%	28.8%	38.0%	713	173	525	56
	Central	154	36.1%	2.6%	31.1%	41.3%	426	197	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	172	29.8%	2.4%	25.4%	34.7%	578	146	523	51
	Southern	151	42.9%	2.6%	37.8%	48.1%	353	226	568	56
Hunting	Statewide	341	16.5%	1.0%	14.7%	18.5%	2,070	377	2,170	221
	Northern	133	18.7%	2.0%	15.1%	23.0%	713	90	525	56
	Central	67	15.7%	1.8%	12.5%	19.6%	426	97	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	53	9.2%	1.4%	6.8%	12.4%	578	54	523	51
	Southern	88	24.9%	2.3%	20.6%	29.7%	353	136	568	56
Kayaking, canoeing, or paddling	Statewide	587	28.4%	1.2%	26.0%	30.9%	2,070	497	2,170	221
	Northern	206	28.9%	2.4%	24.5%	33.7%	713	124	525	56
	Central	115	27.1%	2.4%	22.6%	32.1%	426	125	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	166	28.7%	2.4%	24.2%	33.7%	578	119	523	51
	Southern	100	28.3%	2.5%	23.7%	33.5%	353	129	568	56



Table 4 (continued). Recent Outdoor Recreation on Forests in Indiana

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Collecting firewood	Statewide	488	23.6%	1.1%	21.4%	25.8%	2,070	517	2,170	221
	Northern	153	21.5%	2.1%	17.7%	25.8%	713	112	525	56
	Central	114	26.9%	2.4%	22.5%	31.8%	426	146	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	109	18.8%	2.0%	15.1%	23.0%	578	97	523	51
	Southern	112	31.6%	2.5%	26.9%	36.8%	353	162	568	56
Harvesting timber	Statewide	110	5.3%	0.6%	4.3%	6.6%	2,070	120	2,170	221
	Northern	36	5.1%	1.2%	3.2%	8.0%	713	21	525	56
	Central	30	1.0%	1.3%	4.8%	10.2%	426	39	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	16	2.8%	0.7%	1.7%	4.7%	578	20	523	51
	Southern	28	7.9%	1.5%	5.4%	11.3%	353	40	568	56
Other	Statewide	122	5.9%	0.6%	4.8%	7.1%	2,070	149	2,170	221
	Northern	49	6.8%	1.2%	4.8%	9.6%	713	39	525	56
	Central	32	7.5%	1.3%	5.3%	10.7%	426	49	554	58
	Indianapolis M.A.	21	3.6%	0.8%	2.3%	5.6%	578	27	523	51
	Southern	20	5.8%	1.2%	3.9%	8.5%	353	34	568	56

Table 5. Recent State Forest Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Clark	Statewide	73	3.4%	0.4%	2.7%	4.3%	2,146	107	2,279	112
	Northern	5	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	2.2%	740	3	555	26
	Central	4	1.0%	0.3%	0.5%	2.0%	440	9	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	12	1.9%	0.8%	0.9%	4.1%	607	8	559	15
	Southern	52	14.5%	1.9%	11.2%	18.5%	359	87	587	37
Ferdinand	Statewide	31	1.4%	0.3%	1.0%	2.0%	2,146	50	2,279	112
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	740	0	555	26
	Central	1	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.8%	440	3	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.3%	0.6%	0.5%	3.3%	607	5	559	15
	Southern	22	6.0%	1.1%	4.2%	8.5%	359	42	587	37
Frances Slocum	Statewide	35	1.6%	0.3%	1.1%	2.4%	2,146	34	2,279	112
	Northern	30	4.1%	0.9%	2.6%	6.3%	740	27	555	26
	Central	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	440	4	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	1.6%	607	3	559	15
	Southern	-	-	-	-	-	359	0	587	37
Greene-Sullivan	Statewide	74	3.4%	0.4%	2.7%	4.4%	2,146	89	2,279	112
	Northern	7	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	3.1%	740	3	555	26
	Central	38	8.6%	1.4%	6.2%	11.9%	440	52	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	12	1.9%	0.6%	1.1%	3.3%	607	14	559	15
	Southern	17	4.7%	1.3%	2.8%	7.9%	359	20	587	37
Harrison-Crawford	Statewide	78	3.6%	0.4%	2.8%	4.6%	2,146	110	2,279	112
	Northern	6	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.2%	740	4	555	26
	Central	4	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	3.2%	440	6	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.3%	0.9%	1.8%	5.7%	607	16	559	15
	Southern	48	13.4%	1.8%	10.3%	17.3%	359	84	587	37



Table 5 (continued). Recent State Forest Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Jackson-Washington</b>	Statewide	45	2.1%	0.4%	1.5%	2.9%	2,146	57	2,279	112
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.4%	740	1	555	26
	Central	5	1.1%	0.4%	0.5%	2.3%	440	9	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	11	1.8%	0.8%	0.8%	4.1%	607	8	559	15
	Southern	27	7.4%	1.4%	5.1%	10.7%	359	39	587	37
<b>Martin</b>	Statewide	38	1.8%	0.30	1.3%	2.4%	2,146	56	2,279	112
	Northern	5	0.7%	0.4%	0.0%	2.0%	740	4	555	26
	Central	5	1.1%	0.4%	0.5%	2.4%	440	9	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	1.6%	607	6	559	15
	Southern	23	6.5%	1.2%	4.5%	9.4%	359	37	587	37
<b>Morgan-Monroe</b>	Statewide	255	11.9%	0.8%	10.4%	13.5%	2,146	256	2,279	112
	Northern	23	3.1%	0.8%	1.8%	5.3%	740	16	555	26
	Central	57	12.9%	1.8%	9.8%	16.8%	440	71	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	156	25.7%	2.2%	21.7%	30.2%	607	139	559	15
	Southern	19	5.2%	1.1%	3.4%	7.8%	359	30	587	37
<b>Mountain-Tea</b>	Statewide	9	0.4%	0.1%	0.2%	0.8%	2,146	9	2,279	112
	Northern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	740	1	555	26
	Central	5	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	2.9%	440	4	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	607	2	559	15
	Southern	2	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.9%	359	2	587	37
<b>Owen-Putnam</b>	Statewide	71	3.3%	0.4%	2.6%	4.3%	2,146	85	2,279	112
	Northern	3	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.1%	740	2	555	26
	Central	32	7.3%	1.4%	5.0%	10.4%	440	43	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	30	5.0%	1.0%	3.4%	7.4%	607	34	559	15
	Southern	6	1.6%	0.8%	0.6%	4.1%	359	6	587	37
<b>Pike</b>	Statewide	40	1.9%	0.3%	1.3%	2.7%	2,146	50	2,279	112
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.0%	740	3	555	26
	Central	3	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%	3.4%	440	3	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	15	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	4.8%	607	11	559	15
	Southern	18	5.1%	1.1%	3.3%	7.7%	359	33	587	37
<b>Ravinia</b>	Statewide	5	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.6%	2,146	6	2,279	112
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	740	0	555	26
	Central	-	-	-	-	-	440	0	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	1.9%	607	5	559	15
	Southern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	359	1	587	37
<b>Salamonie River</b>	Statewide	114	5.3%	0.6%	4.3%	6.6%	2,146	111	2,279	112
	Northern	82	11.1%	1.5%	8.4%	14.4%	740	64	555	26
	Central	15	3.4%	0.8%	2.2%	5.4%	440	26	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	15	2.4%	0.6%	1.4%	4.1%	607	18	559	15
	Southern	2	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	1.9%	359	3	587	37
<b>Selmier</b>	Statewide	9	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.9%	2,146	10	2,279	112
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	740	0	555	26
	Central	1	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	440	2	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	1.9%	607	3	559	15
	Southern	5	1.3%	0.7%	0.4%	3.6%	359	5	587	37





Table 5 (continued). Recent State Forest Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Yellowwood	Statewide	106	5.0%	0.5%	4.0%	6.1%	2,146	118	2,279	112
	Northern	1	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.9%	740	2	555	26
	Central	46	10.5%	1.7%	7.5%	14.4%	440	50	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	45	7.3%	1.2%	5.3%	10.1%	607	47	559	15
	Southern	14	3.9%	1.0%	2.3%	6.5%	359	19	587	37
I didn't visit any State Forest	Statewide	1,139	53.1%	1.3%	50.5%	55.6%	2,146	1,259	2,279	112
	Northern	471	63.6%	2.4%	58.9%	68.1%	740	362	555	26
	Central	231	52.4%	2.6%	47.3%	57.5%	440	333	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	285	47.0%	2.5%	42.2%	51.9%	607	293	559	15
	Southern	152	42.3%	2.5%	37.4%	47.3%	359	271	587	37
I don't know the name of the State Forest I visited	Statewide	180	8.4%	0.8%	7.0%	10.0%	2,146	143	2,279	112
	Northern	71	9.6%	1.5%	7.1%	12.9%	740	48	555	26
	Central	41	9.2%	1.7%	6.4%	13.1%	440	36	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	47	7.7%	1.4%	5.4%	11.0%	607	33	559	15
	Southern	21	5.9%	1.4%	3.7%	9.3%	359	26	587	37
I don't know if I visited a State Forest	Statewide	203	9.5%	0.8%	8.0%	11.2%	2,146	168	2,279	112
	Northern	75	10.2%	1.5%	7.6%	13.5%	740	54	555	26
	Central	30	6.8%	1.4%	4.5%	10.1%	440	32	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	66	10.9%	1.7%	8.0%	14.7%	607	45	559	15
	Southern	32	8.8%	1.7%	6.0%	12.7%	359	37	587	37

Table 6. Average Number of State Forests Visited in Past 12 Months

Region	Weighted					Unweighted	
	Count	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	625	1.57	0.043	1.49	1.66	709	0
Northern	123	1.39	0.073	1.25	1.54	91	0
Central	139	1.57	0.077	1.42	1.72	177	0
Indianapolis Metro Area	208	1.63	0.097	1.44	1.82	188	0
Southern	155	1.64	0.070	1.50	1.78	253	0



Table 7. Likelihood of Visiting State Forest in Next 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Very unlikely</b>	Statewide	179	8.2%	0.6%	7.0%	9.5%	2,187	240	2,343	48
	Northern	71	9.5%	1.3%	7.2%	12.3%	753	69	569	12
	Central	34	7.5%	1.2%	5.5%	10.2%	453	61	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	47	7.8%	1.2%	5.7%	10.5%	610	53	563	11
	Southern	27	7.2%	1.1%	5.3%	9.8%	371	57	611	13
<b>Unlikely</b>	Statewide	494	22.6%	1.0%	20.6%	24.7%	2,187	601	2,343	48
	Northern	223	29.6%	2.2%	25.6%	34.0%	753	186	569	12
	Central	93	20.5%	1.9%	17.1%	24.4%	453	158	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	101	16.6%	1.7%	13.5%	20.2%	610	119	563	11
	Southern	77	20.7%	2.0%	17.0%	24.9%	371	138	611	13
<b>Likely</b>	Statewide	978	44.7%	1.3%	42.2%	47.2%	2,187	1,007	2,343	48
	Northern	336	44.6%	2.4%	39.9%	49.3%	753	238	569	12
	Central	210	46.5%	2.6%	41.5%	51.5%	453	255	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	271	44.4%	2.5%	39.7%	49.3%	610	244	563	11
	Southern	161	43.3%	2.5%	38.5%	48.3%	371	270	611	13
<b>Very likely</b>	Statewide	536	24.5%	1.1%	22.4%	26.8%	2,187	495	2,343	48
	Northern	123	16.3%	1.9%	13.0%	20.4%	753	76	569	12
	Central	115	25.5%	2.3%	21.2%	30.3%	453	126	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	190	31.2%	2.4%	26.7%	36.0%	610	147	563	11
	Southern	107	28.8%	2.4%	24.3%	33.8%	371	146	611	13



Table 8. Recent State Park Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Brown County	Statewide	584	27.0%	1.1%	24.8%	29.2%	2,165	587	2,308	83
	Northern	85	11.3%	1.6%	8.5%	14.8%	750	53	561	20
	Central	125	28.2%	2.4%	23.8%	33.1%	444	162	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	275	45.2%	2.5%	40.4%	50.1%	608	231	559	15
	Southern	99	27.3%	2.4%	22.9%	32.2%	363	141	598	26
Chain O'Lakes	Statewide	110	5.1%	0.6%	4.0%	6.5%	2,165	77	2,308	83
	Northern	100	13.3%	1.7%	10.2%	17.0%	750	62	561	20
	Central	4	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.1%	444	6	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	1.0%	0.4%	0.5%	2.1%	608	8	559	15
	Southern	0	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	363	1	598	26
Charlestown	Statewide	56	2.6%	0.3%	2.0%	3.4%	2,165	77	2,308	83
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	0.9%	750	3	561	20
	Central	3	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	1.7%	444	5	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	2.8%	608	7	559	15
	Southern	44	12.0%	1.8%	8.9%	15.8%	363	62	598	26
Clifty Falls	Statewide	214	9.9%	0.7%	8.5%	11.4%	2,165	254	2,308	83
	Northern	18	2.3%	0.7%	1.3%	4.3%	750	13	561	20
	Central	35	8.0%	1.4%	5.7%	11.2%	444	51	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	83	13.6%	1.8%	10.5%	17.4%	608	69	559	15
	Southern	78	21.6%	2.1%	17.6%	26.1%	363	121	598	26
Falls of the Ohio	Statewide	89	4.1%	0.5%	3.3%	5.2%	2,165	112	2,308	83
	Northern	3	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	1.2%	750	4	561	20
	Central	6	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.3%	444	7	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	2.9%	0.9%	1.6%	5.5%	608	12	559	15
	Southern	62	17.1%	2.0%	13.5%	21.5%	363	89	598	26
Fort Harrison	Statewide	219	10.1%	0.8%	8.7%	11.7%	2,165	188	2,308	83
	Northern	7	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%	2.2%	750	7	561	20
	Central	21	4.7%	1.1%	3.0%	7.4%	444	28	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	188	31.0%	2.4%	26.5%	35.8%	608	148	559	15
	Southern	3	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.0%	363	5	598	26
Harmonie	Statewide	38	1.8%	0.3%	1.2%	2.5%	2,165	55	2,308	83
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.3%	750	1	561	20
	Central	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	444	2	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	-	-	-	-	-	608	0	559	15
	Southern	35	9.6%	1.7%	6.8%	13.4%	363	52	598	26
Indiana Dunes	Statewide	393	18.2%	1.0%	16.2%	20.3%	2,165	295	2,308	83
	Northern	249	33.2%	2.3%	28.8%	37.9%	750	164	561	20
	Central	42	9.5%	1.6%	6.8%	13.3%	444	45	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	85	14.0%	1.8%	10.8%	18.0%	608	59	559	15
	Southern	17	4.7%	1.1%	3.0%	7.2%	363	27	598	26
Lincoln	Statewide	51	2.3%	0.3%	1.8%	3.1%	2,165	75	2,308	83
	Northern	3	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.1%	750	2	561	20
	Central	4	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%	3.3%	444	4	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	2.6%	608	3	559	15
	Southern	39	10.8%	1.6%	8.1%	14.3%	363	66	598	26



Table 8 (continued). Recent State Park Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
McCormick's Creek	Statewide	186	8.6%	0.7%	7.3%	10.0%	2,165	196	2,308	83
	Northern	13	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%	3.6%	750	9	561	20
	Central	72	16.3%	1.9%	12.9%	20.4%	444	89	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	79	12.9%	1.6%	10.1%	16.5%	608	69	559	15
	Southern	22	6.1%	1.4%	3.8%	9.5%	363	29	598	26
Mounds	Statewide	123	5.7%	0.6%	4.6%	6.9%	2,165	132	2,308	83
	Northern	15	2.0%	7.0%	1.0%	3.8%	750	10	561	20
	Central	55	12.3%	1.7%	9.3%	15.9%	444	75	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	39	6.5%	1.3%	4.4%	9.5%	608	29	559	15
	Southern	14	3.8%	1.1%	2.1%	6.8%	363	18	598	26
O'Bannon Woods	Statewide	54	2.5%	0.4%	1.9%	3.3%	2,165	78	2,308	83
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%	750	3	561	20
	Central	1	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	444	2	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.9%	0.4%	0.3%	2.1%	608	6	559	15
	Southern	44	12.3%	1.8%	9.1%	16.3%	363	67	598	26
Ouabache	Statewide	38	1.8%	0.3%	1.2%	2.5%	2,165	44	2,308	83
	Northern	27	3.6%	0.8%	2.3%	5.5%	750	27	561	20
	Central	6	1.3%	0.5%	0.6%	2.9%	444	8	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	608	3	559	15
	Southern	3	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.2%	363	6	598	26
Pokagon	Statewide	155	7.1%	0.7%	5.9%	8.7%	2,165	119	2,308	83
	Northern	113	15.0%	1.8%	11.9%	18.8%	750	79	561	20
	Central	11	2.5%	0.7%	1.4%	4.4%	444	14	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	29	4.8%	1.1%	3.0%	7.5%	608	21	559	15
	Southern	2	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.8%	363	5	598	26
Potato Creek	Statewide	168	7.8%	0.8%	6.4%	9.4%	2,165	109	2,308	83
	Northern	148	19.8%	2.0%	16.1%	24.0%	750	95	561	20
	Central	3	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%	3.3%	444	3	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	16	2.7%	0.9%	1.4%	5.1%	608	10	559	15
	Southern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	363	1	598	26
Prophetstown	Statewide	114	5.3%	0.6%	4.2%	6.5%	2,165	104	2,308	83
	Northern	37	4.9%	1.1%	3.2%	7.4%	750	26	561	20
	Central	51	11.5%	1.7%	8.6%	15.3%	444	56	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	23	3.9%	1.0%	2.3%	6.4%	608	18	559	15
	Southern	3	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.4%	363	4	598	26
Shades	Statewide	103	4.7%	0.6%	3.8%	6.0%	2,165	92	2,308	83
	Northern	11	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	750	7	561	20
	Central	33	7.5%	1.4%	5.2%	10.7%	444	41	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	58	9.5%	1.5%	6.9%	13.0%	608	42	559	15
	Southern	1	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	363	2	598	26
Shakamak	Statewide	64	3.0%	0.4%	2.3%	3.8%	2,165	84	2,308	83
	Northern	5	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	2.0%	750	5	561	20
	Central	39	8.8%	1.4%	6.4%	12.1%	444	54	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	11	1.8%	0.6%	0.9%	3.4%	608	11	559	15
	Southern	9	2.5%	0.8%	1.4%	4.5%	363	14	598	26



Table 8 (continued). Recent State Park Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Spring Mill	Statewide	185	8.6%	0.7%	7.3%	10.0%	2,165	229	2,308	83
	Northern	12	1.6%	0.6%	0.8%	3.3%	750	9	561	20
	Central	36	8.2%	1.5%	5.7%	11.6%	444	46	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	57	9.4%	1.5%	6.8%	12.7%	608	50	559	15
	Southern	80	22.1%	2.1%	18.2%	26.6%	363	124	598	26
Summit Lake	Statewide	61	2.8%	0.4%	2.2%	3.7%	2,165	80	2,308	83
	Northern	10	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	750	6	561	20
	Central	36	8.1%	1.2%	6.1%	10.9%	444	56	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	15	2.5%	0.7%	1.5%	4.2%	608	18	559	15
	Southern	-	-	-	-	-	363	0	598	26
Tippecanoe River	Statewide	150	6.9%	0.7%	5.7%	8.5%	2,165	114	2,308	83
	Northern	103	13.7%	1.7%	10.7%	17.5%	750	67	561	20
	Central	25	5.6%	1.2%	3.7%	8.5%	444	30	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	19	3.1%	1.0%	1.7%	5.8%	608	12	559	15
	Southern	3	0.9%	0.4%	0.3%	2.3%	363	5	598	26
Turkey Run	Statewide	384	17.7%	1.0%	15.8%	19.8%	2,165	331	2,308	83
	Northern	78	10.4%	1.6%	7.7%	13.8%	750	49	561	20
	Central	105	23.6%	2.2%	19.5%	28.3%	444	121	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	174	28.7%	2.3%	24.3%	33.5%	608	131	559	15
	Southern	27	7.3%	1.6%	4.8%	11.0%	363	30	598	26
Versailles	Statewide	42	1.9%	0.3%	1.4%	2.6%	2,165	60	2,308	83
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	750	0	561	20
	Central	11	2.4%	0.8%	1.3%	4.5%	444	15	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	10	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	3.6%	608	7	559	15
	Southern	21	5.9%	1.0%	4.1%	8.3%	363	38	598	26
Whitewater Memorial	Statewide	66	3.1%	0.4%	2.3%	4.1%	2,165	68	2,308	83
	Northern	6	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	2.4%	750	4	561	20
	Central	30	6.7%	1.4%	4.4%	10.0%	444	35	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	21	3.5%	1.0%	2.0%	5.9%	608	17	559	15
	Southern	9	2.5%	0.9%	1.3%	4.9%	363	12	598	26
I didn't visit any State Park	Statewide	639	29.5%	1.1%	27.4%	31.8%	2,165	797	2,308	83
	Northern	257	34.3%	2.3%	30.0%	38.8%	750	218	561	20
	Central	109	24.6%	2.1%	20.8%	28.9%	444	181	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	163	26.8%	2.1%	22.9%	31.1%	608	189	559	15
	Southern	110	30.3%	2.3%	26.1%	35.0%	363	209	598	26
I don't know the name of the State Park I visited	Statewide	41	1.9%	0.4%	1.3%	2.7%	2,165	40	2,308	83
	Northern	5	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	1.9%	750	5	561	20
	Central	11	2.5%	0.9%	1.2%	5.2%	444	10	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	3.0%	0.9%	1.6%	5.3%	608	14	559	15
	Southern	7	1.9%	0.6%	1.0%	3.6%	363	11	598	26
I don't know if I visited a State Park	Statewide	34	1.6%	0.3%	1.0%	2.3%	2,165	34	2,308	83
	Northern	19	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	4.5%	750	13	561	20
	Central	7	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%	3.2%	444	11	590	22
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%	608	4	559	15
	Southern	5	1.3%	0.7%	0.5%	3.5%	363	6	598	26



Table 9. Average Number of State Parks Visited in Past 12 Months

Region	Weighted					Unweighted	
	Count	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	1,450	2.44	0.055	2.34	2.55	1,437	0
Northern	469	2.21	0.099	2.02	2.41	325	0
Central	316	2.28	0.098	2.09	2.47	388	0
Indianapolis Metro Area	424	2.76	0.113	2.54	2.98	352	0
Southern	241	2.55	0.127	2.30	2.80	372	0

Table 10. Likelihood of Visiting State Park in Next 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	132	6.2%	0.6%	5.2%	7.4%	2,135	167	2,272	119
	Northern	52	7.1%	1.2%	5.1%	9.8%	733	47	552	29
	Central	24	5.3%	1.1%	3.5%	8.0%	445	37	587	25
	Indianapolis M.A.	35	5.8%	1.0%	4.1%	8.2%	597	41	545	29
	Southern	22	6.1%	1.1%	4.3%	8.7%	360	42	588	36
Unlikely	Statewide	274	12.8%	0.8%	11.3%	14.5%	2,135	374	2,272	119
	Northern	129	17.6%	1.8%	14.4%	21.4%	733	112	552	29
	Central	45	10.1%	1.2%	8.0%	12.8%	445	91	587	25
	Indianapolis M.A.	52	8.8%	1.2%	6.7%	11.4%	597	71	545	29
	Southern	48	13.2%	1.6%	10.4%	16.7%	360	100	588	36
Likely	Statewide	918	43.0%	1.3%	40.5%	45.5%	2,135	981	2,272	119
	Northern	315	43.0%	2.4%	38.4%	47.8%	733	238	552	29
	Central	199	44.6%	2.6%	39.6%	49.7%	445	252	587	25
	Indianapolis M.A.	248	41.5%	2.5%	36.7%	46.4%	597	227	545	29
	Southern	156	43.4%	2.6%	38.5%	48.5%	360	264	588	36
Very likely	Statewide	811	38.0%	1.3%	35.5%	40.5%	2,135	750	2,272	119
	Northern	237	32.3%	2.3%	27.9%	37.0%	733	155	552	29
	Central	178	40.0%	2.6%	35.0%	45.1%	445	207	587	25
	Indianapolis M.A.	262	44.0%	2.5%	39.1%	48.9%	597	206	545	29
	Southern	134	37.2%	2.6%	32.3%	42.4%	360	182	588	36



Table 11. Recent State Fish &amp; Wildlife Area Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Atterbury</b>	Statewide	83	3.9%	0.5%	3.1%	5.0%	2,108	88	2,240	151
	Northern	6	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.2%	736	4	553	28
	Central	20	4.6%	1.2%	2.7%	7.7%	436	21	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	48	8.1%	1.3%	5.9%	11.0%	589	50	543	31
	Southern	9	2.6%	0.9%	1.3%	4.9%	347	13	570	54
<b>Blue Grass</b>	Statewide	44	2.1%	0.3%	1.6%	2.8%	2,108	67	2,240	151
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	1.9%	736	1	553	28
	Central	3	0.7%	0.6%	0.1%	3.5%	436	2	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	589	2	543	31
	Southern	36	10.5%	1.6%	7.8%	14.1%	347	62	570	54
<b>Chinook</b>	Statewide	11	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.0%	2,108	16	2,240	151
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	736	0	553	28
	Central	9	2.2%	0.7%	1.2%	3.9%	436	14	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	589	2	543	31
	Southern	-	-	-	-	-	347	0	570	54
<b>Crosley</b>	Statewide	19	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	1.4%	2,108	24	2,240	151
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	736	0	553	28
	Central	4	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	3.3%	436	4	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.7%	589	7	543	31
	Southern	8	2.3%	0.7%	1.2%	4.1%	347	13	570	54
<b>Deer Creek</b>	Statewide	66	3.1%	0.5%	2.3%	4.3%	2,108	55	2,240	151
	Northern	20	2.7%	0.9%	1.4%	5.0%	736	11	553	28
	Central	16	3.7%	1.2%	2.0%	6.8%	436	13	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	21	3.6%	0.9%	2.2%	5.9%	589	19	543	31
	Southern	9	2.6%	1.0%	1.2%	5.5%	347	12	570	54
<b>Fairbanks Landing</b>	Statewide	8	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	1.0%	2,108	7	2,240	151
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	1.9%	736	1	553	28
	Central	5	1.3%	0.7%	0.5%	3.8%	436	5	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	589	1	543	31
	Southern	-	-	-	-	-	347	0	570	54
<b>Glendale</b>	Statewide	32	1.5%	0.3%	1.0%	2.2%	2,108	40	2,240	151
	Northern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	736	1	553	28
	Central	3	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.1%	436	5	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%	2.5%	589	3	543	31
	Southern	23	6.7%	1.4%	4.4%	10.2%	347	31	570	54
<b>Goose Pond</b>	Statewide	49	2.3%	0.4%	1.7%	3.2%	2,108	60	2,240	151
	Northern	3	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.1%	736	2	553	28
	Central	23	5.2%	1.2%	3.4%	8.0%	436	32	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.2%	0.6%	0.4%	3.1%	589	5	543	31
	Southern	16	4.8%	1.2%	2.8%	7.9%	347	21	570	54
<b>Hillenbrand</b>	Statewide	6	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%	2,108	9	2,240	151
	Northern	0	-	-	-	-	736	0	553	28
	Central	4	1.1%	0.5%	0.4%	2.7%	436	6	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	589	1	543	31
	Southern	1	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	347	2	570	54





Table 11 (continued). Recent State Fish & Wildlife Area Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Hovey Lake	Statewide	16	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	1.3%	2,108	28	2,240	151
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	736	0	553	28
	Central	-	-	-	-	-	436	0	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	1.7%	589	1	543	31
	Southern	15	4.4%	1.2%	2.6%	7.3%	347	27	570	54
Jasper-Pulaski	Statewide	69	3.3%	0.5%	2.4%	4.4%	2,108	60	2,240	151
	Northern	54	7.3%	1.3%	5.2%	10.2%	736	42	553	28
	Central	3	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	2.5%	436	4	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.3%	589	7	543	31
	Southern	4	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.4%	347	7	570	54
J.E. Roush Lake	Statewide	31	1.5%	0.3%	0.9%	2.3%	2,108	27	2,240	151
	Northern	27	3.7%	0.9%	2.2%	6.1%	736	19	553	28
	Central	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	436	1	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.3%	589	7	543	31
	Southern	-	-	-	-	-	347	0	570	54
Kankakee	Statewide	56	2.7%	0.5%	1.9%	3.7%	2,108	43	2,240	151
	Northern	38	5.2%	1.1%	3.4%	7.8%	736	29	553	28
	Central	7	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.9%	436	6	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.3%	0.6%	0.5%	3.4%	589	5	543	31
	Southern	3	1.1%	0.7%	0.3%	3.8%	347	3	570	54
Kingsbury	Statewide	32	1.5%	0.4%	0.9%	2.4%	2,108	24	2,240	151
	Northern	27	3.8%	0.9%	2.3%	6.1%	736	20	553	28
	Central	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	436	1	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	2.6%	589	2	543	31
	Southern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.5%	347	1	570	54
LaSalle	Statewide	20	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%	1.7%	2,108	14	2,240	151
	Northern	17	2.4%	0.8%	1.2%	4.5%	736	12	553	28
	Central	-	-	-	-	-	436	0	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.2%	589	1	543	31
	Southern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	347	1	570	54
Pigeon River	Statewide	55	2.6%	0.5%	1.8%	3.7%	2,108	43	2,240	151
	Northern	42	5.6%	1.2%	3.7%	8.4%	736	28	553	28
	Central	2	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	436	2	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	2.6%	589	7	543	31
	Southern	4	1.2%	0.7%	0.4%	3.5%	347	6	570	54
Splinter Ridge	Statewide	2	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	2,108	3	2,240	151
	Northern	-	-	-	-	-	736	0	553	28
	Central	-	-	-	-	-	436	0	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	589	1	543	31
	Southern	1	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	347	2	570	54
Sugar Ridge	Statewide	24	1.1%	0.3%	0.7%	1.8%	2,108	36	2,240	151
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	1.9%	736	1	553	28
	Central	3	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%	3.4%	436	3	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%	2.5%	589	3	543	31
	Southern	14	4.1%	0.9%	2.6%	6.4%	347	29	570	54



Table 11 (continued). Recent State Fish &amp; Wildlife Area Visitation

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Tri-County	Statewide	22	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.8%	2,108	18	2,240	151
	Northern	16	2.2%	0.7%	1.1%	4.2%	736	11	553	28
	Central	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	436	4	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%	2.5%	589	3	543	31
	Southern	-	-	-	-	-	347	0	570	54
Wabashiki	Statewide	16	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	1.4%	2,108	16	2,240	151
	Northern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	736	1	553	28
	Central	11	2.5%	1.0%	1.2%	5.2%	436	11	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	589	2	543	31
	Southern	1	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.0%	347	2	570	54
Wilbur Wright	Statewide	21	1.0%	0.2%	0.6%	1.6%	2,108	27	2,240	151
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.4%	736	1	553	28
	Central	11	2.4%	0.7%	1.4%	4.1%	436	17	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.3%	0.5%	0.6%	2.8%	589	8	543	31
	Southern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	347	1	570	54
Willow Slough	Statewide	26	1.2%	0.3%	0.8%	2.0%	2,108	22	2,240	151
	Northern	19	2.6%	0.7%	1.5%	4.4%	736	17	553	28
	Central	4	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.7%	436	3	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	2.6%	589	2	543	31
	Southern	-	-	-	-	-	347	0	570	54
Winamac	Statewide	30	1.4%	0.3%	0.9%	2.2%	2,108	26	2,240	151
	Northern	21	2.9%	0.8%	1.7%	4.9%	736	17	553	28
	Central	4	0.8%	0.6%	0.2%	3.4%	436	3	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.1%	589	5	543	31
	Southern	1	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.2%	347	1	570	54
I didn't visit any Fish & Wildlife Areas	Statewide	1,358	64.4%	1.3%	61.9%	66.8%	2,108	1,515	2,240	151
	Northern	466	63.3%	2.4%	58.6%	67.9%	736	367	553	466
	Central	284	65.2%	2.6%	60.0%	70.0%	436	402	574	284
	Indianapolis M.A.	407	69.0%	2.3%	64.3%	73.4%	589	390	543	407
	Southern	201	57.8%	2.7%	52.5%	62.9%	347	356	570	201
I don't know the name of the Fish & Wildlife Area I visited	Statewide	107	5.1%	0.6%	4.0%	6.4%	2,108	97	2,240	151
	Northern	27	3.6%	1.0%	2.1%	6.1%	736	16	553	28
	Central	24	5.6%	1.3%	3.5%	8.8%	436	26	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	33	5.6%	1.2%	3.7%	8.5%	589	26	543	31
	Southern	23	6.7%	1.5%	4.3%	10.2%	347	29	570	54
I don't know if I visited a Fish & Wildlife Area	Statewide	166	7.9%	0.7%	6.6%	9.4%	2,108	149	2,240	151
	Northern	48	6.5%	1.2%	4.5%	9.3%	736	35	553	28
	Central	38	8.7%	1.5%	6.1%	12.1%	436	39	574	38
	Indianapolis M.A.	52	8.8%	1.5%	6.3%	12.1%	589	38	543	31
	Southern	28	8.2%	1.7%	5.5%	12.1%	347	37	570	54



Table 12. Average Number of Visits to State Fish & Wildlife Areas in Past 12 Months

Region	Weighted					Unweighted	
	Count	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	478	1.55	0.056	1.44	1.66	479	0
Northern	195	1.54	0.102	1.34	1.74	135	0
Central	90	1.53	0.126	1.28	1.77	107	0
Indianapolis Metro Area	98	1.56	0.120	1.33	1.80	89	0
Southern	95	1.58	0.081	1.42	1.73	148	0

Table 13. Likelihood of Visiting a State Fish & Wildlife Area in Next 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	169	7.8%	0.6%	6.7%	9.1%	2,165	228	2,312	79
	Northern	63	8.4%	1.2%	6.3%	11.1%	743	61	560	21
	Central	38	8.5%	1.3%	6.2%	11.6%	450	62	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	41	6.8%	1.1%	5.0%	9.3%	605	52	559	15
	Southern	27	7.3%	1.2%	5.3%	10.0%	367	53	600	24
Unlikely	Statewide	597	27.6%	1.1%	25.5%	29.8%	2,165	735	2,312	79
	Northern	223	30.0%	2.2%	25.9%	34.4%	743	189	560	21
	Central	113	25.1%	2.1%	21.3%	29.4%	450	189	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	159	26.3%	2.2%	22.3%	30.8%	605	164	559	15
	Southern	102	27.9%	2.2%	23.8%	32.5%	367	193	600	24
Likely	Statewide	948	43.8%	1.3%	41.3%	46.3%	2,165	951	2,312	79
	Northern	320	43.1%	2.4%	38.4%	47.9%	743	221	560	21
	Central	203	45.1%	2.6%	40.1%	50.2%	450	241	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	270	44.6%	2.5%	39.8%	49.5%	605	240	559	15
	Southern	155	42.2%	2.5%	37.4%	47.3%	367	249	600	24
Very likely	Statewide	451	20.8%	1.1%	18.8%	23.0%	2,165	398	2,312	79
	Northern	138	18.5%	2.0%	14.9%	22.7%	743	89	560	21
	Central	96	21.3%	2.2%	17.3%	25.9%	450	101	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	135	22.3%	2.2%	18.3%	26.8%	605	103	559	15
	Southern	83	22.6%	2.3%	18.3%	27.5%	367	105	600	24



Table 14. Wood Product Purchases in Last 5 Years

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Your home or personal use	Statewide	1,588	97.8%	0.4%	96.9%	98.5%	1,624	1,702	1,746	645
	Northern	550	97.9%	0.7%	95.8%	98.9%	562	410	421	160
	Central	324	98.2%	0.6%	96.4%	99.1%	330	437	448	164
	Indianapolis Metro Area	449	98.5%	0.6%	0.7%	3.1%	456	413	422	152
	Southern	265	96.1%	1.2%	92.8%	97.9%	276	442	455	169
Your Community	Statewide	76	4.7%	0.6%	3.6%	6.0%	1,624	85	1,746	645
	Northern	25	4.5%	1.2%	2.6%	7.6%	562	16	421	160
	Central	13	3.8%	0.9%	2.4%	6.1%	330	20	448	164
	Indianapolis Metro Area	21	4.6%	1.1%	2.9%	7.3%	456	23	422	152
	Southern	17	6.3%	1.4%	4.0%	9.7%	276	26	455	169
Your work or professional use	Statewide	202	12.5%	1.0%	10.7%	14.5%	1,624	224	1,746	645
	Northern	75	13.4%	1.9%	10.2%	17.6%	562	59	421	160
	Central	43	13.0%	2.0%	9.6%	17.4%	330	58	448	164
	Indianapolis Metro Area	46	10.1%	1.6%	7.3%	13.8%	456	47	422	152
	Southern	38	13.7%	2.0%	10.1%	18.2%	276	60	455	169

Table 15. Forestland Ownership

	Weighted						Unweighted		
	Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	399	18.3%	0.9%	16.5%	20.1%	2,185	529	2,344	47
Northern	127	16.9%	1.7%	13.7%	20.6%	753	108	569	12
Central	103	22.7%	2.0%	19.0%	26.8%	452	158	602	10
Indianapolis Metro Area	65	10.7%	1.4%	8.1%	13.9%	612	70	566	8
Southern	104	28.4%	2.2%	24.2%	32.9%	368	193	607	17

Table 16. Average Length of Forestland Ownership

Region	Weighted					Unweighted	
	Count	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	398	17.18	0.752	15.71	18.66	526	3
Northern	127	16.79	1.564	13.72	19.86	107	1
Central	102	17.67	1.246	15.22	20.12	157	1
Indianapolis Metro Area	65	13.06	1.777	9.57	16.55	70	0
Southern	104	19.77	1.347	17.12	22.41	192	1



Table 17. Forest Landowner Timber Harvests

	Weighted					Unweighted			
	Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	212	53.2%	2.7%	47.9%	58.5%	398	274	527	2
Northern	79	62.5%	5.4%	51.4%	72.4%	127	69	108	0
Central	57	55.6%	4.6%	46.5%	64.4%	102	80	158	0
Indianapolis Metro Area	29	43.9%	7.1%	30.8%	58.0%	65	30	70	0
Southern	47	45.4%	4.5%	36.8%	54.3%	104	95	191	2

Table 18. Opinions About the Amount of State-Owned Forestland

Region	Response	Weighted					Unweighted			
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval	Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases	
Statewide	Not Enough	1,214	55.7%	1.3%	53.3%	58.2%	2,178	1,171	2,329	62
	About Right	476	21.9%	1.0%	19.9%	23.9%		598		
	Too Much	13	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.1%		18		
	No Opinion	475	21.8%	1.0%	19.8%	23.9%		542		
Northern	Not Enough	399	52.8%	2.4%	48.1%	57.5%	755	281	568	13
	About Right	182	24.2%	2.0%	20.4%	28.4%		146		
	Too Much	3	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%		2		
	No Opinion	171	22.6%	2.0%	18.9%	26.7%		139		
Central	Not Enough	254	56.5%	2.5%	51.6%	61.3%	449	287	598	14
	About Right	98	21.8%	2.0%	18.2%	25.9%		167		
	Too Much	3	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	1.9%		5		
	No Opinion	94	21.0%	2.0%	17.4%	25.1%		139		
Indianapolis Metro Area	Not Enough	375	61.6%	2.4%	56.9%	66.1%	609	308	561	13
	About Right	111	18.2%	1.8%	15.0%	22.0%		130		
	Too Much	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%		1		
	No Opinion	122	20.1%	2.0%	16.5%	24.2%		122		
Southern	Not Enough	186	51.0%	2.6%	46.0%	56.0%	365	295	602	22
	About Right	85	23.2%	2.1%	19.3%	27.6%		155		
	Too Much	7	1.9%	0.8%	0.8%	4.1%		10		
	No Opinion	87	23.9%	2.2%	19.9%	28.5%		42		



Table 19. Characteristics of a Healthy Forest

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>A forest that has not been harvested</b>	Statewide	767	35.0%	1.2%	32.6%	37.4%	2,194	756	2,355	36
	Northern	241	31.6%	2.2%	27.4%	36.1%	761	177	577	4
	Central	148	32.7%	2.5%	28.0%	37.8%	453	173	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	239	39.0%	2.4%	34.3%	43.8%	613	207	566	8
	Southern	139	38.0%	2.5%	33.1%	43.0%	367	199	610	14
<b>A forest that has animals running around</b>	Statewide	1,844	84.1%	0.9%	82.2%	85.7%	2,194	1,933	2,355	36
	Northern	616	81.0%	1.8%	77.1%	84.3%	761	455	577	4
	Central	387	85.4%	1.6%	81.9%	88.2%	453	492	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	526	85.8%	1.7%	82.1%	88.9%	613	482	566	8
	Southern	315	85.9%	1.6%	82.5%	88.7%	367	504	610	14
<b>A forest that supports biodiversity</b>	Statewide	1,551	70.7%	1.1%	68.5%	72.8%	2,194	1,502	2,355	36
	Northern	523	68.7%	2.1%	64.4%	72.8%	761	366	577	4
	Central	303	66.9%	2.3%	28.7%	37.8%	453	362	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	475	77.6%	1.9%	73.7%	81.1%	613	401	566	8
	Southern	250	68.0%	2.3%	63.4%	72.3%	367	373	610	14
<b>A forest that has mature and young trees</b>	Statewide	1,951	88.9%	0.8%	87.3%	90.4%	2,194	2,071	2,355	36
	Northern	671	88.3%	1.5%	85.0%	90.9%	761	503	577	4
	Central	405	89.4%	1.4%	86.3%	91.9%	453	526	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	550	89.7%	1.5%	86.4%	92.3%	613	507	566	8
	Southern	325	88.4%	1.6%	84.8%	91.2%	367	535	610	14
<b>A forest that has mostly mature trees</b>	Statewide	239	10.9%	0.8%	9.4%	12.5%	2,194	258	2,355	36
	Northern	64	8.5%	1.4%	6.1%	11.5%	761	45	577	4
	Central	49	10.9%	1.6%	8.1%	14.4%	453	67	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	70	11.4%	1.6%	8.6%	14.9%	613	62	566	8
	Southern	56	15.1%	1.9%	11.8%	19.2%	367	84	610	14
<b>A forest that is green</b>	Statewide	1,081	49.3%	1.3%	46.8%	51.8%	2,194	1,185	2,355	36
	Northern	360	47.3%	2.4%	42.7%	52.0%	761	280	577	4
	Central	226	49.9%	2.6%	44.9%	54.9%	453	300	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	298	48.7%	2.5%	43.8%	53.5%	613	281	566	8
	Southern	197	53.7%	2.5%	48.7%	58.6%	367	324	610	14
<b>A forest that is full of native trees and shrubs from Indiana</b>	Statewide	1,631	74.4%	1.1%	72.1%	76.5%	2,194	1,725	2,355	36
	Northern	536	70.5%	2.2%	66.0%	74.6%	761	406	577	4
	Central	339	74.9%	2.2%	70.4%	78.9%	453	441	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	473	77.3%	2.0%	73.1%	81.0%	613	425	566	8
	Southern	283	77.0%	2.1%	72.7%	80.8%	367	453	610	14
<b>A forest that does not have a house on it</b>	Statewide	725	33.0%	1.2%	30.7%	35.4%	2,194	793	2,355	36
	Northern	249	32.8%	2.2%	28.5%	37.3%	761	192	577	4
	Central	151	33.4%	2.5%	28.8%	38.4%	453	199	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	189	30.8%	2.3%	26.5%	35.5%	613	171	566	8
	Southern	136	36.9%	2.5%	32.2%	41.8%	367	231	610	14
<b>A forest that supports non-motorized recreation</b>	Statewide	1,091	49.8%	1.3%	47.3%	52.3%	2,194	1,199	2,355	36
	Northern	365	48.0%	2.4%	43.3%	52.7%	761	284	577	4
	Central	209	46.1%	2.6%	41.2%	51.2%	453	287	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	324	52.8%	2.5%	48.0%	57.6%	613	304	566	8
	Southern	193	52.7%	2.5%	47.7%	57.6%	367	324	610	14



Table 19 (continued). Characteristics of a Healthy Forest

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>A forest that supports hunting</b>	Statewide	713	32.5%	1.2%	30.3%	34.9%	2,194	830	2,355	36
	Northern	261	34.4%	2.3%	30.1%	38.9%	761	206	577	4
	Central	143	31.5%	2.3%	27.2%	36.2%	453	211	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	163	26.7%	2.1%	22.7%	31.1%	613	162	566	8
	Southern	146	39.7%	2.5%	35.0%	44.6%	367	251	610	14
<b>Other</b>	Statewide	86	3.9%	0.5%	3.0%	5.0%	2,194	92	2,355	36
	Northern	29	3.8%	0.9%	2.4%	5.9%	761	25	577	4
	Central	25	5.5%	1.2%	3.7%	8.3%	453	32	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	3.0%	0.9%	1.6%	5.4%	613	15	566	8
	Southern	14	3.7%	1.0%	2.2%	6.2%	367	20	610	14

Table 20. Current Level of Threat: Insects and Diseases

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not a threat</b>	Statewide	101	4.7%	0.6%	3.7%	6.0%	2,147	88	2,292	99
	Northern	42	5.6%	1.2%	3.6%	8.5%	736	26	552	29
	Central	10	2.2%	0.6%	1.2%	3.9%	446	16	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	27	4.5%	1.1%	2.8%	7.2%	604	22	558	16
	Southern	22	6.2%	1.5%	3.9%	9.8%	361	24	594	30
<b>Somewhat a threat</b>	Statewide	684	31.9%	1.2%	29.5%	34.3%	2,147	688	2,292	99
	Northern	237	32.1%	2.3%	27.8%	36.8%	736	166	552	29
	Central	139	31.2%	2.5%	26.5%	36.2%	446	171	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	199	33.0%	2.4%	28.6%	37.8%	604	176	558	16
	Southern	109	30.2%	2.4%	25.8%	35.1%	361	175	594	30
<b>Moderate threat</b>	Statewide	799	37.2%	1.3%	34.8%	39.7%	2,147	833	2,292	99
	Northern	267	36.3%	2.4%	31.9%	41.1%	736	196	552	29
	Central	187	42.0%	2.6%	37.0%	47.1%	446	225	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	221	36.6%	2.4%	32.0%	41.4%	604	209	558	16
	Southern	124	34.3%	2.5%	29.7%	39.2%	361	203	594	30
<b>A very big threat</b>	Statewide	563	26.2%	1.1%	24.1%	28.4%	2,147	683	2,292	99
	Northern	191	25.9%	2.1%	22.1%	30.2%	736	164	552	29
	Central	110	24.6%	2.0%	20.9%	28.9%	446	176	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	156	25.9%	2.2%	21.9%	30.4%	604	151	558	16
	Southern	106	29.2%	2.3%	25.0%	33.9%	361	192	594	30





Table 21. Current Level of Threat: Cutting Trees for Wood Products

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	101	4.7%	0.6%	3.7%	6.0%	2,147	88	2,292	99
	Northern	42	5.6%	1.2%	3.6%	8.5%	736	26	552	29
	Central	10	2.2%	0.6%	1.2%	3.9%	446	16	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	27	4.5%	1.1%	2.8%	7.2%	604	22	558	16
	Southern	22	6.2%	1.5%	3.9%	9.8%	361	24	594	30
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	684	31.9%	1.2%	29.5%	34.3%	2,147	688	2,292	99
	Northern	237	32.1%	2.3%	27.8%	36.8%	736	166	552	29
	Central	139	31.2%	2.5%	26.5%	36.2%	446	171	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	199	33.0%	2.4%	28.6%	37.8%	604	176	558	16
	Southern	109	30.2%	2.4%	25.8%	35.1%	361	175	594	30
Moderate threat	Statewide	799	37.2%	1.3%	34.8%	39.7%	2,147	833	2,292	99
	Northern	267	36.3%	2.4%	31.9%	41.1%	736	196	552	29
	Central	187	42.0%	2.6%	37.0%	47.1%	446	225	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	221	36.6%	2.4%	32.0%	41.4%	604	209	558	16
	Southern	124	34.3%	2.5%	29.7%	39.2%	361	203	594	30
A very big threat	Statewide	563	26.2%	1.1%	24.1%	28.4%	2,147	683	2,292	99
	Northern	191	25.9%	2.1%	22.1%	30.2%	736	164	552	29
	Central	110	24.6%	2.0%	20.9%	28.9%	446	176	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	156	25.9%	2.2%	21.9%	30.4%	604	151	558	16
	Southern	106	29.2%	2.3%	25.0%	33.9%	361	192	594	30

Table 22. Current Level of Threat: Cutting Trees to Create Wildlife Habitat

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	1,085	51.8%	1.3%	49.3%	54.4%	2,094	1,176	2,220	171
	Northern	378	52.6%	2.5%	47.8%	57.4%	718	289	539	42
	Central	225	51.6%	2.6%	46.4%	56.7%	436	302	569	43
	Indianapolis M.A.	286	48.9%	2.5%	43.9%	53.8%	586	271	535	39
	Southern	196	55.4%	2.6%	24.1%	33.4%	354	314	577	47
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	660	31.5%	1.2%	29.1%	34.0%	2,094	662	2,220	171
	Northern	230	32.0%	2.3%	27.6%	36.8%	718	158	539	42
	Central	128	29.4%	2.4%	24.9%	34.4%	436	159	569	43
	Indianapolis M.A.	201	34.3%	2.4%	29.7%	39.2%	586	177	535	39
	Southern	101	28.5%	2.4%	24.1%	33.4%	354	168	577	47
Moderate threat	Statewide	258	12.3%	0.8%	10.8%	14.1%	2,094	290	2,220	171
	Northern	84	11.7%	1.5%	9.1%	15.0%	718	74	539	42
	Central	67	15.4%	1.9%	12.0%	19.5%	436	88	569	43
	Indianapolis M.A.	68	11.6%	1.6%	8.8%	15.2%	586	64	535	39
	Southern	39	11.0%	1.7%	8.1%	14.8%	354	64	577	47
A very big threat	Statewide	90	4.3%	0.5%	3.4%	5.5%	2,094	92	2,220	171
	Northern	26	3.6%	0.9%	2.2%	5.9%	718	18	539	42
	Central	16	3.7%	1.1%	2.1%	6.4%	436	20	569	43
	Indianapolis M.A.	30	5.2%	1.2%	3.3%	8.2%	586	23	535	39
	Southern	18	5.1%	1.2%	3.2%	7.9%	354	31	577	47



Table 23. Current Level of Threat: Unplanned Fires of Wildfires

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	345	16.0%	1.0%	14.1%	18.1%	2,151	295	2,300	91
	Northern	141	19.1%	2.0%	15.5%	23.3%	739	88	556	25
	Central	61	13.8%	1.9%	10.4%	17.9%	446	67	589	23
	Indianapolis M.A.	101	16.7%	1.9%	13.2%	20.9%	603	81	558	16
	Southern	42	11.5%	1.6%	8.6%	15.1%	363	59	597	27
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	727	33.8%	1.2%	31.4%	36.2%	2,151	741	2,300	91
	Northern	216	29.2%	2.3%	25.0%	33.8%	739	152	556	25
	Central	143	32.0%	2.4%	27.4%	36.9%	446	177	589	23
	Indianapolis M.A.	235	39.0%	2.4%	34.3%	43.9%	603	210	558	16
	Southern	133	36.7%	2.5%	31.9%	41.7%	363	202	597	27
Moderate threat	Statewide	444	20.6%	1.0%	18.7%	22.7%	2,151	517	2,300	91
	Northern	161	21.8%	1.9%	18.3%	25.9%	739	144	556	25
	Central	95	21.2%	2.1%	17.4%	25.7%	446	131	589	23
	Indianapolis M.A.	108	17.9%	1.9%	14.5%	21.9%	603	108	558	16
	Southern	80	22.0%	2.2%	18.0%	26.7%	363	134	597	27
A very big threat	Statewide	635	29.6%	1.1%	27.4%	31.9%	2,151	747	2,300	91
	Northern	221	29.9%	2.2%	25.8%	34.4%	739	172	556	25
	Central	147	33.0%	2.4%	28.5%	37.8%	446	214	589	23
	Indianapolis M.A.	159	26.4%	2.1%	22.5%	30.8%	603	159	558	16
	Southern	108	29.8%	2.3%	25.6%	34.5%	363	202	597	27

Table 24. Current Level of Threat: Planned or Prescribed Fires

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	1,262	59.9%	1.3%	57.4%	62.4%	2,105	1,292	2,224	167
	Northern	437	60.3%	2.4%	55.5%	64.9%	725	312	539	42
	Central	241	55.6%	2.6%	50.4%	60.7%	434	319	564	48
	Indianapolis M.A.	370	62.6%	2.4%	57.8%	67.2%	591	323	540	34
	Southern	214	60.2%	2.6%	55.0%	65.1%	355	338	581	43
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	519	24.7%	1.1%	22.6%	26.9%	2,105	591	2,224	167
	Northern	175	24.1%	2.1%	20.3%	28.3%	725	146	539	42
	Central	121	28.0%	2.4%	23.5%	32.9%	434	151	564	48
	Indianapolis M.A.	131	22.2%	2.0%	18.5%	26.4%	591	132	540	34
	Southern	92	26.0%	2.3%	21.8%	30.7%	355	162	581	43
Moderate threat	Statewide	217	10.3%	0.8%	8.9%	11.9%	2,105	243	2,224	167
	Northern	76	10.5%	1.5%	7.9%	13.9%	725	55	539	42
	Central	46	10.5%	1.5%	7.9%	13.9%	434	67	564	48
	Indianapolis M.A.	62	10.4%	1.5%	7.9%	13.7%	591	63	540	34
	Southern	33	9.3%	1.6%	6.7%	12.9%	355	58	581	43
A very big threat	Statewide	107	5.1%	0.6%	4.0%	6.5%	2,105	98	2,224	167
	Northern	37	5.2%	1.1%	3.3%	7.9%	725	26	539	42
	Central	26	5.9%	1.5%	3.6%	9.5%	434	27	564	48
	Indianapolis M.A.	28	4.8%	1.2%	3.0%	7.6%	591	22	540	34
	Southern	16	4.5%	1.2%	2.6%	7.5%	355	23	581	43



Table 25. Current Level of Threat: Climate Change

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	547	25.7%	1.1%	23.6%	27.9%	2,131	656	2,277	114
	Northern	211	28.9%	2.2%	24.8%	33.4%	730	171	549	32
	Central	113	25.8%	2.1%	21.8%	30.2%	438	167	579	33
	Indianapolis M.A.	114	19.0%	1.8%	15.7%	22.8%	602	130	553	21
	Southern	109	30.2%	2.3%	25.9%	34.8%	361	188	596	28
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	526	24.7%	1.1%	22.5%	26.9%	2,131	569	2,277	114
	Northern	189	25.8%	2.2%	21.8%	30.3%	730	137	549	32
	Central	104	23.7%	2.2%	19.7%	28.2%	438	153	579	33
	Indianapolis M.A.	148	24.6%	2.1%	20.7%	29.0%	602	139	553	21
	Southern	85	23.5%	2.2%	19.4%	28.1%	361	140	596	28
Moderate threat	Statewide	481	22.6%	1.1%	20.5%	24.8%	2,131	477	2,277	114
	Northern	157	21.5%	2.0%	17.8%	25.7%	730	117	549	32
	Central	91	20.8%	2.1%	16.9%	25.3%	438	114	579	33
	Indianapolis M.A.	169	28.1%	2.3%	23.8%	32.8%	602	139	553	21
	Southern	64	17.6%	2.0%	14.0%	21.9%	361	107	596	28
A very big threat	Statewide	578	27.1%	1.2%	24.9%	29.5%	2,131	575	2,277	114
	Northern	174	23.8%	2.1%	19.9%	28.1%	730	124	549	32
	Central	130	29.7%	2.5%	25.1%	34.9%	438	145	579	33
	Indianapolis M.A.	170	28.3%	2.3%	24.1%	33.0%	602	145	553	21
	Southern	104	28.7%	2.4%	24.3%	33.6%	361	161	596	28

Table 26. Current Level of Threat: Wind or Ice Storms

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	503	23.4%	1.1%	21.3%	25.7%	2,144	462	2,285	106
	Northern	185	25.0%	2.2%	21.0%	29.5%	738	124	553	28
	Central	87	19.5%	2.1%	15.7%	23.9%	446	99	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	144	24.0%	2.2%	20.0%	28.5%	601	128	554	20
	Southern	87	24.2%	2.4%	19.8%	29.1%	359	111	590	34
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	880	41.0%	1.3%	38.6%	43.5%	2,144	950	2,285	106
	Northern	283	38.3%	2.4%	33.7%	43.0%	738	215	553	28
	Central	185	41.6%	2.6%	36.7%	46.7%	446	244	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	269	44.8%	2.5%	40.0%	49.7%	601	243	554	20
	Southern	143	39.8%	2.5%	35.0%	44.7%	359	248	590	34
Moderate threat	Statewide	571	26.6%	1.1%	24.4%	28.9%	2,144	637	2,285	106
	Northern	204	27.6%	2.2%	23.5%	32.0%	738	159	553	28
	Central	126	28.4%	2.4%	24.0%	33.3%	446	169	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	144	23.9%	2.1%	20.0%	28.3%	601	138	554	20
	Southern	97	27.0%	2.3%	22.7%	31.8%	359	171	590	34
A very big threat	Statewide	191	8.9%	0.7%	7.6%	10.3%	2,144	236	2,285	106
	Northern	67	9.1%	1.3%	6.9%	12.0%	738	55	553	28
	Central	47	10.6%	1.5%	8.0%	13.8%	446	76	588	24
	Indianapolis M.A.	44	7.3%	1.2%	5.2%	10.1%	601	45	554	20
	Southern	33	9.1%	1.4%	6.7%	12.2%	359	60	590	34



Table 27. Current Level of Threat: Drought or Lack of Water

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	240	11.2%	0.8%	9.7%	12.9%	2,149	238	2,297	94
	Northern	94	12.6%	1.6%	9.7%	16.2%	739	66	556	25
	Central	51	11.5%	1.7%	8.5%	15.3%	447	61	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	53	8.9%	1.4%	6.5%	12.0%	601	51	555	19
	Southern	42	11.7%	1.7%	8.7%	15.5%	362	60	595	29
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	764	35.5%	1.2%	33.2%	38.0%	2,149	825	2,297	94
	Northern	252	34.1%	2.3%	29.8%	38.8%	739	196	556	25
	Central	155	34.6%	2.5%	30.0%	39.6%	447	202	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	230	38.3%	2.4%	33.6%	43.1%	601	208	555	19
	Southern	127	35.0%	2.4%	30.5%	39.9%	362	219	595	29
Moderate threat	Statewide	669	31.1%	1.2%	28.8%	33.5%	2,149	709	2,297	94
	Northern	225	30.5%	2.3%	26.2%	35.1%	739	164	556	25
	Central	133	29.7%	2.3%	25.3%	34.5%	447	183	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	198	32.9%	2.4%	28.4%	37.7%	601	177	555	19
	Southern	113	31.2%	2.4%	26.6%	36.2%	362	185	595	29
A very big threat	Statewide	476	22.2%	1.1%	20.1%	24.3%	2,149	525	2,297	94
	Northern	168	22.7%	2.0%	19.0%	26.9%	739	130	556	25
	Central	108	24.2%	2.2%	20.1%	28.8%	447	145	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	120	20.0%	2.0%	16.4%	24.1%	601	119	555	19
	Southern	80	22.1%	2.2%	18.1%	26.7%	362	131	595	29

Table 28. Current Level of Threat: Air Pollution

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	334	15.6%	0.9%	13.9%	17.5%	2,135	399	2,271	120
	Northern	134	18.2%	1.9%	14.8%	22.2%	739	101	553	28
	Central	76	17.2%	1.8%	13.9%	21.1%	439	108	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	61	10.2%	1.3%	7.9%	13.0%	597	79	548	26
	Southern	63	17.4%	1.8%	14.1%	21.4%	360	111	589	35
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	735	34.4%	1.2%	32.1%	36.9%	2,135	802	2,271	120
	Northern	234	31.7%	2.3%	27.4%	36.2%	739	183	553	28
	Central	146	33.3%	2.4%	28.7%	38.1%	439	206	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	230	38.5%	2.5%	33.9%	43.5%	597	204	548	26
	Southern	125	34.7%	2.4%	30.1%	39.7%	360	209	589	35
Moderate threat	Statewide	646	30.3%	1.2%	27.9%	32.7%	2,135	652	2,271	120
	Northern	230	31.1%	2.3%	26.8%	35.8%	739	166	553	28
	Central	122	27.7%	2.4%	23.3%	32.6%	439	155	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	191	32.1%	2.4%	27.6%	36.9%	597	165	548	26
	Southern	103	28.6%	2.4%	24.1%	33.5%	360	166	589	35
A very big threat	Statewide	420	19.7%	1.0%	17.7%	21.8%	2,135	418	2,271	120
	Northern	140	19.0%	1.9%	15.6%	23.0%	739	103	553	28
	Central	96	21.8%	2.3%	17.7%	26.6%	439	112	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	115	19.2%	2.0%	15.6%	23.5%	597	100	548	26
	Southern	69	19.2%	2.1%	15.4%	23.8%	360	103	589	35



Table 29. Current Level of Threat: Water Pollution

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	217	10.2%	0.7%	8.8%	11.7%	2,137	274	2,268	123
	Northern	88	12.0%	1.6%	9.3%	15.5%	734	70	549	32
	Central	49	11.1%	1.5%	8.5%	14.3%	444	79	584	28
	Indianapolis M.A.	39	6.4%	1.1%	4.6%	8.9%	599	48	549	25
	Southern	41	11.4%	1.5%	8.7%	14.7%	360	77	586	38
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	706	33.0%	1.2%	30.7%	35.4%	2,137	786	2,268	123
	Northern	228	31.0%	2.3%	26.7%	35.6%	734	174	549	32
	Central	152	34.3%	2.5%	29.6%	39.3%	444	198	584	28
	Indianapolis M.A.	192	32.1%	2.3%	27.7%	36.8%	599	193	549	25
	Southern	134	37.1%	1.5%	32.4%	42.1%	360	221	586	38
Moderate threat	Statewide	683	31.9%	1.2%	29.6%	34.4%	2,137	671	2,268	123
	Northern	247	33.7%	2.3%	29.3%	38.4%	734	172	549	32
	Central	121	27.2%	2.3%	22.9%	31.9%	444	163	584	28
	Indianapolis M.A.	213	35.6%	2.4%	31.0%	40.5%	599	175	549	25
	Southern	102	28.2%	2.4%	23.8%	33.1%	360	161	586	38
A very big threat	Statewide	532	24.9%	1.1%	22.7%	27.2%	2,137	537	2,268	123
	Northern	171	23.3%	2.0%	19.5%	27.5%	734	133	549	32
	Central	122	27.4%	2.4%	22.9%	32.4%	444	144	584	28
	Indianapolis M.A.	155	25.9%	2.2%	21.8%	30.5%	599	133	549	25
	Southern	84	23.3%	2.2%	19.2%	28.0%	360	127	586	38

Table 30. Current Level of Threat: Spread of Non-Native Plants and Animals

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	162	7.6%	0.7%	6.3%	9.1%	2,139	166	2,279	112
	Northern	66	9.0%	1.5%	6.5%	12.4%	733	41	548	33
	Central	38	8.6%	1.5%	6.1%	12.1%	440	47	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	38	6.3%	1.1%	4.4%	8.9%	605	38	556	18
	Southern	20	5.6%	1.1%	3.8%	8.1%	361	40	594	30
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	551	25.8%	1.1%	23.6%	28.0%	2,139	600	2,279	112
	Northern	180	24.6%	2.1%	20.7%	28.9%	733	138	548	33
	Central	115	26.0%	2.3%	21.7%	30.8%	440	150	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	159	26.3%	2.2%	22.2%	30.8%	605	153	556	18
	Southern	97	26.9%	2.3%	22.6%	31.7%	361	159	594	30
Moderate threat	Statewide	773	36.1%	1.2%	33.7%	38.6%	2,139	823	2,279	112
	Northern	270	36.9%	2.4%	32.4%	41.6%	733	202	548	33
	Central	158	35.9%	2.5%	31.2%	40.9%	440	214	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	206	34.1%	2.4%	29.6%	38.9%	605	191	556	18
	Southern	139	38.3%	2.5%	33.5%	43.3%	361	216	594	30
A very big threat	Statewide	653	30.5%	1.2%	28.2%	32.9%	2,139	690	2,279	112
	Northern	216	29.5%	2.2%	25.4%	34.0%	733	167	548	33
	Central	129	29.4%	2.4%	25.0%	34.3%	440	170	581	31
	Indianapolis M.A.	202	33.4%	2.4%	28.9%	38.2%	605	174	556	18
	Southern	106	29.2%	2.3%	24.9%	34.0%	361	179	594	30



Table 31. Current Level of Threat: Land Conversion to Row Crop Agriculture

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	294	13.8%	0.9%	12.2%	15.6%	2,132	350	2,269	122
	Northern	101	13.7%	1.7%	10.8%	17.3%	734	82	550	31
	Central	66	15.1%	1.8%	11.9%	19.0%	439	96	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	84	14.0%	1.7%	11.1%	17.6%	600	85	553	21
	Southern	43	12.0%	1.5%	9.3%	15.2%	359	87	588	36
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	698	32.7%	1.2%	30.4%	35.2%	2,132	722	2,269	122
	Northern	233	31.7%	2.3%	27.4%	36.3%	734	174	550	31
	Central	135	30.7%	2.4%	26.2%	35.6%	439	179	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	193	32.2%	2.4%	27.8%	37.1%	600	167	553	21
	Southern	137	38.3%	2.6%	33.4%	43.5%	359	202	588	36
Moderate threat	Statewide	634	29.7%	1.2%	27.5%	32.1%	2,132	675	2,269	122
	Northern	200	27.3%	2.2%	23.2%	31.7%	734	149	550	31
	Central	129	29.3%	2.4%	24.8%	34.3%	439	163	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	198	33.1%	2.4%	28.6%	37.9%	600	182	553	21
	Southern	107	29.7%	2.4%	25.4%	34.6%	359	181	588	36
A very big threat	Statewide	506	23.7%	1.1%	21.6%	26.0%	2,132	522	2,269	122
	Northern	201	27.3%	2.2%	23.2%	31.9%	734	145	550	31
	Central	109	24.9%	2.3%	20.8%	29.6%	439	140	578	34
	Indianapolis M.A.	124	20.6%	2.0%	17.0%	24.8%	600	119	553	21
	Southern	72	20.0%	2.1%	16.2%	24.4%	359	118	588	36

Table 32. Current Level of Threat: Land Conversion to Housing Development

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	49	2.3%	0.4%	1.7%	3.1%	2,163	59	2,307	84
	Northern	19	2.6%	0.8%	1.4%	4.8%	741	13	556	25
	Central	9	2.0%	0.5%	1.2%	3.3%	449	19	594	18
	Indianapolis M.A.	13	2.1%	0.6%	1.2%	3.6%	612	14	564	10
	Southern	8	2.3%	0.7%	1.3%	4.1%	361	13	593	31
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	270	12.5%	0.8%	11.0%	14.2%	2,163	343	2,307	84
	Northern	88	11.8%	1.5%	9.2%	15.1%	741	76	556	25
	Central	59	13.1%	1.6%	10.3%	16.6%	449	96	594	18
	Indianapolis M.A.	65	10.7%	1.5%	8.1%	13.9%	612	68	564	10
	Southern	58	16.2%	1.9%	12.8%	20.2%	361	103	593	31
Moderate threat	Statewide	606	28.0%	1.2%	25.8%	30.3%	2,163	646	2,307	84
	Northern	198	26.6%	2.1%	22.7%	31.0%	741	152	556	25
	Central	134	29.9%	2.4%	25.4%	34.9%	449	166	594	18
	Indianapolis M.A.	181	29.6%	2.3%	25.3%	34.3%	612	162	564	10
	Southern	93	25.7%	2.2%	21.7%	30.2%	361	166	593	31
A very big threat	Statewide	1,238	57.2%	1.3%	54.7%	59.7%	2,163	1,259	2,307	84
	Northern	437	58.9%	2.4%	54.2%	63.5%	741	315	556	25
	Central	247	54.9%	2.6%	49.9%	59.9%	449	313	594	18
	Indianapolis M.A.	353	57.6%	2.5%	52.8%	62.4%	612	320	564	10
	Southern	201	55.8%	2.6%	50.8%	60.8%	361	311	593	31





Table 33. Current Level of Threat: Land Conversion to Industrial Development

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	52	2.4%	0.4%	1.8%	3.2%	2,160	63	2,312	79
	Northern	22	3.0%	0.9%	1.7%	5.2%	739	15	558	23
	Central	9	2.1%	0.6%	1.2%	3.6%	446	17	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	9	1.5%	0.5%	0.8%	2.9%	612	11	566	8
	Southern	11	3.0%	0.8%	1.8%	4.9%	363	20	596	28
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	246	11.4%	0.8%	10.0%	13.0%	2,160	314	2,312	79
	Northern	71	9.6%	1.4%	7.3%	12.7%	739	62	558	23
	Central	68	15.2%	1.8%	12.1%	19.0%	446	105	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	56	9.1%	1.4%	6.8%	12.2%	612	60	566	8
	Southern	51	14.1%	1.8%	10.9%	17.9%	363	87	596	28
Moderate threat	Statewide	571	26.4%	1.1%	24.3%	28.8%	2,160	604	2,312	79
	Northern	199	26.9%	2.2%	22.9%	31.4%	739	150	558	23
	Central	111	24.9%	2.3%	20.7%	29.6%	446	144	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	180	29.4%	2.3%	25.1%	34.1%	612	157	566	8
	Southern	81	22.3%	2.1%	18.6%	26.6%	363	153	596	28
A very big threat	Statewide	1,291	59.8%	1.3%	57.3%	62.2%	2,160	1,331	2,312	79
	Northern	446	60.4%	2.4%	55.7%	65.0%	739	331	558	23
	Central	258	57.8%	2.5%	52.8%	62.7%	446	326	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	367	59.9%	2.4%	55.1%	64.6%	612	338	566	8
	Southern	220	60.6%	2.5%	55.7%	65.4%	363	336	596	28

Table 34. Current Level of Threat: Misuse of Woodlands (e.g. Vandalism, Dumping)

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	94	4.4%	0.5%	3.4%	5.5%	2,154	102	2,303	88
	Northern	44	5.9%	1.2%	3.9%	8.7%	739	30	554	27
	Central	14	3.1%	0.8%	1.9%	5.0%	448	21	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	23	3.8%	1.0%	2.3%	6.4%	603	20	555	19
	Southern	13	3.6%	0.8%	2.4%	5.5%	364	31	602	22
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	513	23.8%	1.1%	21.7%	26.0%	2,154	543	2,303	88
	Northern	171	23.2%	2.1%	19.4%	27.5%	739	126	554	27
	Central	103	23.0%	2.1%	19.0%	27.4%	448	137	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	156	25.9%	2.2%	21.8%	30.4%	603	143	555	19
	Southern	83	22.7%	2.1%	18.7%	27.1%	364	137	602	22
Moderate threat	Statewide	619	28.7%	1.2%	26.5%	31.1%	2,154	658	2,303	88
	Northern	225	30.4%	2.3%	26.2%	35.1%	739	165	554	27
	Central	120	26.7%	2.2%	22.6%	31.3%	448	171	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	172	28.6%	2.3%	24.3%	33.2%	603	160	555	19
	Southern	102	28.0%	2.3%	23.6%	32.8%	364	162	602	22
A very big threat	Statewide	929	43.1%	1.3%	40.6%	45.6%	2,154	1,000	2,303	88
	Northern	299	40.5%	2.4%	35.9%	45.3%	739	233	554	27
	Central	212	47.2%	2.6%	42.2%	52.3%	448	263	592	20
	Indianapolis M.A.	252	41.7%	2.5%	37.0%	46.6%	603	232	555	19
	Southern	166	45.7%	2.6%	40.7%	50.8%	364	272	602	22



Table 35. Current Level of Threat: Trespassing of Poaching

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	204	9.5%	0.8%	8.1%	11.2%	2,141	201	2,291	100
	Northern	82	11.1%	1.6%	8.4%	14.7%	735	56	551	30
	Central	40	9.1%	1.5%	6.6%	12.4%	443	56	586	26
	Indianapolis M.A.	57	9.4%	1.5%	6.9%	12.8%	601	46	556	18
	Southern	25	6.8%	1.2%	4.9%	9.5%	362	43	598	26
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	756	35.3%	1.2%	32.9%	37.8%	2,141	785	2,291	100
	Northern	237	32.3%	2.3%	27.9%	36.9%	735	174	551	30
	Central	147	33.3%	2.5%	28.6%	38.3%	443	184	586	26
	Indianapolis M.A.	251	41.8%	2.5%	37.0%	46.7%	601	226	556	18
	Southern	121	33.4%	2.4%	28.8%	38.3%	362	201	598	26
Moderate threat	Statewide	614	28.7%	1.2%	26.4%	31.0%	2,141	659	2,291	100
	Northern	215	29.2%	2.2%	25.1%	33.8%	735	162	551	30
	Central	134	30.3%	2.4%	25.8%	35.2%	443	175	586	26
	Indianapolis M.A.	155	25.7%	2.2%	21.7%	30.2%	601	145	556	18
	Southern	110	30.4%	2.4%	25.8%	35.3%	362	177	598	26
A very big threat	Statewide	567	26.5%	1.1%	24.4%	28.8%	2,141	646	2,291	100
	Northern	201	27.4%	2.2%	23.3%	31.8%	735	159	551	30
	Central	121	27.3%	2.2%	23.1%	31.9%	443	171	586	26
	Indianapolis M.A.	139	23.1%	2.0%	19.4%	27.3%	601	139	556	18
	Southern	106	29.5%	2.4%	25.1%	34.3%	362	177	598	26

Table 36. Current Level of Threat: Other

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not a threat	Statewide	287	66.4%	2.8%	60.8%	71.6%	432	213	375	2,016
	Northern	92	62.1%	5.4%	51.0%	72.1%	149	50	95	486
	Central	52	63.8%	5.8%	51.8%	74.3%	82	47	93	519
	Indianapolis M.A.	104	75.2%	4.4%	65.6%	82.8%	138	72	107	467
	Southern	39	60.8%	6.5%	47.7%	72.6%	64	44	80	544
Somewhat a threat	Statewide	40	9.3%	1.8%	6.3%	13.6%	432	35	375	2,016
	Northern	14	9.6%	3.3%	4.8%	18.5%	149	10	95	486
	Central	9	11.1%	4.4%	4.9%	23.2%	82	9	93	519
	Indianapolis M.A.	10	7.4%	3.1%	3.2%	16.1%	138	7	107	467
	Southern	7	10.5%	4.2%	4.7%	21.8%	64	9	80	544
Moderate threat	Statewide	34	7.8%	1.5%	5.3%	11.2%	432	40	375	2,016
	Northern	15	10.0%	3.4%	5.0%	18.9%	149	10	95	486
	Central	6	6.8%	2.3%	3.5%	12.9%	82	13	93	519
	Indianapolis M.A.	9	6.5%	2.2%	3.3%	12.3%	138	11	107	467
	Southern	4	6.5%	2.9%	2.7%	15.1%	64	6	80	544
A very big threat	Statewide	71	16.5%	2.0%	12.9%	20.8%	432	87	375	2,016
	Northern	27	18.2%	4.0%	11.6%	27.4%	149	25	95	486
	Central	15	18.3%	4.1%	11.6%	27.6%	82	24	93	519
	Indianapolis M.A.	15	11.0%	2.9%	6.4%	18.0%	138	17	107	467
	Southern	14	22.1%	5.3%	13.5%	34.1%	64	21	80	544





Table 37. Indiana Forests' Value: Produce Wood Products

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	238	10.9%	0.8%	9.4%	12.5%	2,188	259	2,347	44
	Northern	85	11.3%	1.5%	8.6%	14.7%	754	59	570	11
	Central	53	11.6%	1.6%	8.8%	15.2%	453	67	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	56	9.2%	1.4%	6.8%	12.3%	612	55	563	11
	Southern	44	11.8%	1.6%	9.1%	15.3%	370	78	612	12
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	721	32.9%	1.2%	30.6%	35.3%	2,188	740	2,347	44
	Northern	265	35.1%	2.3%	30.8%	39.7%	754	200	570	11
	Central	140	31.0%	2.4%	26.4%	36.0%	452	174	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	200	32.6%	2.3%	28.2%	37.3%	612	183	563	11
	Southern	116	31.4%	2.4%	26.9%	36.2%	370	183	612	12
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	857	39.2%	1.2%	36.8%	41.6%	2,188	957	2,347	44
	Northern	269	35.7%	2.3%	31.3%	40.3%	754	214	570	11
	Central	192	42.4%	2.5%	37.6%	47.4%	452	271	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	242	39.5%	2.4%	34.9%	44.4%	612	224	563	11
	Southern	154	41.7%	2.5%	36.8%	46.7%	370	248	612	12
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	197	9.0%	0.7%	7.6%	10.6%	2,188	214	2,347	44
	Northern	68	9.0%	1.4%	6.6%	12.2%	754	48	570	11
	Central	42	9.4%	1.6%	6.7%	13.1%	452	54	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	54	8.8%	1.4%	6.5%	11.8%	612	52	563	11
	Southern	33	8.8%	1.4%	6.4%	12.0%	370	60	612	12
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	176	8.1%	0.7%	6.8%	9.6%	2,188	177	2,347	44
	Northern	67	8.9%	1.4%	6.5%	12.1%	754	49	570	11
	Central	25	5.6%	1.1%	3.8%	8.2%	452	36	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	61	9.9%	1.5%	7.3%	13.3%	612	49	563	11
	Southern	23	6.3%	1.2%	4.3%	9.0%	370	43	612	12

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they produce wood and wood products for people.



Table 38. Indiana Forests' Value: Provide Jobs and Income

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	161	7.3%	0.7%	6.1%	8.7%	2,190	167	2,351	40
	Northern	42	5.5%	1.1%	3.7%	8.1%	754	30	571	10
	Central	46	10.1%	1.6%	7.3%	13.7%	454	49	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	45	7.4%	1.3%	5.2%	10.4%	611	39	561	13
	Southern	28	7.5%	1.2%	5.5%	10.3%	371	49	616	8
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	613	28.0%	1.2%	25.8%	30.3%	2,190	617	2,351	40
	Northern	226	30.0%	2.2%	25.9%	34.5%	754	167	571	10
	Central	113	24.9%	2.2%	20.8%	29.5%	454	152	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	180	29.5%	2.3%	25.2%	34.1%	611	157	561	13
	Southern	94	25.3%	2.3%	21.1%	30.0%	371	141	616	8
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,019	46.5%	1.3%	44.1%	49.0%	2,190	1,149	2,351	40
	Northern	331	43.9%	2.4%	39.3%	48.6%	754	261	571	10
	Central	219	48.4%	2.6%	43.4%	53.4%	454	300	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	283	46.3%	2.5%	41.5%	51.2%	611	278	561	13
	Southern	186	50.0%	2.5%	45.0%	55.0%	371	310	616	8
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	264	12.0%	0.9%	10.4%	13.8%	2,190	268	2,351	40
	Northern	96	12.7%	1.7%	9.8%	16.3%	754	66	571	10
	Central	55	12.2%	1.8%	9.1%	16.1%	454	67	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	70	11.4%	1.6%	8.5%	15.0%	611	58	561	13
	Southern	43	11.7%	1.6%	8.9%	15.1%	371	77	616	8
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	133	6.1%	0.6%	5.0%	7.4%	2,190	150	2,351	40
	Northern	59	7.9%	1.3%	5.7%	10.8%	754	47	571	10
	Central	20	4.5%	0.8%	3.1%	6.4%	454	35	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	33	5.4%	1.1%	3.6%	8.2%	611	29	561	13
	Southern	20	5.5%	1.0%	3.8%	8.0%	371	39	616	8

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they provide jobs and income for people.



Table 39. Indiana Forests' Value: Produce Environmental Benefits to People

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	18	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	1.3%	2,195	25	2,362	29
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.0%	756	3	573	8
	Central	5	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	3.3%	455	6	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	1.1%	614	5	566	8
	Southern	6	1.6%	0.5%	0.8%	3.1%	370	11	615	9
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	18	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	1.4%	2,195	23	2,362	29
	Northern	7	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.6%	756	5	573	8
	Central	4	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.2%	455	4	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	1.1%	614	5	566	8
	Southern	5	1.4%	0.5%	0.7%	2.8%	370	9	615	9
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	604	27.5%	1.1%	25.4%	29.7%	2,195	722	2,362	29
	Northern	198	26.2%	2.1%	22.4%	30.4%	756	168	573	8
	Central	137	30.0%	2.3%	25.7%	34.7%	455	201	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	168	27.3%	2.1%	23.3%	31.7%	614	174	566	8
	Southern	101	27.4%	2.2%	23.2%	31.9%	370	179	615	9
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	1,500	68.3%	1.2%	66.0%	70.6%	2,195	1,528	2,362	29
	Northern	518	68.5%	2.2%	64.1%	72.7%	756	376	573	8
	Central	300	65.9%	2.4%	61.1%	70.4%	455	378	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	433	70.5%	2.2%	66.0%	74.6%	614	375	566	8
	Southern	249	67.4%	2.3%	62.7%	71.8%	370	399	615	9
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	55	2.5%	0.4%	1.9%	3.4%	2,195	64	2,362	29
	Northern	28	3.8%	0.9%	2.3%	6.0%	756	21	573	8
	Central	10	2.2%	0.6%	1.3%	3.6%	455	19	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	614	7	566	8
	Southern	9	2.3%	0.6%	1.3%	3.9%	370	17	615	9

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they produce environmental benefits to people (e.g., clean air, clean water, carbon sequestration, etc.).



Table 40. Indiana Forests' Value: Support Biodiversity

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	20	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	1.6%	2,196	21	2,362	29
	Northern	7	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.7%	756	4	573	8
	Central	5	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	3.3%	454	5	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.5%	613	5	565	9
	Southern	5	1.3%	0.5%	0.6%	2.9%	373	7	618	6
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	27	1.2%	0.3%	0.8%	1.9%	2,196	33	2,362	29
	Northern	9	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	2.9%	756	6	573	8
	Central	5	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.4%	454	6	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.5%	613	7	565	9
	Southern	6	1.7%	0.5%	0.9%	3.1%	373	14	618	6
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	689	31.4%	1.2%	29.2%	33.7%	2,196	836	2,362	29
	Northern	256	33.9%	2.2%	29.6%	38.4%	756	212	573	8
	Central	140	30.8%	2.3%	26.5%	35.4%	454	216	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	158	25.8%	2.1%	21.9%	30.1%	613	174	565	9
	Southern	135	36.3%	2.4%	31.7%	41.2%	373	234	618	6
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	1,375	62.6%	1.2%	60.2%	64.9%	2,196	1,385	2,362	29
	Northern	449	59.4%	2.3%	54.7%	63.9%	756	326	573	8
	Central	288	63.4%	2.4%	58.6%	68.0%	454	355	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	425	69.3%	2.2%	64.8%	73.5%	613	362	565	9
	Southern	212	57.0%	2.5%	52.0%	61.8%	373	342	618	6
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	85	3.9%	0.5%	3.0%	4.9%	2,196	87	2,362	29
	Northern	34	4.6%	1.0%	3.0%	7.0%	756	25	573	8
	Central	17	3.7%	0.9%	2.3%	5.8%	454	24	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.2%	0.9%	1.9%	5.5%	613	17	565	9
	Southern	14	3.7%	0.9%	2.2%	6.0%	373	21	618	6

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they support biodiversity (including providing habitat for game and non-game wildlife species).



Table 41. Indiana Forests' Value: Provide Outdoor Recreation for People

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	27	1.2%	0.3%	0.8%	1.9%	2,197	30	2,366	25
	Northern	5	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	2.1%	755	3	573	8
	Central	8	1.7%	0.7%	0.8%	3.8%	455	9	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	3.1%	614	7	566	8
	Southern	6	1.7%	0.6%	0.9%	3.2%	373	11	619	5
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	90	4.1%	0.5%	3.2%	5.2%	2,197	92	2,366	25
	Northern	30	4.0%	1.0%	2.5%	6.4%	755	23	573	8
	Central	21	4.6%	1.1%	2.8%	7.2%	455	24	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	24	3.9%	1.0%	2.3%	6.4%	614	20	566	8
	Southern	15	4.0%	1.0%	2.5%	6.3%	373	25	619	5
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,039	47.3%	1.3%	44.8%	49.8%	2,197	1,176	2,366	25
	Northern	363	48.1%	2.4%	43.5%	52.9%	755	288	573	8
	Central	212	46.5%	2.5%	41.6%	51.5%	455	301	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	271	44.1%	2.4%	39.3%	48.9%	614	268	566	8
	Southern	193	51.8%	2.5%	46.8%	56.7%	373	319	619	5
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	989	45.0%	1.3%	42.6%	47.5%	2,197	1,009	2,366	25
	Northern	330	43.7%	2.4%	39.1%	48.5%	755	238	573	8
	Central	205	45.0%	2.5%	40.1%	50.0%	455	258	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	303	49.4%	2.5%	44.6%	54.2%	614	264	566	8
	Southern	151	40.5%	2.5%	35.8%	45.5%	373	249	619	5
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	52	2.4%	0.4%	1.8%	3.2%	2,197	59	2,366	25
	Northern	26	3.5%	0.8%	2.2%	5.6%	755	21	573	8
	Central	10	2.2%	0.6%	1.3%	3.9%	455	16	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.3%	0.5%	0.6%	2.9%	614	7	566	8
	Southern	8	2.0%	0.6%	1.2%	3.5%	373	15	619	5

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they provide outdoor recreation for people (e.g., hiking, camping, hunting, etc.).



Table 42. Indiana Forests' Value: Just Because Exist

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	30	1.4%	0.3%	0.9%	2.1%	2,194	37	2,363	28
	Northern	10	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.0%	754	8	572	9
	Central	8	1.8%	0.7%	0.8%	3.9%	456	12	609	3
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.8%	615	9	568	6
	Southern	4	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.5%	369	8	614	10
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	76	3.5%	0.5%	2.7%	4.5%	2,194	88	2,363	28
	Northern	26	3.5%	0.9%	2.1%	5.8%	754	19	572	9
	Central	12	2.5%	0.7%	1.5%	4.2%	456	19	609	3
	Indianapolis M.A.	25	4.0%	0.9%	2.6%	6.2%	615	26	568	6
	Southern	13	3.6%	0.9%	2.1%	5.9%	369	24	614	10
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	702	32.0%	1.2%	29.8%	34.3%	2,194	872	2,363	28
	Northern	245	32.6%	2.2%	28.4%	37.0%	754	209	572	9
	Central	154	33.7%	2.3%	29.3%	38.4%	456	230	609	3
	Indianapolis M.A.	175	28.5%	2.2%	24.5%	32.9%	615	188	568	6
	Southern	128	34.6%	2.3%	30.2%	39.3%	369	245	614	10
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	1,301	59.3%	1.2%	56.9%	61.7%	2,194	1,266	2,363	28
	Northern	431	57.2%	2.4%	52.5%	61.7%	754	304	572	9
	Central	272	59.5%	2.5%	54.7%	64.2%	456	331	609	3
	Indianapolis M.A.	389	63.3%	2.3%	58.7%	67.8%	615	323	568	6
	Southern	209	56.6%	2.5%	51.7%	61.4%	369	308	614	10
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	85	3.9%	0.5%	3.1%	4.9%	2,194	100	2,363	28
	Northern	41	5.4%	1.1%	3.7%	7.9%	754	32	572	9
	Central	11	2.4%	0.7%	1.4%	4.1%	456	17	609	3
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	3.0%	0.8%	1.8%	4.9%	615	22	568	6
	Southern	15	4.1%	0.8%	2.7%	6.1%	369	29	614	10

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable just because they exist even if they do not produce direct benefits to people.



Table 43. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Wood Products

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	18	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	1.4%	2,189	23	2,352	39
	Northern	9	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	2.8%	753	8	569	12
	Central	1	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	455	3	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	611	4	563	11
	Southern	6	1.5%	0.6%	0.7%	3.1%	370	8	615	9
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	128	5.9%	0.6%	4.8%	7.1%	2,189	145	2,352	39
	Northern	37	4.8%	1.0%	3.2%	7.4%	753	26	569	12
	Central	23	5.0%	1.1%	3.3%	7.6%	455	33	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	37	6.1%	1.2%	4.2%	8.9%	611	38	563	11
	Southern	31	8.4%	1.5%	5.9%	12.0%	370	48	615	9
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	647	29.5%	1.1%	27.4%	31.8%	2,189	782	2,352	39
	Northern	217	28.7%	2.2%	24.7%	33.2%	753	174	569	12
	Central	163	35.8%	2.4%	31.3%	40.7%	455	239	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	147	24.1%	2.1%	20.3%	28.3%	611	153	563	11
	Southern	120	32.5%	2.3%	28.1%	37.2%	370	216	615	9
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	76	3.4%	0.5%	2.6%	4.5%	2,189	80	2,352	39
	Northern	23	3.0%	0.8%	1.7%	5.2%	753	16	569	12
	Central	25	5.6%	1.3%	3.5%	8.9%	455	25	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	17	2.7%	0.7%	1.6%	4.6%	611	18	563	11
	Southern	11	2.9%	0.7%	1.8%	4.6%	370	21	615	9
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,320	60.3%	1.2%	57.9%	62.7%	2,189	1,322	2,352	39
	Northern	468	62.2%	2.3%	57.5%	66.6%	753	345	569	12
	Central	242	53.2%	2.5%	48.2%	58.1%	455	305	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	407	66.7%	2.3%	62.1%	71.0%	611	350	563	11
	Southern	203	54.7%	2.5%	49.7%	59.6%	370	322	615	9

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient wood products that people need.



Table 44. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Jobs and Income

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	11	0.5%	0.2%	0.3%	0.9%	2,190	13	2,355	36
	Northern	2	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	0.9%	753	2	569	12
	Central	1	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	454	3	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.1%	611	5	563	11
	Southern	3	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	2.5%	372	3	618	6
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	145	6.6%	0.6%	5.5%	8.0%	2,190	149	2,355	36
	Northern	49	6.6%	1.2%	4.5%	9.4%	753	34	569	12
	Central	27	5.9%	1.2%	3.9%	8.9%	454	32	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	40	6.5%	1.2%	4.5%	9.3%	611	38	563	11
	Southern	29	7.7%	1.4%	5.3%	11.1%	372	45	618	6
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	701	32.0%	1.2%	29.8%	34.4%	2,190	841	2,355	36
	Northern	233	31.0%	2.2%	26.8%	35.5%	753	184	569	12
	Central	162	35.8%	2.4%	31.2%	40.6%	454	242	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	169	27.6%	2.2%	23.6%	32.1%	611	175	563	11
	Southern	137	36.8%	2.4%	32.2%	41.7%	372	240	618	6
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	63	2.9%	0.4%	2.2%	3.8%	2,190	74	2,355	36
	Northern	18	2.3%	0.7%	1.3%	4.2%	753	14	569	12
	Central	21	4.7%	1.3%	2.8%	7.9%	454	23	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	12	2.0%	0.6%	1.1%	3.7%	611	14	563	11
	Southern	12	3.1%	0.7%	1.9%	5.0%	372	23	618	6
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,270	58.0%	1.3%	55.5%	60.4%	2,190	1,278	2,355	36
	Northern	451	59.9%	2.4%	55.2%	64.4%	753	335	569	12
	Central	242	53.3%	2.5%	48.3%	58.2%	454	305	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	385	63.1%	2.4%	58.3%	67.6%	611	331	563	11
	Southern	192	51.5%	2.5%	46.5%	56.4%	372	307	618	6

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient jobs and income for people.





Table 45. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Environmental Benefits

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	44	2.0%	0.4%	1.4%	3.0%	2,187	33	2,353	38
	Northern	19	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	4.8%	751	10	568	13
	Central	5	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.6%	453	7	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	2.9%	0.9%	1.6%	5.2%	611	13	563	11
	Southern	2	0.7%	0.6%	0.1%	3.4%	372	3	618	6
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	232	10.6%	0.8%	9.1%	12.3%	2,187	221	2,353	38
	Northern	73	9.8%	1.4%	7.3%	13.0%	751	53	568	13
	Central	46	10.1%	1.8%	7.1%	14.1%	453	48	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	69	11.3%	1.6%	8.4%	14.9%	611	58	563	11
	Southern	44	11.8%	1.8%	8.7%	15.8%	372	62	618	6
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	840	38.4%	1.2%	36.0%	40.8%	2,187	1,010	2,353	38
	Northern	290	38.7%	2.3%	34.2%	43.3%	751	230	568	13
	Central	185	40.8%	2.5%	36.1%	45.7%	453	279	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	217	35.5%	2.3%	31.2%	40.2%	611	229	563	11
	Southern	148	39.7%	2.4%	35.0%	44.6%	372	272	618	6
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	167	7.6%	0.7%	6.4%	9.1%	2,187	177	2,353	38
	Northern	58	7.7%	1.3%	5.4%	10.7%	751	40	568	13
	Central	43	9.4%	1.6%	6.7%	13.0%	453	50	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	35	5.7%	1.1%	3.8%	8.4%	611	32	563	11
	Southern	31	8.5%	1.3%	6.2%	11.4%	372	55	618	6
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	904	41.4%	1.3%	38.9%	43.9%	2,187	912	2,353	38
	Northern	311	41.4%	2.4%	36.8%	46.1%	751	235	568	13
	Central	175	38.6%	2.5%	33.8%	43.6%	453	220	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	272	44.6%	2.5%	39.8%	49.5%	611	231	563	11
	Southern	146	39.4%	2.5%	34.6%	44.3%	372	226	618	6

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient environmental benefits for people.



Table 46. Current Management: Sufficiently Support Biodiversity

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	34	1.6%	0.3%	1.0%	2.3%	2,190	30	2,359	32
	Northern	15	2.0%	0.7%	1.0%	4.0%	752	9	569	12
	Central	4	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.5%	454	5	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	10	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%	3.5%	612	8	565	9
	Southern	5	1.2%	0.5%	0.6%	2.8%	372	8	618	6
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	215	9.8%	0.8%	8.3%	11.5%	2,190	194	2,359	32
	Northern	71	9.5%	1.5%	6.9%	12.9%	752	43	569	12
	Central	34	7.6%	1.4%	5.2%	10.8%	454	45	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	74	12.1%	1.7%	9.1%	15.8%	612	62	565	9
	Southern	35	9.5%	1.7%	6.6%	13.3%	372	44	618	6
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	885	40.4%	1.2%	38.0%	42.8%	2,190	1,065	2,359	32
	Northern	304	40.4%	2.4%	35.9%	45.1%	752	243	569	12
	Central	198	43.6%	2.5%	38.8%	48.6%	454	292	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	217	35.4%	2.3%	31.0%	40.1%	612	224	565	9
	Southern	166	44.7%	2.5%	39.8%	49.6%	372	306	618	6
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	165	7.6%	0.7%	6.3%	9.0%	2,190	187	2,359	32
	Northern	60	8.1%	1.3%	5.8%	11.1%	752	45	569	12
	Central	46	10.1%	1.6%	7.3%	13.8%	454	57	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	27	4.3%	1.0%	2.8%	6.7%	612	28	565	9
	Southern	32	8.7%	1.4%	6.3%	11.7%	372	57	618	6
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	891	40.7%	1.3%	38.2%	43.2%	2,190	883	2,359	32
	Northern	301	40.1%	2.4%	35.5%	44.8%	752	229	569	12
	Central	171	37.7%	2.5%	33.0%	42.7%	454	208	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	285	46.5%	2.5%	41.7%	51.4%	612	243	565	9
	Southern	134	36.0%	2.5%	31.3%	40.9%	372	203	618	6

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed sufficiently support biodiversity (including providing habitat for game and non-game wildlife).



Table 47. Current Management: Produce Sufficient Recreational Opportunities

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	22	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.7%	2,189	19	2,358	33
	Northern	7	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%	2.3%	754	6	571	10
	Central	7	1.6%	0.8%	0.6%	4.0%	455	5	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	2.2%	608	4	563	11
	Southern	4	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.6%	372	4	618	6
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	178	8.1%	0.7%	6.8%	9.7%	2,189	159	2,358	33
	Northern	63	8.3%	1.4%	6.0%	11.5%	754	40	571	10
	Central	32	7.1%	1.4%	4.8%	10.6%	455	34	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	56	9.2%	1.5%	6.7%	12.5%	608	44	563	11
	Southern	27	7.2%	1.4%	4.9%	10.5%	372	41	618	6
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,135	51.8%	1.3%	49.3%	54.3%	2,189	1,294	2,358	33
	Northern	381	50.5%	2.4%	45.8%	55.2%	754	294	571	10
	Central	252	55.4%	2.6%	50.3%	60.4%	455	359	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	305	50.1%	2.5%	45.3%	55.0%	608	298	563	11
	Southern	197	53.1%	2.5%	48.1%	58.0%	372	343	618	6
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	276	12.6%	0.9%	11.0%	14.4%	2,189	293	2,358	33
	Northern	101	13.4%	1.7%	10.5%	17.0%	754	76	571	10
	Central	54	11.9%	1.7%	9.0%	15.7%	455	70	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	74	12.1%	1.7%	9.3%	15.8%	608	67	563	11
	Southern	46	12.5%	1.6%	9.6%	16.0%	372	80	618	6
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	578	26.4%	1.1%	24.2%	28.7%	2,189	593	2,358	33
	Northern	202	26.8%	2.1%	22.8%	31.2%	754	155	571	10
	Central	109	23.9%	2.2%	19.9%	28.5%	455	138	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	169	27.8%	2.2%	23.6%	32.4%	608	150	563	11
	Southern	98	26.3%	2.3%	22.1%	31.0%	372	150	618	6

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient outdoor recreational opportunities for people.



Table 48. Current Management: Too Much Emphasis on Benefits to People

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	103	4.7%	0.5%	3.7%	5.9%	2,184	104	2,350	41
	Northern	34	4.5%	1.0%	2.9%	6.8%	753	26	570	11
	Central	23	5.1%	1.2%	3.2%	7.8%	452	28	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	28	4.7%	1.1%	2.9%	7.4%	608	23	562	12
	Southern	18	4.9%	1.1%	3.1%	7.5%	371	27	616	8
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	582	26.7%	1.1%	24.5%	28.9%	2,184	687	2,350	41
	Northern	187	24.8%	2.1%	21.0%	29.1%	753	153	570	11
	Central	118	26.1%	2.2%	22.0%	30.7%	452	167	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	160	26.3%	2.1%	22.4%	30.6%	608	170	562	12
	Southern	117	31.6%	2.4%	27.1%	36.4%	371	197	616	8
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	419	19.2%	1.0%	17.3%	21.3%	2,184	450	2,350	41
	Northern	148	19.6%	2.0%	16.1%	23.7%	753	106	570	11
	Central	86	19.2%	2.1%	15.4%	23.5%	452	115	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	111	18.2%	1.9%	14.7%	22.3%	608	103	562	12
	Southern	74	20.0%	2.1%	16.3%	24.4%	371	126	616	8
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	135	6.2%	0.6%	5.0%	7.5%	2,184	136	2,350	41
	Northern	61	8.1%	1.4%	5.8%	11.2%	753	39	570	11
	Central	30	6.5%	1.3%	4.4%	9.5%	452	40	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	31	5.2%	1.1%	3.4%	7.8%	608	29	562	12
	Southern	13	3.6%	0.8%	2.3%	5.4%	371	28	616	8
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	945	43.3%	1.3%	40.8%	45.8%	2,184	973	2,350	41
	Northern	324	43.0%	2.4%	38.4%	47.7%	753	246	570	11
	Central	195	43.1%	2.5%	38.2%	48.2%	452	252	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	278	45.7%	2.5%	40.8%	50.6%	608	237	562	12
	Southern	148	40.0%	2.5%	35.2%	45.0%	371	238	616	8

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed place too much emphasis on providing benefits to people.



Table 49. Management Expectation: Should Be Left Untouched by Humans

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	148	6.8%	0.6%	5.7%	8.0%	2,190	184	2,355	36
	Northern	42	5.6%	1.1%	3.8%	8.1%	751	36	571	10
	Central	37	8.0%	1.3%	5.9%	10.9%	455	55	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	43	7.1%	1.2%	5.1%	9.8%	612	47	565	9
	Southern	26	7.1%	1.3%	5.0%	10.1%	372	46	614	10
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	1,300	59.4%	1.3%	56.9%	61.8%	2,190	1,450	2,355	36
	Northern	456	60.7%	2.4%	56.0%	65.2%	751	351	571	10
	Central	271	59.5%	2.5%	54.4%	64.4%	455	376	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	357	58.3%	2.5%	53.4%	63.0%	612	346	565	9
	Southern	216	58.3%	2.5%	53.2%	63.1%	372	377	614	10
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	465	21.2%	1.1%	19.2%	23.5%	2,190	430	2,355	36
	Northern	154	20.5%	2.0%	16.9%	24.6%	751	110	571	10
	Central	93	20.5%	2.3%	16.5%	25.3%	455	100	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	138	22.6%	2.2%	18.6%	27.1%	612	104	565	9
	Southern	80	21.5%	2.2%	17.5%	26.0%	372	116	614	10
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	116	5.3%	0.6%	4.3%	6.5%	2,190	118	2,355	36
	Northern	51	6.8%	1.2%	4.8%	9.6%	751	38	571	10
	Central	20	4.4%	1.1%	2.6%	7.3%	455	24	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	24	3.9%	0.9%	2.4%	6.2%	612	23	565	9
	Southern	21	5.5%	1.2%	3.7%	8.3%	372	33	614	10
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	161	7.3%	0.7%	6.1%	8.7%	2,190	173	2,355	36
	Northern	48	6.4%	1.2%	4.4%	9.1%	751	36	571	10
	Central	34	7.5%	1.3%	5.4%	10.5%	455	50	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	50	8.2%	1.3%	5.9%	11.2%	612	45	565	9
	Southern	28	7.6%	1.5%	5.2%	11.0%	372	42	614	10

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed?  
 Indiana forests and woodlands should be left untouched by humans.



Table 50. Management Expectation: Needs Met by Trees Grown in Indiana

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	72	3.3%	0.5%	2.5%	4.4%	2,185	75	2,344	47
	Northern	26	3.5%	0.9%	2.1%	5.8%	752	19	569	12
	Central	17	3.8%	1.0%	2.2%	6.4%	452	21	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.3%	0.9%	1.9%	5.7%	612	18	565	9
	Southern	9	2.4%	0.8%	1.3%	4.4%	369	17	611	13
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	642	29.4%	1.1%	27.2%	31.7%	2,185	755	2,344	47
	Northern	228	30.3%	2.2%	26.2%	34.8%	752	188	569	12
	Central	118	26.2%	2.1%	22.3%	30.6%	452	183	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	184	30.1%	2.2%	26.0%	34.6%	612	201	565	9
	Southern	111	30.2%	2.3%	25.8%	35.0%	369	183	611	13
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	824	37.7%	1.2%	35.3%	40.2%	2,185	861	2,344	47
	Northern	261	34.8%	2.3%	30.4%	39.4%	752	197	569	12
	Central	197	43.6%	2.6%	38.7%	48.7%	452	240	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	220	36.0%	2.4%	31.4%	40.8%	612	187	565	9
	Southern	145	39.3%	2.5%	34.5%	44.3%	369	237	611	13
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	105	4.8%	0.5%	3.9%	6.0%	2,185	112	2,344	47
	Northern	32	4.3%	1.0%	2.7%	6.6%	752	24	569	12
	Central	22	4.8%	1.1%	3.0%	7.5%	452	28	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	34	5.6%	1.1%	3.7%	8.2%	612	30	565	9
	Southern	18	4.8%	1.0%	3.2%	7.1%	369	30	611	13
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	541	24.8%	1.1%	22.6%	27.0%	2,185	541	2,344	47
	Northern	204	27.1%	2.2%	23.1%	31.6%	752	141	569	12
	Central	97	21.6%	2.1%	17.7%	26.0%	452	127	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	153	25.0%	2.2%	21.0%	29.6%	612	129	565	9
	Southern	86	23.3%	2.2%	19.4%	27.8%	369	144	611	13

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? In Indiana, our future needs for wood and wood products should be met by the trees we grow in state.



Table 51. Management Expectation: Growing Trees to Replace Harvested Trees

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	166	7.7%	0.7%	6.3%	9.2%	2,168	147	2,324	67
	Northern	50	6.8%	1.3%	4.6%	9.8%	746	30	564	17
	Central	36	8.0%	1.6%	5.3%	11.8%	447	37	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	49	8.0%	1.4%	5.7%	11.3%	605	39	559	15
	Southern	31	8.5%	1.6%	5.9%	12.1%	369	41	608	16
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	592	27.3%	1.1%	25.1%	29.6%	2,168	614	2,324	67
	Northern	184	24.7%	2.1%	20.8%	29.0%	746	135	564	17
	Central	142	31.8%	2.4%	27.2%	36.7%	447	174	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	165	27.3%	2.2%	23.1%	31.9%	605	142	559	15
	Southern	100	27.2%	2.3%	22.9%	31.9%	369	163	608	16
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	200	9.2%	0.7%	7.9%	10.7%	2,168	261	2,324	67
	Northern	75	10.1%	1.4%	7.7%	13.1%	746	67	564	17
	Central	43	9.7%	1.5%	7.2%	12.9%	447	66	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	41	6.7%	1.2%	4.7%	9.5%	605	46	559	15
	Southern	41	11.0%	1.4%	8.6%	14.0%	369	82	608	16
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	42	1.9%	0.3%	1.4%	2.7%	2,168	49	2,324	67
	Northern	19	2.6%	0.8%	1.4%	4.7%	746	13	564	17
	Central	6	1.4%	0.4%	0.8%	2.6%	447	12	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	9	1.5%	0.5%	0.7%	3.0%	605	9	559	15
	Southern	8	2.1%	0.6%	1.2%	3.7%	369	15	608	16
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,168	53.9%	1.3%	51.3%	56.4%	2,168	1,253	2,324	67
	Northern	417	55.8%	2.4%	51.1%	60.5%	746	319	564	17
	Central	220	49.1%	2.6%	44.1%	54.2%	447	304	593	19
	Indianapolis M.A.	342	56.5%	2.5%	51.6%	61.3%	605	323	559	15
	Southern	189	51.3%	2.5%	46.3%	56.2%	369	307	608	16

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? In Indiana, we are growing enough trees to replace the ones we harvest.





Table 52. Management Expectation: Import Wood Products Instead of Harvesting

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	117	5.4%	0.6%	4.4%	6.6%	2,181	131	2,342	49
	Northern	37	5.0%	1.0%	3.3%	7.5%	752	30	570	11
	Central	26	5.7%	1.2%	3.7%	8.6%	451	33	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	36	5.9%	1.1%	4.0%	8.5%	608	34	561	13
	Southern	18	4.8%	0.9%	3.3%	7.0%	370	34	613	11
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	821	37.7%	1.2%	35.3%	40.1%	2,181	919	2,342	49
	Northern	257	34.2%	2.3%	29.9%	38.8%	752	199	570	11
	Central	181	40.1%	2.5%	35.3%	45.1%	451	239	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	226	37.2%	2.4%	32.6%	42.0%	608	210	561	13
	Southern	157	42.4%	2.5%	37.6%	47.4%	370	271	613	11
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	501	23.0%	1.1%	20.9%	25.2%	2,181	542	2,342	49
	Northern	211	28.1%	2.2%	24.0%	32.6%	752	159	570	11
	Central	95	21.0%	2.0%	17.3%	25.1%	451	140	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	110	18.0%	1.9%	14.7%	22.0%	608	111	561	13
	Southern	85	23.1%	2.2%	19.0%	27.7%	370	132	613	11
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	66	3.0%	0.4%	2.3%	4.0%	2,181	66	2,342	49
	Northern	31	4.1%	0.9%	2.6%	6.4%	752	25	570	11
	Central	10	2.3%	0.8%	1.1%	4.5%	451	12	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	3.0%	0.9%	1.7%	5.2%	608	16	561	13
	Southern	7	1.8%	0.6%	0.9%	3.4%	370	13	613	11
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	676	31.0%	1.2%	28.7%	33.4%	2,181	684	2,342	49
	Northern	215	28.5%	2.2%	24.4%	33.0%	752	157	570	11
	Central	140	31.0%	2.4%	26.5%	35.9%	451	174	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	218	35.9%	2.4%	31.3%	40.8%	608	190	561	13
	Southern	103	27.9%	2.3%	23.6%	32.7%	370	163	613	11

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? We should import wood products we use from other states or countries instead of harvesting Indiana trees.



Table 53. Management Expectation: Indiana Forests are Shrinking

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	12	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.0%	2,183	13	2,352	39
	Northern	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	1.0%	751	1	571	10
	Central	4	1.0%	0.4%	0.4%	2.2%	451	6	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.5%	609	5	562	12
	Southern	1	0.2%	0.2%	0.0%	1.6%	372	1	617	7
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	64	2.9%	0.4%	2.3%	3.8%	2,183	87	2,352	39
	Northern	20	2.7%	0.8%	1.5%	4.8%	751	14	571	10
	Central	13	2.9%	0.7%	1.8%	4.6%	451	23	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	14	2.4%	0.7%	1.4%	4.2%	609	16	562	12
	Southern	17	4.5%	0.9%	3.0%	6.7%	372	34	617	7
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	886	40.6%	1.3%	38.1%	43.1%	2,183	955	2,352	39
	Northern	297	39.6%	2.4%	35.1%	44.3%	751	228	571	10
	Central	197	43.7%	2.5%	38.8%	48.7%	451	273	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	250	41.1%	2.5%	36.3%	46.0%	609	220	562	12
	Southern	142	38.1%	2.5%	33.4%	43.0%	372	234	617	7
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	377	17.3%	1.0%	15.4%	19.3%	2,183	372	2,352	39
	Northern	132	17.6%	1.9%	14.3%	21.6%	751	92	571	10
	Central	83	18.4%	2.1%	14.7%	22.8%	451	91	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	101	16.6%	1.8%	13.3%	20.5%	609	92	562	12
	Southern	60	16.2%	1.9%	12.8%	20.2%	372	97	617	7
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	844	38.7%	1.2%	36.3%	41.1%	2,183	925	2,352	39
	Northern	300	40.0%	2.4%	35.5%	44.7%	751	236	571	10
	Central	154	34.1%	2.4%	29.5%	39.0%	451	209	602	10
	Indianapolis M.A.	238	39.0%	2.4%	34.4%	43.8%	609	229	562	12
	Southern	152	41.0%	2.5%	36.2%	46.0%	372	251	617	7

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Indiana forests are shrinking.



Table 54. Management Expectation: Cut Trees for Housing

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	325	14.9%	0.9%	13.2%	16.8%	2,184	343	2,347	44
	Northern	116	15.5%	1.8%	12.3%	19.4%	750	80	569	12
	Central	64	14.2%	1.7%	11.1%	17.9%	452	91	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	86	14.1%	1.6%	11.2%	17.7%	610	87	562	12
	Southern	59	15.7%	1.9%	12.3%	19.9%	372	85	615	9
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	835	38.2%	1.2%	35.8%	40.7%	2,184	878	2,347	44
	Northern	297	39.6%	2.4%	35.1%	44.3%	750	218	569	12
	Central	178	39.3%	2.5%	34.4%	44.4%	452	222	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	230	37.7%	2.4%	33.1%	42.6%	610	210	562	12
	Southern	130	35.1%	2.4%	30.6%	39.9%	372	228	615	9
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	789	36.1%	1.2%	33.8%	38.6%	2,184	854	2,347	44
	Northern	275	36.6%	2.3%	32.2%	41.3%	750	216	569	12
	Central	163	36.0%	2.5%	31.3%	40.9%	452	218	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	213	34.8%	2.4%	30.4%	39.6%	610	201	562	12
	Southern	139	37.4%	2.5%	32.7%	42.4%	372	219	615	9
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	59	2.7%	0.4%	2.0%	3.6%	2,184	77	2,347	44
	Northern	22	3.0%	0.8%	1.8%	4.9%	750	21	569	12
	Central	12	2.6%	0.7%	1.6%	4.4%	452	19	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	14	2.3%	0.7%	1.2%	4.1%	610	15	562	12
	Southern	11	2.9%	0.8%	1.7%	5.0%	372	22	615	9
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	176	8.0%	0.7%	6.8%	9.5%	2,184	195	2,347	44
	Northern	39	5.3%	1.0%	3.6%	7.7%	750	34	569	12
	Central	36	8.0%	1.4%	5.7%	11.1%	452	51	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	68	11.1%	1.7%	8.2%	14.8%	610	49	562	12
	Southern	33	8.8%	1.3%	6.5%	11.8%	372	61	615	9

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Sometimes it is necessary to cut Indiana trees to make room for new homes.



Table 55. Management Expectation: Cut Trees to Protect from Insects and Disease

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	13	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.1%	2,196	13	2,367	24
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.0%	754	3	574	7
	Central	-	-	-	-	-	455	0	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	2.2%	614	4	567	7
	Southern	4	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	2.8%	373	6	619	5
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	43	1.9%	0.4%	1.3%	2.8%	2,196	35	2,367	24
	Northern	15	2.0%	0.7%	1.0%	3.9%	754	9	574	7
	Central	5	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.7%	455	7	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	13	2.1%	0.8%	1.0%	4.4%	614	9	567	7
	Southern	9	2.5%	1.0%	1.2%	5.3%	373	10	619	5
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,290	58.8%	1.3%	56.3%	61.2%	2,196	1,421	2,367	24
	Northern	445	59.0%	2.4%	54.3%	63.5%	754	340	574	7
	Central	274	60.3%	2.5%	55.3%	65.0%	455	370	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	358	58.4%	2.4%	53.6%	63.1%	614	341	567	7
	Southern	213	57.1%	2.5%	52.1%	61.9%	373	370	619	5
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	693	31.6%	1.2%	29.3%	33.9%	2,196	737	2,367	24
	Northern	233	30.9%	2.2%	26.8%	35.4%	754	181	574	7
	Central	149	32.7%	2.4%	28.2%	37.6%	455	194	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	193	31.4%	2.3%	27.1%	36.0%	614	175	567	7
	Southern	119	31.8%	2.4%	27.3%	36.6%	373	187	619	5
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	157	7.1%	0.7%	5.9%	8.6%	2,196	161	2,367	24
	Northern	57	7.6%	1.3%	5.4%	10.5%	754	41	574	7
	Central	27	5.9%	1.2%	4.0%	8.7%	455	36	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	45	7.3%	1.3%	5.1%	10.4%	614	38	567	7
	Southern	28	7.5%	1.3%	5.2%	10.6%	373	46	619	5

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to protect Indiana forests and woodlands from the spread of insects and diseases.



Table 56. Forest Management: Cut Some Trees for Wildfire Protection

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	22	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.7%	2,192	21	2,362	29
	Northern	9	1.2%	0.6%	0.5%	3.0%	753	6	573	8
	Central	2	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.8%	454	4	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	3.0%	613	6	566	8
	Southern	4	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.6%	373	5	619	5
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	149	6.8%	0.7%	5.6%	8.2%	2,192	146	2,362	29
	Northern	51	6.7%	1.3%	4.6%	9.7%	753	33	573	8
	Central	31	6.9%	1.2%	4.8%	9.8%	454	41	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	43	7.0%	1.4%	4.7%	10.3%	613	32	566	8
	Southern	24	6.4%	1.2%	4.4%	9.1%	373	40	619	5
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,273	58.1%	1.3%	55.6%	60.5%	2,192	1,400	2,362	29
	Northern	442	58.7%	2.4%	53.9%	63.2%	753	343	573	8
	Central	268	59.2%	2.5%	54.2%	64.0%	454	357	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	349	56.9%	2.5%	52.0%	61.6%	613	331	566	8
	Southern	214	57.5%	2.5%	52.6%	62.4%	373	369	619	5
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	517	23.6%	1.1%	21.6%	25.7%	2,192	567	2,362	29
	Northern	166	22.1%	2.0%	18.5%	26.2%	753	130	573	8
	Central	107	23.5%	2.1%	19.6%	27.9%	454	147	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	147	23.9%	2.1%	20.1%	28.2%	613	141	566	8
	Southern	97	26.1%	2.3%	21.9%	30.8%	373	149	619	5
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	231	10.5%	0.8%	9.0%	12.3%	2,192	228	2,362	29
	Northern	85	11.3%	1.6%	8.6%	14.8%	753	61	573	8
	Central	45	9.9%	1.7%	7.1%	13.7%	454	55	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	68	11.0%	1.6%	8.2%	14.6%	613	56	566	8
	Southern	33	9.0%	1.4%	6.5%	12.2%	373	56	619	5

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to protect Indiana forests and woodlands from wildfire.



Table 57. Management Expectation: Cut Some Trees to Support Biodiversity

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	15	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	1.2%	2,185	18	2,352	39
	Northern	5	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.8%	753	4	572	9
	Central	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	1.2%	450	4	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	2.1%	610	3	562	12
	Southern	5	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	3.0%	372	7	617	7
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	111	5.1%	0.6%	4.1%	6.3%	2,185	127	2,352	39
	Northern	41	5.5%	1.1%	3.7%	8.1%	753	33	572	9
	Central	22	5.0%	1.1%	3.2%	7.6%	450	31	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	24	3.9%	1.0%	2.4%	6.4%	610	24	562	12
	Southern	23	6.3%	1.3%	4.2%	9.2%	372	39	617	7
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,228	56.2%	1.3%	53.7%	58.7%	2,185	1,351	2,352	39
	Northern	415	55.1%	2.4%	50.4%	59.8%	753	323	572	9
	Central	280	62.1%	2.4%	57.2%	66.8%	450	365	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	334	54.9%	2.5%	50.0%	59.6%	610	312	562	12
	Southern	199	53.3%	2.5%	48.3%	58.3%	372	351	617	7
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	460	21.1%	1.0%	19.1%	23.2%	2,185	469	2,352	39
	Northern	150	19.9%	2.0%	16.3%	24.0%	753	106	572	9
	Central	89	19.7%	2.0%	16.1%	23.9%	450	120	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	134	21.9%	2.1%	18.1%	26.2%	610	118	562	12
	Southern	88	23.6%	2.3%	19.4%	28.3%	372	125	617	7
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	371	17.0%	1.0%	15.2%	19.0%	2,185	387	2,352	39
	Northern	142	18.9%	1.9%	15.5%	22.8%	753	106	572	9
	Central	57	12.8%	1.7%	9.9%	16.4%	450	81	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	114	18.7%	1.9%	15.2%	22.8%	610	105	562	12
	Southern	58	15.5%	1.9%	12.1%	19.5%	372	95	617	7

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to help grow more diverse forests that support biodiversity.



Table 58. Management Expectation: Cut Some Trees to Improve Forest Health

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	13	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.2%	2,188	13	2,358	33
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.0%	752	3	574	7
	Central	1	0.2%	0.2%	0.1%	0.8%	452	3	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.6%	611	4	563	11
	Southern	2	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	2.1%	373	3	620	4
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	53	2.4%	0.4%	1.7%	3.4%	2,188	49	2,358	33
	Northern	22	2.9%	0.9%	1.6%	5.2%	752	14	574	7
	Central	16	3.5%	1.1%	1.9%	6.5%	452	16	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	9	1.4%	0.6%	0.7%	3.1%	611	9	563	11
	Southern	6	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	3.7%	373	10	620	4
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,337	61.1%	1.3%	58.6%	63.5%	2,188	1,488	2,358	33
	Northern	469	62.4%	2.3%	57.8%	66.9%	752	368	574	7
	Central	294	65.0%	2.4%	60.1%	69.7%	452	392	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	361	59.1%	2.5%	54.2%	63.8%	611	348	563	11
	Southern	213	57.0%	2.5%	52.0%	61.9%	373	380	620	4
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	572	26.2%	1.1%	24.0%	28.4%	2,188	596	2,358	33
	Northern	191	25.4%	2.1%	21.5%	29.7%	752	140	574	7
	Central	103	22.8%	2.1%	19.0%	27.1%	452	142	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	164	26.9%	2.2%	22.8%	31.4%	611	144	563	11
	Southern	114	30.6%	2.4%	26.1%	35.5%	373	170	620	4
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	213	9.7%	0.8%	8.3%	11.3%	2,188	212	2,358	33
	Northern	65	8.7%	1.4%	6.4%	11.8%	752	49	574	7
	Central	38	8.4%	1.5%	5.9%	11.8%	452	48	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	71	11.7%	1.7%	8.8%	15.4%	611	58	563	11
	Southern	38	10.1%	1.6%	7.4%	13.7%	373	57	620	4

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to improve the health of Indiana forests and woodlands.





Table 59. Management Expectation: For Carbon Storage, No Trees Should Be Cut

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	172	7.9%	0.7%	6.6%	9.3%	2,188	189	2,353	38
	Northern	58	7.7%	1.3%	5.5%	10.7%	753	43	574	7
	Central	33	7.4%	1.2%	5.3%	10.2%	452	47	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	58	9.5%	1.5%	7.0%	12.8%	611	52	563	11
	Southern	23	6.2%	1.0%	4.4%	8.5%	371	47	615	9
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	1,017	46.5%	1.3%	44.0%	49.0%	2,188	1,168	2,353	38
	Northern	356	47.3%	2.4%	42.6%	52.0%	753	280	574	7
	Central	217	47.9%	2.6%	42.9%	52.9%	452	301	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	255	41.8%	2.4%	37.1%	46.6%	611	261	563	11
	Southern	189	50.9%	2.5%	45.9%	55.8%	371	326	615	9
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	369	16.9%	1.0%	15.0%	18.9%	2,188	370	2,353	38
	Northern	128	16.9%	1.8%	13.7%	20.8%	753	93	574	7
	Central	86	19.0%	2.1%	15.2%	23.6%	452	100	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	99	16.2%	1.9%	12.8%	20.3%	611	85	563	11
	Southern	56	15.1%	1.8%	11.8%	19.0%	371	92	615	9
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	117	5.3%	0.6%	4.3%	6.6%	2,188	113	2,353	38
	Northern	37	4.9%	1.0%	3.2%	7.4%	753	28	574	7
	Central	21	4.6%	1.1%	2.9%	7.3%	452	27	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	36	5.8%	1.2%	3.9%	8.7%	611	28	563	11
	Southern	23	6.2%	1.3%	4.1%	9.3%	371	30	615	9
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	513	23.5%	1.1%	21.4%	25.7%	2,188	513	2,353	38
	Northern	174	23.2%	2.0%	19.4%	27.4%	753	130	574	7
	Central	96	21.1%	2.1%	17.2%	25.6%	452	126	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	163	26.7%	2.3%	22.5%	31.3%	611	137	563	11
	Southern	80	21.7%	2.2%	17.6%	26.3%	371	120	615	9

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? To help absorb and store carbon from the Earth's atmosphere, no trees should be harvested from Indiana forests and woodlands.



Table 60. Management Expectation: Balance Management

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	36	1.7%	0.3%	1.1%	2.4%	2,189	40	2,355	36
	Northern	12	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	3.6%	754	7	574	7
	Central	8	1.7%	0.8%	0.6%	4.3%	453	8	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	2.1%	611	7	563	11
	Southern	11	3.0%	0.8%	1.8%	5.1%	371	18	614	10
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	145	6.6%	0.6%	5.5%	7.9%	2,189	156	2,355	36
	Northern	55	7.3%	1.2%	5.2%	10.2%	754	43	574	7
	Central	23	5.1%	1.1%	3.4%	7.7%	453	30	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	36	5.8%	1.1%	4.0%	8.5%	611	33	563	11
	Southern	30	8.2%	1.4%	5.8%	11.5%	371	50	614	10
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,252	57.2%	1.3%	54.7%	59.6%	2,189	1,385	2,355	36
	Northern	436	57.9%	2.4%	53.2%	62.4%	754	329	574	7
	Central	267	58.8%	2.5%	53.8%	63.7%	453	368	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	347	56.8%	2.5%	51.9%	61.6%	611	335	563	11
	Southern	201	54.3%	2.5%	49.2%	59.2%	371	353	614	10
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	542	24.8%	1.1%	22.7%	27.0%	2,189	537	2,355	36
	Northern	179	23.8%	2.1%	20.0%	28.0%	754	135	574	7
	Central	112	24.7%	2.2%	20.6%	29.3%	453	135	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	159	26.1%	2.2%	22.0%	30.6%	611	133	563	11
	Southern	92	24.9%	2.3%	20.7%	29.6%	371	134	614	10
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	214	9.8%	0.7%	8.4%	11.4%	2,189	237	2,355	36
	Northern	71	9.4%	1.3%	7.1%	12.4%	754	60	574	7
	Central	44	9.7%	1.5%	7.2%	13.0%	453	63	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	64	10.4%	1.5%	7.7%	13.9%	611	55	563	11
	Southern	36	9.6%	1.5%	7.0%	13.0%	371	59	614	10

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Indiana forests and woodlands should be managed for a balance of wood products, environmental benefits, biodiversity, and outdoor recreation benefits.



Table 61. Management Expectation: Overseen by Professional Forester

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	42	1.9%	0.3%	1.4%	2.7%	2,190	50	2,359	32
	Northern	16	2.1%	0.8%	1.0%	4.3%	753	9	573	8
	Central	9	2.0%	0.6%	1.1%	3.5%	452	15	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.3%	0.5%	0.6%	2.7%	612	9	564	10
	Southern	9	2.5%	0.7%	1.5%	4.3%	373	17	618	6
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	169	7.7%	0.7%	6.5%	9.1%	2,190	190	2,359	32
	Northern	69	9.1%	1.4%	6.8%	12.2%	753	57	573	8
	Central	35	7.7%	1.3%	5.5%	10.7%	452	49	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	34	5.5%	1.1%	3.7%	8.2%	612	31	564	10
	Southern	32	8.5%	1.4%	6.2%	11.7%	373	53	618	6
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	921	42.0%	1.2%	39.6%	44.5%	2,190	1,071	2,359	32
	Northern	337	44.8%	2.4%	40.2%	49.5%	753	268	573	8
	Central	192	42.3%	2.5%	37.5%	47.3%	452	277	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	240	39.2%	2.4%	34.6%	43.9%	612	252	564	10
	Southern	152	40.9%	2.5%	36.2%	45.8%	373	274	618	6
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	903	41.3%	1.3%	38.8%	43.8%	2,190	899	2,359	32
	Northern	264	35.1%	2.3%	30.7%	39.8%	753	190	573	8
	Central	193	42.7%	2.6%	37.8%	47.8%	452	230	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	286	46.8%	2.5%	42.0%	51.7%	612	240	564	10
	Southern	159	42.8%	2.5%	37.9%	47.8%	373	239	618	6
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	154	7.1%	0.7%	5.8%	8.5%	2,190	149	2,359	32
	Northern	67	8.9%	1.4%	6.5%	12.0%	753	49	573	8
	Central	24	5.3%	1.1%	3.5%	7.8%	452	33	604	8
	Indianapolis M.A.	44	7.2%	1.4%	4.9%	10.4%	612	32	564	10
	Southern	20	5.3%	1.0%	3.5%	7.7%	373	35	618	6

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? Any activities that involve harvesting Indiana trees should be overseen by professional foresters.



Table 62. Familiarity with Indiana Department of Natural Resources

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Never heard of it	Statewide	89	4.1%	0.5%	3.1%	5.3%	2,199	81	2,364	27
	Northern	30	4.0%	1.0%	2.5%	6.4%	757	19	573	8
	Central	18	4.0%	1.1%	2.3%	6.9%	456	17	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	27	4.4%	1.1%	2.7%	7.0%	615	22	569	5
	Southern	14	3.8%	1.0%	2.2%	6.3%	371	23	614	10
Slightly familiar	Statewide	655	29.8%	1.2%	27.5%	32.1%	2,199	711	2,364	27
	Northern	238	31.4%	2.2%	27.3%	35.9%	757	188	573	8
	Central	129	28.2%	2.2%	24.0%	32.8%	456	183	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	186	30.2%	2.3%	26.0%	34.8%	615	171	569	5
	Southern	102	27.5%	2.3%	23.3%	32.3%	371	169	614	10
Somewhat familiar	Statewide	639	29.1%	1.1%	26.9%	31.4%	2,199	702	2,364	27
	Northern	213	28.2%	2.1%	24.2%	32.5%	757	175	573	8
	Central	143	31.2%	2.4%	26.7%	36.2%	456	178	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	181	29.5%	2.2%	25.3%	34.1%	615	169	569	5
	Southern	102	27.5%	2.2%	23.4%	32.1%	371	180	614	10
Moderately familiar	Statewide	576	26.2%	1.1%	24.0%	28.5%	2,199	617	2,364	27
	Northern	194	25.7%	2.2%	21.7%	30.1%	757	134	573	8
	Central	107	23.4%	2.1%	19.6%	27.7%	456	155	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	164	26.8%	2.2%	22.7%	31.3%	615	152	569	5
	Southern	111	29.8%	2.4%	25.4%	34.6%	371	176	614	10
Extremely familiar	Statewide	240	10.9%	0.8%	9.4%	12.6%	2,199	253	2,364	27
	Northern	81	10.7%	1.5%	8.1%	14.1%	757	57	573	8
	Central	60	13.2%	1.8%	10.1%	17.0%	456	75	608	4
	Indianapolis M.A.	56	9.2%	1.4%	6.8%	12.3%	615	55	569	5
	Southern	42	11.4%	1.6%	8.6%	14.8%	371	66	614	10

Table 63. Met Anyone from Indiana DNR

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Yes	Statewide	1,334	66.2%	1.3%	63.6%	68.6%	2,017	1,480	2,157	234
	Northern	447	64.7%	2.4%	59.8%	69.2%	692	340	518	63
	Central	302	72.0%	2.4%	67.0%	76.6%	419	410	559	53
	Indianapolis M.A.	345	60.9%	2.5%	55.8%	65.7%	566	328	521	53
	Southern	241	70.8%	2.4%	65.8%	75.3%	340	402	559	65



Table 64. Familiarity with Division of Forestry

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Never heard of it	Statewide	651	30.0%	1.2%	27.6%	32.4%	2,174	607	2,322	69
	Northern	253	33.7%	2.3%	29.3%	38.4%	751	177	566	15
	Central	115	25.8%	2.4%	21.4%	30.7%	447	137	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	203	33.2%	2.4%	28.7%	38.0%	611	170	565	9
	Southern	80	21.9%	2.2%	17.9%	26.6%	365	123	600	24
Slightly familiar	Statewide	940	43.3%	1.3%	40.8%	45.8%	2,174	1,045	2,322	69
	Northern	317	42.1%	2.4%	37.6%	46.9%	751	248	566	15
	Central	204	45.6%	2.6%	40.6%	50.6%	447	282	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	267	43.6%	2.5%	38.9%	48.5%	611	251	565	9
	Southern	153	42.0%	2.5%	37.2%	47.0%	365	264	600	24
Somewhat familiar	Statewide	396	18.2%	1.0%	16.4%	20.2%	2,174	453	2,322	69
	Northern	126	16.8%	1.8%	13.6%	20.6%	751	103	566	15
	Central	86	19.1%	2.1%	15.4%	23.5%	447	109	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	97	15.9%	1.8%	12.7%	19.6%	611	98	565	9
	Southern	87	23.9%	2.2%	19.9%	28.4%	365	143	600	24
Moderately familiar	Statewide	137	6.3%	0.6%	5.2%	7.6%	2,174	159	2,322	69
	Northern	38	5.0%	1.1%	3.3%	7.7%	751	26	566	15
	Central	29	6.5%	1.2%	4.5%	9.3%	447	43	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	35	5.7%	1.1%	3.9%	8.3%	611	36	565	9
	Southern	35	9.5%	1.6%	6.8%	13.0%	365	54	600	24
Extremely familiar	Statewide	50	2.3%	0.4%	1.7%	3.1%	2,174	58	2,322	69
	Northern	17	2.3%	0.7%	1.2%	4.3%	751	12	566	15
	Central	13	3.0%	0.7%	1.8%	4.8%	447	20	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	10	1.6%	0.6%	0.8%	3.4%	611	10	565	9
	Southern	10	2.7%	0.8%	1.5%	4.6%	365	16	600	24



Table 65. Associations with the Division of Forestry

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Camping</b>	Statewide	610	27.8%	1.1%	25.6%	30.0%	2,195	720	2,355	36
	Northern	216	28.7%	2.1%	24.7%	33.1%	753	179	570	11
	Central	126	27.6%	2.2%	23.5%	32.0%	456	192	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	157	25.4%	2.2%	21.4%	29.9%	616	147	569	5
	Southern	111	30.0%	2.3%	25.7%	34.7%	371	202	610	14
<b>Environmental conservation</b>	Statewide	1,360	61.9%	1.2%	59.5%	64.3%	2,195	1,461	2,355	36
	Northern	481	63.8%	2.3%	59.2%	68.2%	753	363	570	11
	Central	278	60.9%	2.5%	55.9%	65.8%	456	387	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	377	61.3%	2.4%	56.5%	65.9%	616	346	569	5
	Southern	224	60.4%	2.5%	55.5%	65.2%	371	365	610	14
<b>Cutting trees/ timber/ timber harvest</b>	Statewide	804	36.6%	1.2%	34.2%	39.0%	2,195	883	2,355	36
	Northern	272	36.1%	2.3%	31.7%	40.8%	753	202	570	11
	Central	169	37.1%	2.4%	32.5%	41.9%	456	242	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	235	38.1%	2.4%	33.6%	42.9%	616	233	569	5
	Southern	128	34.5%	2.4%	29.8%	39.4%	371	206	610	14
<b>Fishing</b>	Statewide	580	26.4%	1.1%	24.3%	28.6%	2,195	702	2,355	36
	Northern	200	26.5%	2.1%	22.7%	30.8%	753	166	570	11
	Central	124	27.3%	2.2%	23.2%	31.8%	456	191	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	151	24.6%	2.1%	20.7%	28.9%	616	151	569	5
	Southern	105	28.2%	2.2%	24.1%	32.7%	371	194	610	14
<b>Wildfire fighting</b>	Statewide	672	30.6%	1.2%	28.4%	32.9%	2,195	756	2,355	36
	Northern	234	31.1%	2.2%	26.9%	35.6%	753	185	570	11
	Central	136	29.9%	2.2%	25.7%	34.5%	456	205	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	200	32.5%	2.3%	28.2%	37.1%	616	196	569	5
	Southern	101	27.3%	2.2%	23.1%	31.9%	371	170	610	14
<b>Forest management</b>	Statewide	1,608	73.3%	1.1%	71.0%	75.4%	2,195	1,734	2,355	36
	Northern	554	73.5%	2.1%	69.1%	77.5%	753	416	570	11
	Central	321	70.4%	2.4%	65.4%	74.9%	456	449	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	463	75.1%	2.1%	70.7%	79.1%	616	431	569	5
	Southern	271	73.1%	2.2%	68.6%	77.2%	371	438	610	14
<b>Helping forest/ private landowners</b>	Statewide	622	28.3%	1.1%	26.2%	30.6%	2,195	721	2,355	36
	Northern	210	27.9%	2.1%	23.9%	32.2%	753	170	570	11
	Central	135	29.5%	2.2%	25.3%	34.1%	456	202	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	158	25.6%	2.1%	21.7%	30.0%	616	152	569	5
	Southern	119	32.2%	2.4%	27.7%	37.0%	371	197	610	14
<b>Hunting</b>	Statewide	657	29.9%	1.1%	27.8%	32.2%	2,195	793	2,355	36
	Northern	223	29.6%	2.1%	25.5%	33.9%	753	187	570	11
	Central	150	32.9%	2.3%	28.5%	37.5%	456	226	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	166	26.9%	2.2%	22.9%	31.4%	616	161	569	5
	Southern	119	32.1%	2.3%	27.7%	36.8%	371	219	610	14
<b>Natural resources</b>	Statewide	1,122	51.1%	1.3%	48.6%	53.6%	2,195	1,292	2,355	36
	Northern	406	53.9%	2.4%	49.1%	58.5%	753	321	570	11
	Central	223	48.9%	2.5%	44.0%	53.9%	456	339	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	306	49.7%	2.5%	44.9%	54.6%	616	302	569	5
	Southern	187	50.4%	2.5%	45.4%	55.4%	371	330	610	14



Table 65 (continued). Associations with the Division of Forestry

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Outdoor recreation	Statewide	655	29.8%	1.1%	27.7%	32.1%	2,195	814	2,355	36
	Northern	219	29.1%	2.1%	25.2%	33.3%	753	197	570	11
	Central	151	33.1%	2.3%	28.7%	37.8%	456	229	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	166	26.9%	2.1%	22.9%	31.3%	616	165	569	5
	Southern	119	32.2%	2.3%	27.8%	36.9%	371	223	610	14
Parks	Statewide	1,081	49.2%	1.3%	46.7%	51.7%	2,195	1,187	2,355	36
	Northern	357	47.4%	2.4%	42.7%	52.1%	753	285	570	11
	Central	231	50.6%	2.6%	45.7%	55.6%	456	315	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	297	48.2%	2.5%	43.4%	53.0%	616	274	569	5
	Southern	196	52.9%	2.5%	47.9%	57.8%	371	313	610	14
Planting trees	Statewide	1,165	53.1%	1.3%	50.6%	55.5%	2,195	1,272	2,355	36
	Northern	431	57.2%	2.4%	52.5%	61.8%	753	325	570	11
	Central	223	49.0%	2.5%	44.0%	54.0%	456	326	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	323	52.5%	2.5%	47.6%	57.3%	616	308	569	5
	Southern	188	50.7%	2.5%	45.7%	55.6%	371	313	610	14
Smokey Bear	Statewide	555	25.3%	1.1%	23.2%	27.5%	2,195	600	2,355	36
	Northern	187	24.8%	2.1%	20.9%	29.1%	753	138	570	11
	Central	113	24.7%	2.2%	20.7%	29.2%	456	160	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	154	25.0%	2.1%	21.1%	29.4%	616	142	569	5
	Southern	102	27.5%	2.3%	23.2%	32.2%	371	160	610	14
Streams/ lakes	Statewide	623	28.4%	1.1%	26.2%	30.6%	2,195	769	2,355	36
	Northern	219	29.1%	2.1%	25.1%	33.5%	753	180	570	11
	Central	123	26.9%	2.1%	23.0%	31.2%	456	202	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	161	26.2%	2.1%	22.3%	30.5%	616	168	569	5
	Southern	120	32.3%	2.3%	27.9%	37.1%	371	219	610	14
Water quality	Statewide	533	24.3%	1.1%	22.3%	26.4%	2,195	651	2,355	36
	Northern	189	25.1%	2.0%	21.4%	29.3%	753	163	570	11
	Central	112	24.5%	2.1%	20.6%	28.8%	456	173	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	137	22.3%	2.0%	18.6%	26.5%	616	141	569	5
	Southern	95	25.7%	2.1%	21.7%	30.2%	371	174	610	14
Wildlife management	Statewide	1,052	47.9%	1.3%	45.4%	50.4%	2,195	1,162	2,355	36
	Northern	355	47.1%	2.4%	42.5%	51.9%	753	276	570	11
	Central	213	46.7%	2.5%	41.8%	51.7%	456	301	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	294	47.7%	2.5%	42.9%	52.5%	616	274	569	5
	Southern	190	51.3%	2.5%	46.3%	56.3%	371	311	610	14
Wildlife viewing/ birdwatching	Statewide	457	20.8%	1.0%	19.0%	22.8%	2,195	566	2,355	36
	Northern	142	18.8%	1.8%	15.6%	22.5%	753	128	570	11
	Central	101	22.1%	2.0%	18.4%	26.2%	456	155	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	124	20.1%	1.9%	16.6%	24.1%	616	124	569	5
	Southern	91	24.6%	2.2%	20.5%	29.1%	371	159	610	14
I don't know what it does	Statewide	135	6.1%	0.6%	5.0%	7.5%	2,195	143	2,355	36
	Northern	48	6.3%	1.2%	4.4%	9.1%	753	35	570	11
	Central	26	5.7%	1.2%	3.7%	8.6%	456	31	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	44	7.1%	1.2%	5.1%	9.9%	616	44	569	5
	Southern	18	4.7%	1.0%	3.1%	7.1%	371	33	610	14





Table 65 (continued). Associations with the Division of Forestry

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>I've never heard of it</b>	Statewide	98	4.5%	0.6%	3.5%	5.7%	2,195	89	2,355	36
	Northern	40	5.4%	1.1%	3.5%	8.1%	753	27	570	11
	Central	15	3.4%	0.9%	1.9%	5.7%	456	18	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	29	4.6%	1.1%	2.8%	7.4%	616	20	569	5
	Southern	14	3.6%	0.8%	2.3%	5.6%	371	24	610	14
<b>Other</b>	Statewide	38	1.7%	0.4%	1.2%	2.6%	2,195	34	2,355	36
	Northern	12	1.6%	0.6%	0.7%	3.5%	753	9	570	11
	Central	7	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.4%	456	9	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	13	2.1%	0.8%	1.0%	4.5%	616	8	569	5
	Southern	6	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%	3.5%	371	8	610	14

Table 66. Division of Forestry Advise Landowners on Timber Harvests

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	114	5.3%	0.5%	4.3%	6.5%	2,159	139	2,325	66
	Northern	38	5.1%	1.1%	3.4%	7.7%	741	30	564	17
	Central	20	4.4%	0.9%	3.0%	6.5%	449	34	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	30	5.0%	1.0%	3.3%	7.5%	605	31	562	12
	Southern	26	7.1%	1.3%	5.0%	10.0%	364	44	601	23
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	452	20.9%	1.0%	19.0%	23.1%	2,159	479	2,325	66
	Northern	159	21.4%	2.0%	17.8%	25.6%	741	120	564	17
	Central	96	21.5%	2.1%	17.7%	25.8%	449	127	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	118	19.6%	2.0%	15.9%	23.8%	605	102	562	12
	Southern	79	21.6%	2.1%	17.8%	26.0%	364	130	601	23
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	924	42.8%	1.3%	40.3%	45.3%	2,159	1,033	2,325	66
	Northern	312	42.1%	2.4%	37.5%	46.9%	741	244	564	17
	Central	217	48.2%	2.6%	43.2%	53.3%	449	286	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	262	43.3%	2.5%	38.6%	48.2%	605	253	562	12
	Southern	133	36.6%	2.4%	32.0%	41.4%	364	250	601	23
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	138	6.4%	0.6%	5.3%	7.7%	2,159	147	2,325	66
	Northern	34	4.7%	1.0%	3.0%	7.1%	741	26	564	17
	Central	27	6.1%	1.2%	4.1%	9.0%	449	33	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	43	7.0%	1.3%	4.9%	10.0%	605	38	562	12
	Southern	34	9.3%	1.6%	6.6%	12.9%	364	50	601	23
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	530	24.6%	1.1%	22.4%	26.8%	2,159	527	2,325	66
	Northern	197	26.6%	2.2%	22.6%	31.1%	741	144	564	17
	Central	89	19.8%	2.1%	16.0%	24.2%	449	118	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	152	25.1%	2.2%	21.1%	29.5%	605	138	562	12
	Southern	93	25.4%	2.4%	21.1%	30.4%	364	127	601	23

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? It is the job of DoF to advise Indiana landowners on how many and what kinds of trees they might harvest and sell.



Table 67. Rating of Division of Forestry on Managing Indiana's Forests

Region	Weighted					Unweighted	
	Count	Mean	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Count	Missing Cases
Statewide	2,017	6.48	0.044	6.40	6.57	2,148	243
Northern	692	6.39	0.085	6.23	6.56	513	68
Central	424	6.60	0.088	6.43	6.77	563	49
Indianapolis Metro Area	562	6.41	0.076	6.26	6.56	517	57
Southern	339	6.65	0.096	6.46	6.83	555	69

Note: On a scale of 1 to 10, how poorly or well do you think the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry is doing in terms of managing forests and woodlands in Indiana? (1 = very poorly and 10 = very well)

Table 68. Familiarity with Private Forestland Green Certification Program

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Never heard of it	Statewide	1,953	88.7%	0.8%	87.1%	90.2%	2,201	2,064	2,368	23
	Northern	655	86.5%	1.7%	82.9%	89.5%	757	498	574	7
	Central	398	87.2%	1.6%	83.7%	90.1%	456	517	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	576	93.7%	1.0%	91.4%	95.5%	614	521	568	6
	Southern	324	86.7%	1.7%	82.9%	89.7%	374	528	619	5
Slightly familiar	Statewide	158	7.2%	0.6%	6.1%	8.5%	2,201	205	2,368	23
	Northern	65	8.5%	1.3%	6.3%	11.5%	757	53	574	7
	Central	39	8.6%	1.3%	6.4%	11.5%	456	64	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	24	4.0%	0.9%	2.6%	6.1%	614	27	568	6
	Southern	30	8.1%	1.3%	5.8%	11.0%	374	61	619	5
Somewhat familiar	Statewide	57	2.6%	0.4%	1.9%	3.5%	2,201	65	2,368	23
	Northern	24	3.1%	0.9%	1.8%	5.3%	757	16	574	7
	Central	11	2.5%	0.9%	1.2%	5.0%	456	15	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	9	1.5%	0.4%	0.8%	2.6%	614	14	568	6
	Southern	13	3.4%	1.0%	1.9%	6.1%	374	20	619	5
Moderately familiar	Statewide	28	1.3%	0.3%	0.8%	2.0%	2,201	28	2,368	23
	Northern	11	1.5%	0.6%	0.6%	3.5%	757	6	574	7
	Central	7	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.5%	456	10	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.8%	0.4%	0.4%	1.9%	614	6	568	6
	Southern	5	1.3%	0.7%	0.5%	3.5%	374	6	619	5
Extremely familiar	Statewide	5	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%	2,201	6	2,368	23
	Northern	2	0.3%	0.3%	0.0%	2.3%	757	1	574	7
	Central	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	456	1	607	5
	Indianapolis M.A.	-	-	-	-	-	614	-	568	6
	Southern	2	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%	374	4	619	5

Note: Before reading this description, what was your level of familiarity with the Private Forestland Green Certification Program in Indiana?



Table 69. Support for Private Forestland Green Certification Program

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Very Against</b>	Statewide	19	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	1.4%	2,185	24	2,339	52
	Northern	5	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.8%	750	4	567	14
	Central	6	1.5%	0.5%	0.7%	2.9%	452	10	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.6%	613	2	565	9
	Southern	5	1.2%	0.5%	0.6%	2.8%	370	8	610	14
<b>Against</b>	Statewide	29	1.3%	0.3%	0.9%	2.0%	2,185	38	2,339	52
	Northern	16	2.1%	0.7%	1.1%	4.0%	750	13	567	14
	Central	3	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	1.5%	452	6	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	0.9%	0.3%	0.5%	1.8%	613	10	565	9
	Southern	4	1.1%	0.4%	0.5%	2.4%	370	9	610	14
<b>Neither Supportive nor Against</b>	Statewide	820	37.5%	1.2%	35.2%	40.0%	2,185	963	2,339	52
	Northern	308	41.0%	2.4%	36.5%	45.7%	750	245	567	14
	Central	153	33.9%	2.4%	29.5%	38.7%	452	229	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	208	33.9%	2.3%	29.6%	38.6%	613	214	565	9
	Southern	151	40.8%	2.5%	36.0%	45.7%	370	275	610	14
<b>Supportive</b>	Statewide	1,032	47.2%	1.3%	44.7%	49.7%	2,185	1,073	2,339	52
	Northern	330	44.0%	2.4%	39.4%	48.8%	750	247	567	14
	Central	227	50.3%	2.6%	45.3%	55.4%	452	290	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	306	50.0%	2.5%	45.1%	54.8%	613	274	565	9
	Southern	168	45.4%	2.5%	40.5%	50.4%	370	262	610	14
<b>Very Supportive</b>	Statewide	285	13.1%	0.9%	11.4%	15.0%	2,185	241	2,339	52
	Northern	91	12.2%	1.7%	9.3%	15.8%	750	58	567	14
	Central	61	13.6%	1.9%	10.3%	17.7%	452	62	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	90	14.7%	1.9%	11.4%	18.8%	613	65	565	9
	Southern	42	11.4%	1.7%	8.4%	15.3%	370	56	610	14

Note: After reading the description about the Private Forestland Green Certification Program in Indiana, what is your opinion about this program?



Table 70. Familiarity with Classified Forest and Wildlands Program

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Never heard of it	Statewide	1,668	75.9%	1.1%	73.8%	77.9%	2,198	1,702	2,361	30
	Northern	564	74.5%	2.1%	70.2%	78.3%	757	424	574	7
	Central	330	72.5%	2.2%	68.0%	76.7%	455	411	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	517	84.2%	1.7%	80.7%	87.3%	614	458	566	8
	Southern	257	69.0%	2.3%	64.3%	73.4%	372	409	616	8
Slightly familiar	Statewide	262	11.9%	0.8%	10.5%	13.6%	2,198	339	2,361	30
	Northern	96	12.7%	1.6%	10.0%	16.1%	757	80	574	7
	Central	57	12.5%	1.6%	9.7%	16.0%	455	95	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	53	8.6%	1.3%	6.3%	11.5%	614	56	566	8
	Southern	56	15.1%	1.8%	12.0%	19.0%	372	108	616	8
Somewhat familiar	Statewide	168	7.6%	0.7%	6.4%	9.0%	2,198	200	2,361	30
	Northern	63	8.3%	1.4%	6.0%	11.4%	757	46	574	7
	Central	41	9.1%	1.3%	6.8%	12.0%	455	67	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	31	5.1%	1.0%	3.4%	7.6%	614	32	566	8
	Southern	32	8.7%	1.4%	6.3%	11.9%	372	55	616	8
Moderately familiar	Statewide	62	2.8%	0.4%	2.1%	3.8%	2,198	76	2,361	30
	Northern	16	2.2%	0.7%	1.2%	4.1%	757	13	574	7
	Central	21	4.6%	1.2%	2.7%	7.5%	455	23	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	1.0%	0.3%	0.5%	1.9%	614	9	566	8
	Southern	19	5.1%	1.2%	3.3%	7.9%	372	31	616	8
Extremely familiar	Statewide	38	1.7%	0.3%	1.2%	2.5%	2,198	44	2,361	30
	Northern	17	2.3%	0.8%	1.2%	4.4%	757	11	574	7
	Central	6	1.3%	0.5%	0.6%	2.7%	455	9	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	7	1.1%	0.3%	0.6%	2.0%	614	11	566	8
	Southern	8	2.0%	0.8%	1.0%	4.1%	372	13	616	8

Note: Before reading this description, what was your level of familiarity with the Classified Forest and Wildlands Program in Indiana?



Table 71. Support for Classified Forest and Wildlands Program

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Very Against</b>	Statewide	14	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.1%	2,191	18	2,353	38
	Northern	3	0.3%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%	753	2	569	12
	Central	3	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%	453	5	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	2.4%	614	3	566	8
	Southern	5	1.2%	0.5%	0.6%	2.8%	371	8	615	9
<b>Against</b>	Statewide	36	1.7%	0.3%	1.1%	2.4%	2,191	45	2,353	38
	Northern	20	2.7%	0.8%	1.5%	4.7%	753	14	569	12
	Central	8	1.8%	0.6%	0.9%	3.4%	453	13	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.9%	614	5	566	8
	Southern	6	1.5%	0.5%	0.8%	2.9%	371	13	615	9
<b>Neither Supportive nor Against</b>	Statewide	658	30.0%	1.2%	27.8%	32.3%	2,191	766	2,353	38
	Northern	252	33.5%	2.3%	29.2%	38.0%	753	205	569	12
	Central	126	27.8%	2.2%	23.6%	32.4%	453	187	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	169	27.5%	2.2%	23.5%	31.9%	614	172	566	8
	Southern	111	29.9%	2.3%	25.6%	34.5%	371	202	615	9
<b>Supportive</b>	Statewide	1,156	52.8%	1.3%	50.3%	55.3%	2,191	1,226	2,353	38
	Northern	375	49.9%	2.4%	45.2%	54.6%	753	285	569	12
	Central	235	51.8%	2.6%	46.8%	56.8%	453	311	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	343	55.9%	2.5%	51.0%	60.6%	614	309	566	8
	Southern	203	54.6%	2.5%	49.7%	59.5%	371	321	615	9
<b>Very Supportive</b>	Statewide	327	14.9%	1.0%	13.2%	16.9%	2,191	298	2,353	38
	Northern	102	13.6%	1.7%	10.5%	17.4%	753	63	569	12
	Central	82	18.0%	2.1%	14.3%	22.4%	453	87	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	96	15.6%	1.9%	12.3%	19.6%	614	77	566	8
	Southern	47	12.7%	1.8%	9.6%	16.7%	371	71	615	9

Note: After reading the description about the Classified Forest and Wildlands Program in Indiana, what is your opinion about this program?



Table 72. Familiarity with the Family Forest Carbon Program

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Never heard of it	Statewide	1,938	88.1%	0.8%	86.4%	89.6%	2,200	2,060	2,365	26
	Northern	655	86.4%	1.6%	82.8%	89.3%	758	498	575	6
	Central	405	89.0%	1.5%	85.7%	91.7%	455	524	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	557	90.6%	1.4%	87.5%	93.0%	615	510	568	6
	Southern	321	86.3%	1.8%	82.3%	89.4%	372	528	616	8
Slightly familiar	Statewide	141	6.4%	0.6%	5.4%	7.7%	2,200	182	2,365	26
	Northern	53	7.0%	1.2%	5.0%	9.6%	758	43	575	6
	Central	27	5.9%	1.0%	4.2%	8.3%	455	49	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	34	5.6%	1.1%	3.8%	8.1%	615	36	568	6
	Southern	27	7.2%	1.2%	5.2%	10.0%	372	54	616	8
Somewhat familiar	Statewide	94	4.3%	0.5%	3.3%	5.4%	2,200	97	2,365	26
	Northern	35	4.6%	1.0%	3.0%	7.1%	758	26	575	6
	Central	19	4.1%	1.0%	2.5%	6.6%	455	27	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	21	3.4%	0.9%	2.0%	5.8%	615	19	568	6
	Southern	19	5.1%	1.3%	3.1%	8.3%	372	25	616	8
Moderately familiar	Statewide	22	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.7%	2,200	21	2,365	26
	Northern	12	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.6%	758	6	575	6
	Central	4	0.9%	0.6%	0.2%	3.1%	455	5	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	615	3	568	6
	Southern	4	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	3.2%	372	7	616	8
Extremely familiar	Statewide	5	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%	2,200	5	2,365	26
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.1%	758	2	575	6
	Central	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	455	1	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	-	-	-	-	-	615	-	568	6
	Southern	1	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.9%	372	2	616	8

Note: Before reading this description, what was your level of familiarity with the Family Forest Carbon Program in Indiana?



Table 73. Support for Family Forest Carbon Program

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Never heard of it	Statewide	1,938	88.1%	0.8%	86.4%	89.6%	2,200	2,060	2,365	26
	Northern	655	86.4%	1.6%	82.8%	89.3%	758	498	575	6
	Central	405	89.0%	1.5%	85.7%	91.7%	455	524	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	557	90.6%	1.4%	87.5%	93.0%	615	510	568	6
	Southern	321	86.3%	1.8%	82.3%	89.4%	372	528	616	8
Slightly familiar	Statewide	141	6.4%	0.6%	5.4%	7.7%	2,200	182	2,365	26
	Northern	53	7.0%	1.2%	5.0%	9.6%	758	43	575	6
	Central	27	5.9%	1.0%	4.2%	8.3%	455	49	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	34	5.6%	1.1%	3.8%	8.1%	615	36	568	6
	Southern	27	7.2%	1.2%	5.2%	10.0%	372	54	616	8
Somewhat familiar	Statewide	94	4.3%	0.5%	3.3%	5.4%	2,200	97	2,365	26
	Northern	35	4.6%	1.0%	3.0%	7.1%	758	26	575	6
	Central	19	4.1%	1.0%	2.5%	6.6%	455	27	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	21	3.4%	0.9%	2.0%	5.8%	615	19	568	6
	Southern	19	5.1%	1.3%	3.1%	8.3%	372	25	616	8
Moderately familiar	Statewide	22	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.7%	2,200	21	2,365	26
	Northern	12	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.6%	758	6	575	6
	Central	4	0.9%	0.6%	0.2%	3.1%	455	5	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	615	3	568	6
	Southern	4	1.1%	0.6%	0.4%	3.2%	372	7	616	8
Extremely familiar	Statewide	5	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.7%	2,200	5	2,365	26
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.1%	758	2	575	6
	Central	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	455	1	606	6
	Indianapolis M.A.	-	-	-	-	-	615	-	568	6
	Southern	1	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.9%	372	2	616	8

Note: After reading the description about the Family Forest Carbon Program in Indiana, what is your opinion about this program?





Table 74. Likelihood of Following Division of Forestry on Social Media

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	700	32.4%	1.2%	30.1%	34.8%	2,163	792	2,315	76
	Northern	247	33.4%	2.3%	29.1%	38.0%	741	197	560	21
	Central	140	31.3%	2.3%	26.9%	36.0%	447	209	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	207	34.1%	2.3%	29.7%	38.9%	606	195	557	17
	Southern	106	28.8%	2.3%	24.6%	33.5%	369	191	607	17
Unlikely	Statewide	961	44.4%	1.3%	42.0%	46.9%	2,163	1,077	2,315	76
	Northern	339	45.7%	2.4%	41.1%	50.5%	741	264	560	21
	Central	188	42.2%	2.5%	37.3%	47.2%	447	268	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	269	44.5%	2.5%	39.7%	49.3%	606	257	557	17
	Southern	164	44.5%	2.5%	39.7%	49.5%	369	288	607	17
Likely	Statewide	402	18.6%	1.1%	16.6%	20.7%	2,163	349	2,315	76
	Northern	127	17.1%	1.9%	13.7%	21.2%	741	79	560	21
	Central	96	21.6%	2.4%	17.3%	26.6%	447	91	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	109	18.0%	2.0%	14.4%	22.3%	606	88	557	17
	Southern	69	18.7%	2.1%	14.9%	23.2%	369	91	607	17
Very likely	Statewide	100	4.6%	0.6%	3.6%	5.9%	2,163	97	2,315	76
	Northern	28	3.8%	1.0%	2.3%	6.3%	741	20	560	21
	Central	22	5.0%	1.2%	3.1%	7.9%	447	23	591	21
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.4%	0.9%	1.9%	5.8%	606	17	557	17
	Southern	29	7.9%	1.5%	5.4%	11.5%	369	37	607	17

Table 75. Likelihood of Volunteering with Division of Forestry

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	768	35.1%	1.2%	32.8%	37.5%	2,184	893	2,339	52
	Northern	274	36.3%	2.3%	32.0%	40.9%	754	227	571	10
	Central	163	36.1%	2.4%	31.5%	40.9%	451	239	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	203	33.3%	2.3%	29.0%	38.0%	609	204	561	13
	Southern	128	34.5%	2.4%	30.0%	39.3%	370	223	609	15
Unlikely	Statewide	1,174	53.8%	1.3%	51.3%	56.3%	2,184	1,230	2,339	52
	Northern	407	53.9%	2.4%	49.2%	58.6%	754	293	571	10
	Central	231	51.2%	2.6%	46.2%	56.2%	451	299	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	343	56.3%	2.5%	51.4%	61.1%	609	310	561	13
	Southern	194	52.4%	2.6%	47.4%	57.3%	370	328	609	15
Likely	Statewide	211	9.6%	0.8%	8.2%	11.3%	2,184	184	2,339	52
	Northern	58	7.7%	1.3%	5.5%	10.7%	754	39	571	10
	Central	55	12.2%	1.9%	9.0%	16.4%	451	54	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	57	9.3%	1.5%	6.7%	12.8%	609	42	561	13
	Southern	41	11.0%	1.9%	7.9%	15.2%	370	49	609	15
Very likely	Statewide	31	1.4%	0.3%	0.9%	2.2%	2,184	32	2,339	52
	Northern	15	2.0%	0.7%	1.0%	4.0%	754	12	571	10
	Central	2	0.5%	0.2%	0.2%	1.2%	451	6	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	1.0%	0.6%	0.3%	3.1%	609	5	561	13
	Southern	8	2.0%	0.8%	0.9%	4.4%	370	9	609	15



Table 76. Likelihood of Attending Division of Forestry Public Meetings

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	852	39.0%	1.2%	36.6%	41.5%	2,186	930	2,340	51
	Northern	297	39.5%	2.3%	35.0%	44.2%	753	235	568	13
	Central	186	41.1%	2.5%	36.2%	46.1%	452	244	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	234	38.4%	2.4%	33.8%	43.2%	610	222	562	12
	Southern	135	36.4%	2.4%	31.8%	41.3%	371	229	611	13
Unlikely	Statewide	1,124	51.4%	1.3%	48.9%	53.9%	2,186	1,183	2,340	51
	Northern	389	51.7%	2.4%	46.9%	56.4%	753	280	568	13
	Central	225	49.7%	2.6%	44.7%	54.7%	452	301	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	324	53.1%	2.5%	48.2%	57.9%	610	290	562	12
	Southern	187	50.3%	2.5%	45.3%	55.3%	371	312	611	13
Likely	Statewide	193	8.8%	0.7%	7.5%	10.3%	2,186	204	2,340	51
	Northern	62	8.2%	1.3%	6.0%	11.1%	753	48	568	13
	Central	40	8.8%	1.5%	6.3%	12.2%	452	49	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	49	8.0%	1.3%	5.7%	11.0%	610	46	562	12
	Southern	43	11.5%	1.8%	8.4%	15.4%	371	61	611	13
Very likely	Statewide	17	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	1.4%	2,186	23	2,340	51
	Northern	5	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	2.0%	753	5	568	13
	Central	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	0.9%	452	5	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	2.4%	610	4	562	12
	Southern	7	1.8%	0.8%	0.8%	4.1%	371	9	611	13

Table 77. Likelihood of Supporting Fund Raising Initiative

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	525	24.0%	1.1%	22.0%	26.2%	2,185	583	2,338	53
	Northern	182	24.2%	2.1%	20.4%	28.5%	753	145	568	13
	Central	105	23.3%	2.1%	19.4%	27.6%	453	152	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	156	25.5%	2.2%	21.5%	29.9%	611	147	563	11
	Southern	82	22.3%	2.1%	18.4%	26.7%	369	139	607	17
Unlikely	Statewide	935	42.8%	1.3%	40.4%	45.3%	2,185	1,048	2,338	53
	Northern	334	44.4%	2.4%	39.7%	49.1%	753	266	568	13
	Central	169	37.3%	2.4%	32.6%	42.2%	453	244	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	268	43.9%	2.5%	39.2%	48.8%	611	251	563	11
	Southern	165	44.5%	2.5%	39.7%	49.5%	369	287	607	17
Likely	Statewide	656	30.0%	1.2%	27.7%	32.4%	2,185	649	2,338	53
	Northern	215	28.6%	2.2%	24.4%	33.2%	753	145	568	13
	Central	168	37.0%	2.6%	32.2%	42.2%	453	190	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	169	27.7%	2.2%	23.5%	32.3%	611	150	563	11
	Southern	104	28.1%	2.3%	23.8%	32.8%	369	164	607	17
Very likely	Statewide	69	3.2%	0.5%	2.3%	4.3%	2,185	58	2,338	53
	Northern	21	2.8%	0.9%	1.5%	5.2%	753	12	568	13
	Central	11	2.4%	0.8%	1.3%	4.5%	453	14	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	2.9%	0.9%	1.6%	5.3%	611	15	563	11
	Southern	19	5.1%	1.4%	2.9%	8.7%	369	17	607	17



Table 78. Likelihood of Contacting Elected Officials to Support the Division of Forestry

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	704	32.2%	1.2%	29.9%	34.6%	2,185	732	2,338	53
	Northern	244	32.4%	2.3%	28.2%	37.0%	752	185	567	14
	Central	140	30.8%	2.3%	26.4%	35.6%	453	191	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	208	34.0%	2.4%	29.5%	38.8%	611	182	563	11
	Southern	113	30.6%	2.4%	26.0%	35.5%	369	174	607	17
Unlikely	Statewide	1093	50.0%	1.3%	47.5%	52.5%	2,185	1,232	2,338	53
	Northern	387	51.5%	2.4%	46.8%	56.2%	752	301	567	14
	Central	234	51.7%	2.6%	46.7%	56.7%	453	310	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	285	46.7%	2.5%	41.9%	51.5%	611	284	563	11
	Southern	186	50.4%	2.6%	45.4%	55.4%	369	337	607	17
Likely	Statewide	340	15.6%	1.0%	13.8%	17.5%	2,185	327	2,338	53
	Northern	112	14.8%	1.8%	11.7%	18.7%	752	73	567	14
	Central	72	15.9%	1.9%	12.5%	20.0%	453	89	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	98	16.0%	1.9%	12.7%	20.1%	611	81	563	11
	Southern	59	15.9%	1.9%	12.5%	20.1%	369	84	607	17
Very likely	Statewide	48	2.2%	0.4%	1.6%	3.1%	2,185	47	2,338	53
	Northern	9	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	2.8%	752	8	567	14
	Central	7	1.6%	0.6%	0.8%	3.2%	453	11	601	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.3%	1.0%	1.9%	5.9%	611	16	563	11
	Southern	12	3.1%	1.1%	1.6%	6.2%	369	12	607	17

Table 79. Likelihood of Voting to Support Forest Management

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Very unlikely	Statewide	263	12.1%	0.9%	10.5%	13.8%	2,183	267	2,345	46
	Northern	105	13.9%	1.7%	10.9%	17.7%	750	73	568	13
	Central	53	11.7%	1.7%	8.8%	15.4%	452	70	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	67	11.0%	1.6%	8.3%	14.5%	609	63	564	10
	Southern	39	10.4%	1.6%	7.6%	13.9%	372	61	613	11
Unlikely	Statewide	367	16.8%	0.9%	15.0%	18.7%	2,183	421	2,345	46
	Northern	137	18.3%	1.9%	14.9%	22.2%	750	103	568	13
	Central	63	14.0%	1.6%	11.1%	17.4%	452	103	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	98	16.1%	1.8%	12.9%	19.9%	609	96	564	10
	Southern	69	18.4%	1.9%	14.9%	22.5%	372	119	613	11
Likely	Statewide	1,176	53.9%	1.3%	51.3%	56.4%	2,183	1,287	2,345	46
	Northern	399	53.2%	2.4%	48.5%	57.9%	750	316	568	13
	Central	245	54.1%	2.6%	49.1%	59.1%	452	321	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	340	55.8%	2.5%	50.9%	60.6%	609	317	564	10
	Southern	192	51.6%	2.5%	46.6%	56.5%	372	333	613	11
Very likely	Statewide	377	17.3%	1.0%	15.4%	19.3%	2,183	370	2,345	46
	Northern	109	14.6%	1.8%	11.4%	18.3%	750	76	568	13
	Central	91	20.2%	2.1%	16.3%	24.7%	452	106	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	104	17.1%	1.9%	13.6%	21.2%	609	88	564	10
	Southern	73	19.6%	2.2%	15.7%	24.3%	372	100	613	11



Table 80. Frequency of Looking for Information on Forests

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Everyday	Statewide	22	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.7%	2,171	21	2,329	62
	Northern	6	0.8%	0.5%	0.3%	2.4%	748	4	565	16
	Central	7	1.5%	0.6%	0.7%	3.3%	450	4	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.2%	607	4	562	12
	Southern	5	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	3.1%	366	6	603	21
Several times a week	Statewide	131	6.0%	0.6%	4.9%	7.4%	2,171	127	2,329	62
	Northern	32	4.3%	1.0%	2.7%	6.9%	748	21	565	16
	Central	36	7.9%	1.4%	5.6%	11.2%	450	44	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	42	6.9%	1.3%	4.7%	10.0%	607	33	562	12
	Southern	21	5.7%	1.3%	3.6%	8.8%	366	29	603	21
Once a week	Statewide	207	9.5%	0.7%	8.2%	11.1%	2,171	215	2,329	62
	Northern	60	8.0%	1.3%	5.7%	11.0%	748	43	565	16
	Central	48	10.7%	1.5%	8.1%	14.1%	450	61	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	54	8.9%	1.4%	6.5%	12.2%	607	45	562	12
	Southern	45	12.3%	1.7%	9.3%	16.1%	366	66	603	21
Once a month	Statewide	723	33.3%	1.2%	30.9%	35.8%	2,171	701	2,329	62
	Northern	255	34.1%	2.3%	29.6%	38.8%	748	173	565	16
	Central	134	29.9%	2.4%	25.3%	34.8%	450	163	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	204	33.6%	2.4%	29.0%	38.4%	607	171	562	12
	Southern	130	35.6%	2.5%	30.9%	40.6%	366	194	603	21
Once a year	Statewide	565	26.0%	1.1%	23.9%	28.3%	2,171	627	2,329	62
	Northern	202	27.0%	2.1%	23.1%	31.4%	748	160	565	16
	Central	115	25.6%	2.3%	21.4%	30.2%	450	154	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	163	26.9%	2.2%	22.8%	31.4%	607	156	562	12
	Southern	85	23.1%	2.1%	19.2%	27.5%	366	157	603	21
Once every few years	Statewide	249	11.4%	0.8%	10.0%	13.0%	2,171	325	2,329	62
	Northern	77	10.3%	1.4%	7.9%	13.3%	748	67	565	16
	Central	57	12.6%	1.6%	9.8%	16.1%	450	89	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	66	10.8%	1.4%	8.3%	13.8%	607	74	562	12
	Southern	49	13.5%	1.6%	10.6%	17.1%	366	95	603	21
Never	Statewide	275	12.7%	0.8%	11.1%	14.4%	2,171	313	2,329	62
	Northern	117	15.6%	1.7%	12.5%	19.2%	748	97	565	16
	Central	53	11.9%	1.5%	9.2%	15.2%	450	81	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	74	12.2%	1.5%	9.5%	15.5%	607	79	562	12
	Southern	31	8.4%	1.3%	6.2%	11.5%	366	56	603	21



Table 81. Recently Looked for Information on Indiana's Forests

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Yes	Statewide	628	28.7%	1.2%	26.5%	31.1%	2,188	614	2,351	40
	Northern	179	23.8%	2.1%	19.9%	28.2%	754	124	570	11
	Central	144	31.7%	2.4%	27.1%	36.6%	454	165	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	178	29.1%	2.3%	24.9%	33.8%	612	154	568	6
	Southern	127	34.5%	2.5%	29.7%	39.6%	369	171	608	16
Not in the last 12 months, but I did a while back	Statewide	783	35.8%	1.2%	33.4%	38.2%	2,188	843	2,351	40
	Northern	289	38.3%	2.4%	33.8%	43.1%	754	206	570	11
	Central	167	36.8%	2.5%	32.0%	41.7%	454	221	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	210	34.3%	2.3%	29.9%	39.0%	612	202	568	6
	Southern	117	31.7%	2.3%	27.4%	36.3%	369	214	608	16
I've never looked	Statewide	777	35.5%	1.2%	33.2%	37.9%	2,188	894	2,351	40
	Northern	286	37.9%	2.3%	33.5%	42.5%	754	240	570	11
	Central	143	31.6%	2.3%	27.2%	36.2%	454	219	605	7
	Indianapolis M.A.	224	36.6%	2.4%	32.0%	41.3%	612	212	568	6
	Southern	125	33.8%	2.4%	29.3%	38.6%	369	223	608	16

Table 82. Information Source: DNR Website or Newsletters

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not trustworthy	Statewide	14	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	1.3%	1,895	17	1,951	14
	Northern	7	1.1%	0.5%	0.4%	2.9%	638	6	463	7
	Central	1	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	389	2	493	1
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.1%	546	4	492	2
	Southern	4	1.2%	0.6%	0.4%	3.2%	323	5	503	4
Somewhat trustworthy	Statewide	195	10.3%	0.8%	8.8%	12.0%	1,895	234	1,951	440
	Northern	65	10.2%	1.6%	7.5%	13.7%	638	49	463	118
	Central	37	9.5%	1.5%	7.0%	12.8%	389	60	493	119
	Indianapolis M.A.	52	9.5%	1.5%	7.0%	12.8%	546	52	492	82
	Southern	41	12.8%	1.8%	9.7%	16.7%	323	73	503	121
Moderately trustworthy	Statewide	688	36.3%	1.3%	33.7%	38.9%	1,895	756	1,951	440
	Northern	261	40.9%	2.6%	36.0%	46.1%	638	196	463	118
	Central	137	35.2%	2.7%	30.2%	40.6%	389	186	493	119
	Indianapolis M.A.	174	31.9%	2.4%	27.4%	36.8%	546	172	492	82
	Southern	116	35.9%	2.6%	30.9%	41.2%	323	202	503	121
Very trustworthy	Statewide	998	52.6%	1.4%	49.9%	55.4%	1,895	944	1,951	440
	Northern	304	47.7%	2.7%	42.6%	52.9%	638	212	463	118
	Central	214	55.0%	2.8%	49.5%	60.4%	389	245	493	119
	Indianapolis M.A.	318	58.2%	2.6%	53.1%	63.1%	546	264	492	82
	Southern	162	50.1%	2.8%	44.6%	55.6%	323	223	503	121



Table 83. Used DNR Website As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Indiana DNR Website or Newsletter	Statewide	604	32.2%	1.3%	29.7%	34.9%	1,874	570	2,018	373
	Northern	201	31.2%	2.5%	26.6%	36.3%	644	135	491	90
	Central	123	30.7%	2.6%	25.9%	36.0%	400	138	526	86
	Indianapolis M.A.	170	32.7%	2.5%	27.9%	37.9%	521	149	491	83
	Southern	110	35.5%	2.8%	30.2%	41.1%	310	148	510	114

Table 84. Information Source: Conservation Officers

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not trustworthy	Statewide	19	1.0%	0.3%	0.6%	1.6%	1,908	23	1,973	418
	Northern	9	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.3%	645	7	469	112
	Central	2	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.5%	393	4	505	107
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.2%	0.1%	1.3%	545	3	493	81
	Southern	6	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%	3.6%	326	9	506	118
Somewhat trustworthy	Statewide	230	12.0%	0.9%	10.4%	13.9%	1,908	233	1,973	418
	Northern	69	10.7%	1.7%	7.9%	14.5%	645	48	469	112
	Central	50	12.7%	1.9%	9.4%	17.0%	393	60	505	107
	Indianapolis M.A.	65	12.0%	1.7%	9.0%	15.8%	545	57	493	81
	Southern	45	13.9%	1.9%	10.5%	18.1%	326	68	506	118
Moderately trustworthy	Statewide	779	40.8%	1.4%	38.1%	43.5%	1,908	787	1,973	418
	Northern	274	42.5%	2.6%	37.4%	47.7%	645	192	469	112
	Central	155	39.4%	2.8%	34.1%	44.9%	393	192	505	107
	Indianapolis M.A.	224	41.1%	2.6%	36.1%	46.3%	545	201	493	81
	Southern	126	38.8%	2.7%	33.6%	44.2%	326	202	506	118
Very trustworthy	Statewide	881	46.2%	1.4%	43.5%	48.9%	1,908	930	1,973	418
	Northern	292	45.4%	2.6%	40.3%	50.5%	645	222	469	112
	Central	186	47.3%	2.8%	41.9%	52.8%	393	249	505	107
	Indianapolis M.A.	254	46.6%	2.6%	41.4%	51.7%	545	232	493	81
	Southern	149	45.7%	2.8%	40.3%	51.2%	326	227	506	118

Table 85. Used Conservation Officers As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Conservation Officers	Statewide	214	11.8%	0.9%	10.1%	13.7%	1,818	217	1,939	452
	Northern	81	12.8%	1.8%	9.6%	16.9%	631	55	478	103
	Central	48	12.4%	1.7%	9.4%	16.2%	386	62	503	109
	Indianapolis M.A.	44	8.7%	1.5%	6.2%	12.1%	508	45	478	96
	Southern	41	14.0%	2.2%	10.3%	18.8%	293	55	480	144



Table 86. Information Source: District Offices

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	15	0.8%	0.2%	0.5%	1.5%	1,800	17	1,829	562
	Northern	4	0.7%	0.3%	0.3%	1.7%	614	5	440	141
	Central	5	1.3%	0.7%	0.4%	3.9%	368	6	463	149
	Indianapolis M.A.	4	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.9%	508	3	449	125
	Southern	2	0.6%	0.4%	0.1%	2.1%	310	3	477	147
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	275	15.3%	1.0%	13.3%	17.4%	1,800	274	1,829	562
	Northern	93	15.2%	2.0%	11.7%	19.5%	614	62	440	141
	Central	47	12.9%	1.9%	9.6%	17.1%	368	61	463	149
	Indianapolis M.A.	75	14.7%	2.0%	11.2%	19.0%	508	62	449	125
	Southern	60	19.3%	2.3%	15.2%	24.2%	310	89	477	147
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	806	44.8%	1.4%	42.0%	47.6%	1,800	828	1,829	562
	Northern	296	48.3%	2.7%	43.0%	53.6%	614	212	440	141
	Central	162	43.9%	2.9%	38.4%	49.7%	368	204	463	149
	Indianapolis M.A.	223	43.9%	2.7%	38.7%	49.3%	508	208	449	125
	Southern	125	40.5%	2.8%	35.0%	46.0%	310	204	477	147
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	704	39.1%	1.4%	36.4%	41.9%	1,800	710	1,829	562
	Northern	220	35.9%	2.6%	30.9%	41.1%	614	161	440	141
	Central	154	41.9%	2.9%	36.4%	47.7%	368	192	463	149
	Indianapolis M.A.	206	40.5%	2.7%	35.3%	46.0%	508	176	449	125
	Southern	123	39.7%	2.9%	34.3%	45.5%	310	181	477	147

Table 87. Used District Offices As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>District Offices</b>	Statewide	69	3.9%	0.6%	2.9%	5.2%	1,785	69	1,908	483
	Northern	35	5.6%	1.3%	3.5%	8.8%	620	22	469	112
	Central	11	2.9%	0.9%	1.5%	5.5%	381	15	497	115
	Indianapolis M.A.	9	1.9%	0.8%	0.9%	4.1%	496	9	465	109
	Southern	14	4.7%	1.3%	2.7%	8.0%	288	23	477	147





Table 88. Information Source: Private Forestry Professionals

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	62	3.4%	0.5%	2.5%	4.6%	1,844	59	1,883	508
	Northern	15	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	4.8%	624	11	450	131
	Central	18	4.7%	1.3%	2.6%	8.1%	378	21	481	131
	Indianapolis M.A.	22	4.2%	1.1%	2.5%	7.1%	531	16	471	103
	Southern	7	2.2%	0.7%	1.1%	4.2%	311	11	481	143
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	439	23.8%	1.2%	21.5%	26.2%	1,844	456	1,883	508
	Northern	145	23.3%	2.3%	19.2%	28.1%	624	107	450	131
	Central	92	24.3%	2.4%	19.8%	29.4%	378	117	481	131
	Indianapolis M.A.	125	23.5%	2.2%	19.4%	28.1%	531	114	471	103
	Southern	77	24.8%	2.5%	20.2%	30.0%	311	118	481	143
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	930	50.4%	1.4%	47.6%	53.2%	1,844	952	1,883	508
	Northern	312	50.0%	2.7%	44.7%	55.3%	624	231	450	131
	Central	185	48.9%	2.9%	43.3%	54.5%	378	230	481	131
	Indianapolis M.A.	269	50.8%	2.7%	45.5%	56.1%	531	238	471	103
	Southern	164	52.5%	2.9%	46.9%	58.1%	311	253	481	143
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	413	22.4%	1.2%	20.1%	24.8%	1,844	416	1,883	508
	Northern	151	24.2%	2.3%	19.9%	29.1%	624	101	450	131
	Central	84	22.2%	2.4%	17.9%	27.2%	378	113	481	131
	Indianapolis M.A.	114	21.5%	2.2%	17.5%	26.1%	531	103	471	103
	Southern	64	20.5%	2.3%	16.4%	25.4%	311	99	481	143

Table 89. Used Private Forestry Professionals As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Private forestry professionals</b>	Statewide	177	9.8%	0.8%	8.3%	11.6%	1,797	194	1,923	468
	Northern	58	9.3%	1.6%	6.6%	12.9%	623	39	476	105
	Central	33	8.7%	1.4%	6.3%	11.8%	382	50	498	114
	Indianapolis M.A.	49	9.7%	1.5%	7.2%	13.0%	504	52	476	98
	Southern	37	12.7%	2.1%	9.2%	17.4%	289	53	476	148





Table 90. Information Source: Other Private Natural Resource Professionals

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	57	3.1%	0.5%	2.2%	4.2%	1,862	63	1,914	477
	Northern	23	3.7%	1.0%	2.1%	6.3%	624	17	455	126
	Central	4	1.1%	0.4%	0.6%	2.1%	380	10	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.8%	1.0%	2.2%	6.3%	540	18	487	87
	Southern	10	3.0%	0.9%	1.7%	5.2%	318	18	489	135
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	611	32.8%	1.3%	30.2%	35.4%	1,862	614	1,914	477
	Northern	194	31.0%	2.5%	26.3%	36.1%	624	137	455	126
	Central	133	35.1%	2.8%	29.8%	40.8%	380	153	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	176	32.6%	2.5%	27.9%	37.7%	540	157	487	87
	Southern	108	33.9%	2.7%	28.9%	39.3%	318	167	489	135
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	939	50.4%	1.4%	47.7%	53.2%	1,862	978	1,914	477
	Northern	325	52.0%	2.7%	46.7%	57.2%	624	242	455	126
	Central	183	48.2%	2.9%	42.6%	53.8%	380	237	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	271	50.2%	2.7%	45.0%	55.4%	540	253	487	87
	Southern	160	50.5%	2.8%	44.9%	56.0%	318	246	489	135
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	255	13.7%	1.0%	11.9%	15.7%	1,862	259	1,914	477
	Northern	83	13.3%	1.8%	10.1%	17.3%	624	59	455	126
	Central	59	15.6%	2.0%	12.0%	20.1%	380	83	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	73	13.4%	1.9%	10.2%	17.6%	540	59	487	87
	Southern	40	12.6%	1.9%	9.2%	16.9%	318	58	489	135

Table 91. Use of Other Private Natural Resource Professionals As Source

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Other private natural resource professionals</b>	Statewide	374	20.8%	1.1%	18.7%	23.1%	1,795	398	1,927	464
	Northern	139	22.3%	2.2%	18.3%	26.9%	623	108	476	105
	Central	64	16.7%	2.0%	79.0%	86.8%	381	90	503	109
	Indianapolis M.A.	111	22.1%	2.2%	18.1%	26.7%	501	108	472	102
	Southern	60	20.8%	2.3%	16.5%	25.7%	290	92	476	148



Table 92. Information Source: Wood Products Companies

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	391	21.2%	1.2%	18.9%	23.6%	1,848	348	1,897	494
	Northern	148	24.0%	2.4%	19.6%	28.9%	617	93	448	133
	Central	68	17.6%	2.2%	13.8%	22.3%	384	82	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	115	21.6%	2.3%	17.4%	26.4%	532	85	477	97
	Southern	61	19.3%	2.2%	15.3%	24.1%	316	88	484	140
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	905	49.0%	1.4%	46.2%	51.7%	1,848	905	1,897	494
	Northern	291	47.2%	2.7%	41.9%	52.5%	617	210	448	133
	Central	189	49.2%	2.9%	43.6%	54.8%	384	226	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	262	49.2%	2.7%	44.0%	54.5%	532	227	477	97
	Southern	163	51.8%	2.8%	46.2%	57.3%	316	242	484	140
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	455	24.6%	1.2%	22.4%	27.0%	1,848	537	1,897	494
	Northern	141	22.8%	2.2%	18.9%	27.3%	617	122	448	133
	Central	105	27.3%	2.5%	22.7%	32.4%	384	145	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	127	24.0%	2.2%	20.0%	28.6%	532	137	477	97
	Southern	82	25.9%	2.5%	21.4%	31.1%	316	133	484	140
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	97	5.3%	0.6%	4.1%	6.7%	1,848	107	1,897	494
	Northern	37	6.0%	1.3%	3.9%	9.3%	617	23	448	133
	Central	23	5.9%	1.3%	3.8%	9.2%	384	35	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	28	5.2%	1.2%	3.3%	8.0%	532	28	477	97
	Southern	9	3.0%	0.8%	1.8%	4.9%	316	21	484	140

Table 93. Use of Wood Products Companies As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Companies that make wood products</b>	Statewide	239	13.4%	1.0%	11.6%	15.4%	1,787	247	1,910	481
	Northern	98	15.8%	2.0%	12.3%	20.3%	617	64	467	114
	Central	42	11.1%	1.7%	8.2%	14.8%	377	60	495	117
	Indianapolis M.A.	59	11.7%	1.7%	8.8%	15.5%	503	59	472	102
	Southern	40	13.9%	2.0%	10.3%	18.4%	290	64	476	148



Table 94. Information Source: Indiana Forestry and Woodland Owners Association

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	46	2.5%	0.5%	1.8%	3.6%	1,795	41	1,833	558
	Northern	14	2.3%	0.8%	1.1%	4.7%	599	10	431	150
	Central	9	2.5%	1.0%	1.2%	5.3%	368	11	469	143
	Indianapolis M.A.	16	3.0%	0.9%	1.6%	5.5%	521	12	462	112
	Southern	7	2.2%	0.8%	1.0%	4.5%	306	8	471	153
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	465	25.9%	1.3%	23.5%	28.5%	1,795	475	1,833	558
	Northern	156	26.1%	2.4%	21.6%	31.1%	599	111	431	150
	Central	93	25.2%	2.5%	20.6%	30.5%	368	115	469	143
	Indianapolis M.A.	135	25.8%	2.4%	21.4%	30.7%	521	123	462	112
	Southern	81	26.6%	2.5%	22.0%	31.9%	306	126	471	153
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	935	52.1%	1.4%	49.3%	54.9%	1,795	964	1,833	558
	Northern	317	52.9%	2.7%	47.5%	58.2%	599	229	431	150
	Central	193	52.3%	2.9%	46.6%	57.9%	368	245	469	143
	Indianapolis M.A.	268	51.5%	2.7%	46.1%	56.8%	521	241	462	112
	Southern	157	51.3%	2.9%	45.6%	56.9%	306	249	471	153
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	349	19.5%	1.2%	17.3%	21.8%	1,795	353	1,833	558
	Northern	112	18.7%	2.1%	14.8%	23.3%	599	81	431	150
	Central	73	19.9%	2.4%	15.7%	25.0%	368	98	469	143
	Indianapolis M.A.	103	19.7%	2.2%	15.7%	24.4%	521	86	462	112
	Southern	61	19.9%	2.4%	15.7%	24.9%	306	88	471	153

Table 95. Use of Indiana Forestry and Woodland Owners Association As Source

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Indiana Forestry and Woodland Owners Association</b>	Statewide	40	2.2%	0.4%	1.5%	3.3%	1,775	36	1,903	488
	Northern	10	1.7%	0.7%	0.7%	3.8%	614	7	470	111
	Central	6	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	3.7%	376	6	496	116
	Indianapolis M.A.	18	3.5%	1.0%	1.9%	6.2%	501	15	469	105
	Southern	6	2.1%	0.9%	0.8%	5.0%	284	8	468	156



Table 96. Information Source: Federal Agencies

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	148	8.0%	0.7%	6.6%	9.6%	1,847	154	1,883	508
	Northern	56	9.0%	1.5%	6.4%	12.4%	628	43	451	130
	Central	24	6.2%	1.3%	4.1%	9.2%	379	34	479	133
	Indianapolis M.A.	45	8.6%	1.5%	6.1%	11.9%	528	42	472	102
	Southern	23	7.3%	1.4%	5.0%	10.6%	312	35	481	143
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	469	25.4%	1.2%	23.0%	27.9%	1,847	485	1,883	508
	Northern	170	27.1%	2.4%	22.7%	32.1%	628	118	451	130
	Central	86	22.8%	2.3%	18.5%	27.7%	379	118	479	133
	Indianapolis M.A.	132	25.0%	2.3%	20.7%	29.9%	528	119	472	102
	Southern	80	25.6%	2.4%	21.1%	30.7%	312	130	481	143
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	784	42.4%	1.4%	39.7%	45.2%	1,847	804	1,883	508
	Northern	262	41.7%	2.6%	36.6%	46.9%	628	190	451	130
	Central	171	45.2%	2.9%	39.7%	50.9%	379	207	479	133
	Indianapolis M.A.	212	40.3%	2.6%	35.2%	45.5%	528	199	472	102
	Southern	139	44.4%	2.9%	38.9%	50.0%	312	208	481	143
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	446	24.2%	1.2%	21.9%	26.7%	1,847	440	1,883	508
	Northern	140	22.3%	2.2%	18.2%	27.0%	628	100	451	130
	Central	98	25.8%	2.6%	21.1%	31.1%	379	120	479	133
	Indianapolis M.A.	138	26.2%	2.4%	21.7%	31.2%	528	112	472	102
	Southern	71	22.7%	2.4%	18.3%	27.7%	312	108	481	143

Table 97. Use of Federal Agencies As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Federal agencies</b>	Statewide	140	7.9%	0.8%	6.5%	9.7%	1,770	123	1,903	488
	Northern	59	9.8%	1.7%	6.9%	13.5%	609	37	465	116
	Central	24	6.3%	1.4%	4.1%	9.6%	380	29	500	112
	Indianapolis M.A.	37	7.6%	1.6%	5.1%	11.3%	492	30	464	110
	Southern	20	6.8%	1.6%	4.3%	10.7%	289	27	474	150



Table 98. Information Source: Non-Profit Organizations

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	70	3.8%	0.5%	2.9%	4.9%	1,844	89	1,884	507
	Northern	23	3.6%	0.9%	2.2%	5.9%	629	21	452	129
	Central	14	3.8%	0.9%	2.4%	6.1%	375	23	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.8%	1.0%	2.3%	6.4%	530	20	472	102
	Southern	12	3.9%	0.9%	2.5%	6.2%	310	25	477	147
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	417	22.6%	1.2%	20.4%	25.0%	1,844	453	1,884	507
	Northern	157	25.0%	2.3%	20.8%	29.8%	629	116	452	129
	Central	81	21.5%	2.3%	17.3%	26.4%	375	112	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	106	19.9%	2.1%	16.1%	24.3%	530	103	472	102
	Southern	73	23.7%	2.3%	19.4%	28.5%	310	122	477	147
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	805	43.7%	1.4%	40.9%	46.4%	1,844	822	1,884	507
	Northern	269	42.7%	2.6%	37.6%	48.0%	629	195	452	129
	Central	153	40.8%	2.8%	35.4%	46.4%	375	199	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	239	45.1%	2.7%	39.9%	50.4%	530	216	472	102
	Southern	144	46.6%	2.9%	41.0%	52.3%	310	212	477	147
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	552	29.9%	1.3%	27.4%	32.6%	1,844	520	1,884	507
	Northern	180	28.6%	2.5%	24.1%	33.7%	629	120	452	129
	Central	127	33.9%	2.8%	28.7%	39.6%	375	149	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	165	31.1%	2.6%	26.3%	36.3%	530	133	472	102
	Southern	80	25.8%	2.6%	21.1%	31.2%	310	118	477	147

Table 99. Use of Non-Profit Organizations As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Non-profit environmental organizations</b>	Statewide	196	11.0%	1.0%	9.3%	13.1%	1,775	164	1,903	488
	Northern	71	11.5%	1.8%	8.5%	15.5%	617	48	469	112
	Central	40	10.6%	1.8%	7.5%	14.8%	375	40	496	116
	Indianapolis M.A.	61	12.3%	2.0%	8.9%	16.7%	497	46	467	107
	Southern	24	8.4%	1.9%	5.4%	12.8%	287	30	471	153



Table 100. Information Source: Purdue Extension

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	13	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	1.3%	1,848	17	1,905	486
	Northern	3	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	621	4	450	131
	Central	2	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	1.9%	377	4	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	1.0%	0.5%	0.3%	2.8%	529	6	472	102
	Southern	2	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%	2.7%	320	3	495	129
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	231	12.5%	0.9%	10.7%	14.5%	1,848	228	1,905	486
	Northern	93	15.0%	2.0%	11.5%	19.4%	621	59	450	131
	Central	34	9.1%	1.5%	6.6%	12.4%	377	53	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	56	10.6%	1.7%	7.8%	14.4%	529	49	472	102
	Southern	47	14.5%	2.0%	11.0%	18.9%	320	67	495	129
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	754	40.8%	1.4%	38.1%	43.5%	1,848	746	1,905	486
	Northern	261	42.1%	2.7%	36.9%	47.4%	621	182	450	131
	Central	158	41.7%	2.8%	36.3%	47.4%	377	191	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	199	37.6%	2.6%	32.6%	42.9%	529	175	472	102
	Southern	136	42.4%	2.8%	37.0%	48.0%	320	198	495	129
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	850	46.0%	1.4%	43.3%	48.8%	1,848	914	1,905	486
	Northern	263	42.4%	2.6%	37.3%	47.6%	621	205	450	131
	Central	183	48.5%	2.9%	42.9%	54.1%	377	240	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	268	50.8%	2.7%	45.5%	56.0%	529	242	472	102
	Southern	136	42.4%	2.8%	37.0%	47.9%	320	227	495	129

Table 101. Use of Purdue Extension As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Purdue Extension</b>	Statewide	247	13.9%	1.0%	12.0%	16.0%	1,781	254	1,915	476
	Northern	92	14.8%	1.9%	11.4%	19.0%	621	67	474	107
	Central	46	12.1%	1.8%	8.9%	16.1%	377	61	496	116
	Indianapolis M.A.	66	13.3%	1.9%	9.9%	17.5%	495	55	467	107
	Southern	44	15.2%	2.1%	11.6%	19.8%	288	71	478	146



Table 102. Information Source: University Websites, Videos, and Publications

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	54	2.9%	0.5%	2.1%	4.0%	1,856	57	1,894	497
	Northern	21	3.3%	1.0%	1.9%	5.9%	631	14	456	125
	Central	10	2.5%	0.7%	1.4%	4.4%	383	17	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	9	1.6%	0.7%	0.7%	3.6%	523	8	466	108
	Southern	14	4.5%	1.3%	2.6%	7.7%	319	18	489	135
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	432	23.3%	1.2%	21.0%	25.7%	1,856	421	1,894	497
	Northern	162	25.6%	2.4%	21.2%	30.6%	631	106	456	125
	Central	82	21.4%	2.3%	17.2%	26.3%	383	102	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	106	20.2%	2.2%	16.3%	24.8%	523	96	466	108
	Southern	83	25.9%	2.5%	21.3%	31.2%	319	117	489	135
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	840	45.3%	1.4%	42.5%	48.1%	1,856	869	1,894	497
	Northern	288	45.6%	2.7%	40.5%	50.9%	631	211	456	125
	Central	174	45.4%	2.9%	39.9%	51.1%	383	215	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	233	44.5%	2.7%	39.3%	49.8%	523	213	466	108
	Southern	146	45.7%	2.8%	40.2%	51.2%	319	230	489	135
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	530	28.6%	1.3%	26.1%	31.1%	1,856	547	1,894	497
	Northern	161	25.4%	2.3%	21.2%	30.2%	631	125	456	125
	Central	117	30.6%	2.7%	25.7%	36.1%	383	149	483	129
	Indianapolis M.A.	176	33.6%	2.6%	28.8%	38.9%	523	149	466	108
	Southern	76	23.9%	2.4%	19.5%	29.0%	319	124	489	135

Table 103. Used University Materials As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>University websites, videos, and publications</b>	Statewide	339	19.1%	1.2%	16.9%	21.5%	1,774	327	1,897	494
	Northern	107	17.5%	2.1%	13.8%	21.9%	615	76	470	111
	Central	79	20.8%	2.4%	16.5%	26.0%	377	86	494	118
	Indianapolis M.A.	94	18.9%	2.2%	14.9%	23.7%	496	77	465	109
	Southern	59	20.6%	2.5%	16.2%	25.8%	286	88	468	156



Table 104. Information Source: TV Shows and Documentaries

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	210	11.0%	0.9%	9.4%	12.8%	1,902	220	1,963	428
	Northern	70	10.9%	1.7%	8.1%	14.6%	645	52	467	114
	Central	47	12.0%	1.8%	9.0%	16.0%	393	64	504	108
	Indianapolis M.A.	45	8.4%	1.5%	5.9%	11.9%	538	40	482	92
	Southern	47	14.3%	2.1%	10.7%	18.8%	327	64	510	114
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	843	44.3%	1.4%	41.6%	47.0%	1,902	833	1,963	428
	Northern	282	43.8%	2.6%	38.7%	49.0%	645	191	467	114
	Central	161	41.0%	2.8%	35.7%	46.5%	393	201	504	108
	Indianapolis M.A.	246	45.8%	2.7%	40.6%	51.0%	538	216	482	92
	Southern	153	46.8%	2.8%	41.4%	52.3%	327	225	510	114
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	707	37.1%	1.3%	34.6%	39.8%	1,902	753	1,963	428
	Northern	242	37.5%	2.5%	32.7%	42.6%	645	192	467	114
	Central	153	38.9%	2.8%	33.7%	44.5%	393	191	504	108
	Indianapolis M.A.	212	39.4%	2.6%	34.5%	44.6%	538	194	482	92
	Southern	100	30.5%	2.5%	25.9%	35.6%	327	176	510	114
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	143	7.5%	0.7%	6.2%	9.1%	1,902	157	1,963	428
	Northern	50	7.8%	1.4%	5.4%	11.1%	645	32	467	114
	Central	31	8.0%	1.5%	5.6%	11.4%	393	48	504	108
	Indianapolis M.A.	34	6.4%	1.3%	4.3%	9.4%	538	32	482	92
	Southern	27	8.4%	1.5%	5.8%	11.9%	327	45	510	114

Table 105. Used TV Shows and Documentaries As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>TV shows and documentaries</b>	Statewide	697	39.4%	1.4%	36.7%	42.2%	1,769	698	1,891	500
	Northern	240	39.3%	2.6%	34.3%	44.6%	611	172	464	117
	Central	155	41.3%	2.8%	35.8%	46.9%	375	183	491	121
	Indianapolis M.A.	196	39.5%	2.7%	34.3%	44.9%	497	174	466	108
	Southern	106	37.0%	2.8%	31.7%	42.6%	286	169	470	154





Table 106. Information Source: News Media

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not trustworthy	Statewide	569	29.7%	1.3%	27.3%	32.3%	1,913	566	1,980	411
	Northern	216	33.3%	2.5%	28.6%	38.3%	648	152	475	106
	Central	115	29.2%	2.5%	24.5%	34.4%	393	146	503	109
	Indianapolis M.A.	145	26.5%	2.3%	22.2%	31.4%	545	127	491	83
	Southern	94	28.8%	2.5%	24.0%	34.0%	327	141	511	113
Somewhat trustworthy	Statewide	819	42.8%	1.4%	40.1%	45.5%	1,913	817	1,980	411
	Northern	277	42.7%	2.6%	37.7%	47.9%	648	192	475	106
	Central	156	39.7%	2.8%	34.4%	45.2%	393	194	503	109
	Indianapolis M.A.	238	43.8%	2.6%	38.7%	49.0%	545	211	491	83
	Southern	148	45.1%	2.8%	39.8%	50.6%	327	220	511	113
Moderately trustworthy	Statewide	454	23.7%	1.1%	21.6%	26.1%	1,913	516	1,980	411
	Northern	135	20.8%	2.0%	17.1%	25.1%	648	115	475	106
	Central	106	26.9%	2.5%	22.4%	32.0%	393	140	503	109
	Indianapolis M.A.	141	25.9%	2.3%	21.7%	30.7%	545	131	491	83
	Southern	72	22.1%	2.2%	18.2%	26.7%	327	130	511	113
Very trustworthy	Statewide	71	3.7%	0.5%	2.8%	4.9%	1,913	81	1,980	411
	Northern	21	3.3%	0.9%	1.9%	5.6%	648	16	475	106
	Central	17	4.2%	1.2%	2.4%	7.3%	393	23	503	109
	Indianapolis M.A.	21	3.8%	0.9%	2.3%	6.0%	545	22	491	83
	Southern	13	4.0%	1.1%	2.2%	6.9%	327	20	511	113

Table 107. Used News Media As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
News media	Statewide	750	42.3%	1.4%	39.6%	45.1%	1,772	779	1,892	499
	Northern	258	42.2%	2.6%	37.1%	47.4%	611	195	465	116
	Central	161	43.0%	2.9%	37.5%	48.7%	374	197	490	122
	Indianapolis M.A.	215	42.9%	2.7%	37.7%	48.2%	501	198	470	104
	Southern	117	40.9%	2.9%	35.4%	46.6%	286	189	467	157



Table 108. Information Source: Social Media

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	981	51.5%	1.4%	48.8%	54.2%	1,904	1,006	1,963	428
	Northern	340	52.7%	2.6%	47.5%	57.8%	646	241	470	111
	Central	193	49.0%	2.8%	43.5%	54.6%	394	254	500	112
	Indianapolis M.A.	275	51.2%	2.7%	46.0%	56.4%	537	234	481	93
	Southern	173	52.7%	2.8%	47.3%	58.1%	327	277	512	112
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	646	34.0%	1.3%	31.4%	36.6%	1,904	668	1,963	428
	Northern	199	30.8%	2.4%	26.3%	35.7%	646	152	470	111
	Central	141	35.7%	2.7%	30.6%	41.2%	394	172	500	112
	Indianapolis M.A.	189	35.2%	2.5%	30.4%	40.4%	537	173	481	93
	Southern	118	35.9%	2.7%	30.8%	41.4%	327	171	512	112
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	242	12.7%	0.9%	11.0%	14.6%	1,904	255	1,963	428
	Northern	91	14.1%	1.8%	10.9%	18.0%	646	68	470	111
	Central	51	13.0%	1.9%	9.7%	17.2%	394	63	500	112
	Indianapolis M.A.	68	12.7%	1.7%	9.7%	16.4%	537	69	481	93
	Southern	32	9.8%	1.6%	7.1%	13.4%	327	55	512	112
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	34	1.8%	0.4%	1.2%	2.8%	1,904	34	1,963	428
	Northern	16	2.4%	0.9%	1.2%	4.9%	646	9	470	111
	Central	9	2.3%	0.9%	1.0%	5.1%	394	11	500	112
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.5%	537	5	481	93
	Southern	5	1.5%	0.6%	0.7%	3.2%	327	9	512	112

Table 109. Used Social Media As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Social media</b>	Statewide	643	36.3%	1.4%	33.6%	39.1%	643	36.3%	1.4%	33.6%
	Northern	222	36.5%	2.6%	31.5%	41.8%	222	36.5%	2.6%	31.5%
	Central	146	38.9%	2.8%	33.5%	44.6%	146	38.9%	2.8%	33.5%
	Indianapolis M.A.	181	36.3%	2.7%	31.2%	41.8%	181	36.3%	2.7%	31.2%
	Southern	93	32.4%	2.8%	27.2%	38.1%	93	32.4%	2.8%	27.2%



Table 110. Information Source: YouTube Videos

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
Not trustworthy	Statewide	593	31.4%	1.3%	28.9%	34.0%	1,889	631	1,944	447
	Northern	192	30.0%	2.4%	25.5%	34.9%	642	143	469	112
	Central	123	31.7%	2.6%	26.8%	37.1%	387	162	495	117
	Indianapolis M.A.	169	31.4%	2.5%	26.7%	36.5%	538	146	480	94
	Southern	109	33.9%	2.6%	29.0%	39.3%	322	180	500	124
Somewhat trustworthy	Statewide	923	48.9%	1.4%	46.1%	51.6%	1,889	934	1,944	447
	Northern	296	46.0%	2.6%	40.9%	51.2%	642	211	469	112
	Central	194	50.0%	2.8%	44.5%	55.6%	387	243	495	117
	Indianapolis M.A.	274	50.9%	2.7%	45.7%	56.2%	538	242	480	94
	Southern	160	49.8%	2.8%	44.3%	55.3%	322	238	500	124
Moderately trustworthy	Statewide	327	17.3%	1.0%	15.3%	19.4%	1,889	338	1,944	447
	Northern	136	21.1%	2.1%	17.3%	25.6%	642	104	469	112
	Central	62	15.9%	2.0%	12.3%	20.2%	387	79	495	117
	Indianapolis M.A.	87	16.2%	1.9%	12.8%	20.3%	538	86	480	94
	Southern	42	13.0%	1.9%	9.8%	17.1%	322	69	500	124
Very trustworthy	Statewide	46	2.4%	0.5%	1.7%	3.5%	1,889	41	1,944	447
	Northern	19	2.9%	1.0%	1.5%	5.5%	642	11	469	112
	Central	9	2.4%	1.0%	1.0%	5.2%	387	11	495	117
	Indianapolis M.A.	8	1.4%	0.7%	0.6%	3.5%	538	6	480	94
	Southern	10	3.2%	1.0%	1.7%	6.0%	322	13	500	124

Table 111. Used YouTube Videos As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
YouTube videos	Statewide	695	39.1%	1.4%	36.4%	41.9%	1,778	651	1,901	490
	Northern	245	39.9%	2.6%	34.9%	45.2%	613	172	467	114
	Central	156	41.8%	2.9%	36.3%	47.5%	372	173	491	121
	Indianapolis M.A.	200	39.5%	2.7%	34.4%	44.9%	505	167	469	105
	Southern	95	33.0%	2.8%	27.9%	38.6%	288	139	474	150



Table 112. Information Source: Podcasts

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	454	24.5%	1.2%	22.2%	26.9%	1,854	504	1,890	501
	Northern	160	25.4%	2.3%	21.1%	30.2%	629	123	454	127
	Central	100	26.3%	2.4%	21.8%	31.4%	380	139	486	126
	Indianapolis M.A.	103	19.6%	2.2%	15.7%	24.2%	527	93	462	112
	Southern	91	28.6%	2.5%	23.9%	33.8%	318	149	488	136
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	962	51.9%	1.4%	49.1%	54.7%	1,854	948	1,890	501
	Northern	297	47.1%	2.7%	41.9%	52.4%	629	209	454	127
	Central	195	51.2%	2.9%	45.6%	56.8%	380	238	486	126
	Indianapolis M.A.	306	58.0%	2.7%	52.7%	63.1%	527	262	462	112
	Southern	165	52.1%	2.8%	46.5%	57.6%	318	239	488	136
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	382	20.6%	1.1%	18.5%	22.9%	1,854	391	1,890	501
	Northern	149	23.7%	2.2%	19.6%	28.4%	629	109	454	127
	Central	74	19.4%	2.2%	15.4%	24.1%	380	96	486	126
	Indianapolis M.A.	105	20.0%	2.1%	16.1%	24.6%	527	97	462	112
	Southern	54	16.9%	2.1%	13.2%	21.3%	318	89	488	136
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	56	3.0%	0.5%	2.1%	4.2%	1,854	47	1,890	501
	Northern	24	3.8%	1.1%	2.1%	6.7%	629	13	454	127
	Central	12	3.1%	1.1%	1.5%	6.1%	380	13	486	126
	Indianapolis M.A.	13	2.4%	0.9%	1.2%	4.8%	527	10	462	112
	Southern	8	2.5%	0.9%	1.2%	5.1%	318	11	488	136

Table 113. Used Podcasts As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Podcasts</b>	Statewide	441	25.1%	1.3%	22.6%	27.7%	1,759	359	1,880	511
	Northern	159	26.3%	2.5%	21.7%	31.4%	604	100	460	121
	Central	98	26.7%	2.8%	21.7%	32.5%	368	91	485	127
	Indianapolis M.A.	125	24.9%	2.4%	20.5%	30.0%	501	96	467	107
	Southern	59	20.5%	2.5%	16.0%	26.0%	285	72	468	156



Table 114. Information Source: Sporting Magazines

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	226	12.1%	1.0%	10.3%	14.1%	1,866	190	1,925	466
	Northern	72	11.3%	1.7%	8.3%	15.1%	635	49	465	116
	Central	45	11.7%	2.0%	8.4%	16.1%	380	46	489	123
	Indianapolis M.A.	68	12.9%	1.9%	9.5%	17.2%	528	47	472	102
	Southern	41	12.8%	2.1%	9.2%	17.5%	322	48	499	125
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	757	40.6%	1.4%	37.9%	43.3%	1,866	751	1,925	466
	Northern	220	34.7%	2.6%	29.9%	39.9%	635	152	465	116
	Central	159	41.7%	2.8%	36.2%	47.3%	380	194	489	123
	Indianapolis M.A.	244	46.2%	2.7%	41.0%	51.5%	528	205	472	102
	Southern	134	41.6%	2.8%	36.2%	47.1%	322	200	499	125
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	751	40.3%	1.4%	37.6%	43.0%	1,866	822	1,925	466
	Northern	287	45.2%	2.6%	40.1%	50.4%	635	218	465	116
	Central	150	39.4%	2.8%	34.1%	44.9%	380	205	489	123
	Indianapolis M.A.	193	36.6%	2.6%	31.7%	41.7%	528	194	472	102
	Southern	121	37.6%	2.7%	32.6%	43.0%	322	205	499	125
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	132	7.1%	0.4%	5.8%	8.5%	1,866	162	1,925	466
	Northern	56	8.8%	1.4%	6.4%	12.1%	635	46	465	116
	Central	27	7.2%	1.4%	4.9%	10.5%	380	44	489	123
	Indianapolis M.A.	23	4.3%	1.0%	2.7%	6.8%	528	26	472	102
	Southern	26	8.0%	1.4%	5.6%	11.3%	322	46	499	125

Table 115. Used Sporting Magazines As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Sporting magazines</b>	Statewide	351	19.9%	1.1%	17.8%	22.2%	1,761	389	1,885	506
	Northern	133	22.0%	2.2%	17.9%	26.7%	605	102	463	118
	Central	81	21.8%	2.3%	17.6%	26.8%	372	109	489	123
	Indianapolis M.A.	79	15.8%	1.9%	12.5%	19.9%	501	86	467	107
	Southern	58	20.4%	2.4%	16.1%	25.4%	284	92	466	158



Table 116. Information Source: Friends and Family

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	143	7.5%	0.8%	6.1%	9.2%	1,905	121	1,972	419
	Northern	44	6.8%	1.4%	4.5%	10.0%	650	28	475	106
	Central	32	8.1%	1.6%	5.5%	12.0%	391	35	501	111
	Indianapolis M.A.	48	9.0%	1.6%	6.3%	12.8%	535	34	481	93
	Southern	19	5.9%	1.5%	3.6%	9.6%	329	24	515	109
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	606	31.8%	1.3%	29.3%	34.4%	1,905	570	1,972	419
	Northern	185	28.5%	2.4%	24.0%	33.4%	650	126	475	106
	Central	118	30.3%	2.6%	25.4%	35.6%	391	145	501	111
	Indianapolis M.A.	195	36.3%	2.6%	31.3%	41.6%	535	152	481	93
	Southern	108	32.8%	2.7%	27.8%	38.3%	329	147	515	109
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	742	39.0%	1.3%	36.4%	41.6%	1,905	803	1,972	419
	Northern	258	39.7%	2.6%	34.8%	44.8%	650	194	475	106
	Central	156	39.9%	2.8%	34.6%	45.4%	391	200	501	111
	Indianapolis M.A.	193	36.1%	2.5%	31.3%	41.1%	535	192	481	93
	Southern	135	41.1%	2.7%	35.9%	46.5%	329	217	515	109
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	413	21.7%	1.1%	19.6%	24.0%	1,905	478	1,972	419
	Northern	163	25.1%	2.2%	21.0%	29.7%	650	127	475	106
	Central	85	21.7%	2.3%	17.5%	26.5%	391	121	501	111
	Indianapolis M.A.	99	18.6%	2.0%	15.0%	22.8%	535	103	481	93
	Southern	66	20.2%	2.0%	16.6%	24.4%	329	127	515	109

Table 117. Used Friends and Family As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Family and friends</b>	Statewide	937	53.2%	1.4%	50.4%	56.0%	1,761	942	1,875	516
	Northern	322	53.2%	2.7%	47.9%	58.4%	606	230	462	119
	Central	206	55.2%	2.8%	49.6%	60.6%	374	244	488	124
	Indianapolis M.A.	249	49.9%	2.7%	44.5%	55.2%	499	221	465	109
	Southern	159	56.4%	2.9%	50.7%	61.9%	282	247	460	164



Table 118. Information Source: Nearby Landowners

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	152	8.1%	0.8%	6.6%	9.8%	1,875	125	1,935	456
	Northern	45	7.1%	1.4%	4.8%	10.4%	642	30	469	112
	Central	31	8.0%	1.7%	5.3%	12.0%	383	31	492	120
	Indianapolis M.A.	54	10.2%	1.7%	7.3%	14.1%	527	39	470	104
	Southern	22	6.7%	1.5%	4.3%	10.4%	323	25	504	120
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	701	37.4%	1.4%	34.7%	40.1%	1,875	653	1,935	456
	Northern	215	33.4%	2.6%	28.6%	38.6%	642	139	469	112
	Central	145	37.7%	2.8%	32.4%	43.3%	383	172	492	120
	Indianapolis M.A.	220	41.9%	2.7%	36.8%	47.3%	527	181	470	104
	Southern	121	37.5%	2.8%	32.2%	43.2%	323	161	504	120
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	782	41.7%	1.4%	39.0%	44.4%	1,875	861	1,935	456
	Northern	288	44.8%	2.6%	39.8%	50.0%	642	226	469	112
	Central	156	40.7%	2.8%	35.3%	46.2%	383	206	492	120
	Indianapolis M.A.	205	38.8%	2.6%	33.9%	44.0%	527	200	470	104
	Southern	134	41.3%	2.7%	36.1%	46.8%	323	229	504	120
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	241	12.8%	0.9%	11.2%	14.7%	1,875	296	1,935	456
	Northern	94	14.7%	1.8%	11.4%	18.6%	642	74	469	112
	Central	52	13.6%	1.8%	10.5%	17.5%	383	83	492	120
	Indianapolis M.A.	48	9.0%	1.5%	6.5%	12.4%	527	50	470	104
	Southern	47	14.4%	1.8%	11.3%	18.3%	323	89	504	120

Table 119. Used Nearby Landowners As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Landowners in my area</b>	Statewide	585	33.4%	1.4%	30.8%	36.1%	1,753	612	1,875	516
	Northern	217	36.0%	2.6%	31.1%	41.3%	602	161	459	122
	Central	125	33.5%	2.7%	28.4%	39.0%	373	162	490	122
	Indianapolis M.A.	137	27.7%	2.4%	23.2%	32.7%	496	127	466	108
	Southern	106	37.7%	2.8%	32.3%	43.4%	281	162	460	164



Table 120. Information Source: Other

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Not trustworthy</b>	Statewide	139	41.8%	3.6%	35.0%	48.9%	332	104	264	2,127
	Northern	45	36.8%	6.2%	25.6%	49.6%	122	27	70	511
	Central	21	37.3%	8.1%	23.2%	54.0%	55	18	54	558
	Indianapolis M.A.	56	50.8%	6.2%	38.9%	62.7%	110	40	84	490
	Southern	17	38.7%	8.1%	24.4%	55.3%	44	19	56	568
<b>Somewhat trustworthy</b>	Statewide	66	19.8%	2.9%	14.7%	26.1%	332	53	264	66
	Northern	22	17.7%	5.2%	9.7%	30.2%	122	11	70	22
	Central	11	20.1%	6.6%	10.1%	36.1%	55	13	54	11
	Indianapolis M.A.	22	19.7%	4.9%	11.8%	31.1%	110	16	84	22
	Southern	11	25.1%	7.3%	13.5%	41.9%	44	13	56	11
<b>Moderately trustworthy</b>	Statewide	70	21.0%	2.9%	15.9%	27.1%	332	63	264	2,127
	Northern	25	20.2%	5.0%	12.0%	31.8%	122	16	70	511
	Central	13	22.9%	7.1%	11.9%	39.7%	55	11	54	558
	Indianapolis M.A.	21	19.5%	4.8%	11.8%	30.5%	110	20	84	490
	Southern	11	24.6%	6.7%	13.9%	39.9%	44	16	56	568
<b>Very trustworthy</b>	Statewide	58	17.5%	2.8%	12.7%	23.6%	332	44	264	2,127
	Northern	31	25.3%	5.7%	15.7%	38.1%	122	16	70	511
	Central	11	19.7%	6.2%	10.2%	34.6%	55	12	54	558
	Indianapolis M.A.	11	10.0%	3.7%	4.7%	20.0%	110	8	84	490
	Southern	5	11.6%	4.6%	5.2%	23.9%	44	8	56	568

Table 121. Used Other As Source in Previous 12 Months

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Other</b>	Statewide	56	11.4%	1.8%	8.3%	15.3%	492	51	459	1,932
	Northern	18	11.1%	3.4%	6.0%	19.7%	158	13	108	473
	Central	16	16.1%	4.4%	9.2%	26.6%	101	16	109	503
	Indianapolis M.A.	14	8.8%	2.7%	4.7%	15.7%	162	12	141	433
	Southern	8	11.2%	4.0%	5.5%	21.7%	71	10	101	523





Table 122. Hard to Trust Others

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	110	5.1%	0.6%	4.1%	6.3%	2,171	115	2,333	58
	Northern	38	5.0%	1.0%	3.4%	7.5%	748	31	566	15
	Central	25	5.5%	1.3%	3.4%	8.8%	451	26	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	33	5.4%	1.1%	3.7%	7.9%	607	34	563	11
	Southern	15	4.1%	1.0%	2.5%	6.5%	365	24	601	23
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	725	33.1%	1.2%	31.0%	35.8%	2,171	770	2,333	58
	Northern	243	32.5%	2.3%	28.2%	37.1%	748	185	566	15
	Central	137	30.3%	2.3%	26.0%	34.9%	451	193	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	233	38.5%	2.4%	33.8%	43.3%	607	203	563	11
	Southern	112	30.6%	2.3%	26.2%	35.3%	365	189	601	23
<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	Statewide	808	37.2%	1.2%	34.8%	39.6%	2,171	923	2,333	58
	Northern	296	39.5%	2.3%	35.0%	44.2%	748	236	566	15
	Central	156	34.5%	2.4%	30.0%	39.3%	451	227	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	216	35.6%	2.3%	31.1%	40.3%	607	216	563	11
	Southern	140	38.5%	2.5%	33.7%	43.4%	365	244	601	23
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	434	20.0%	1.1%	18.0%	22.1%	2,171	434	2,333	58
	Northern	136	18.1%	1.9%	14.7%	22.2%	748	91	566	15
	Central	105	23.2%	2.3%	19.1%	28.0%	451	123	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	110	18.1%	1.9%	14.6%	22.2%	607	96	563	11
	Southern	84	22.9%	2.3%	18.8%	27.6%	365	124	601	23
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	Statewide	95	4.4%	0.5%	3.4%	5.6%	2,171	91	2,333	58
	Northern	36	4.8%	1.1%	3.1%	7.4%	748	23	566	15
	Central	29	6.5%	1.4%	4.2%	9.7%	451	34	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	15	2.5%	0.8%	1.3%	4.6%	607	14	563	11
	Southern	15	4.0%	1.1%	2.3%	6.7%	365	20	601	23

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I find it hard to trust others.



Table 123. People are Honest

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	25	1.2%	0.3%	0.7%	1.8%	2,169	28	2,334	57
	Northern	11	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.2%	749	8	567	14
	Central	4	0.8%	0.4%	0.3%	2.0%	451	6	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.5%	606	5	562	12
	Southern	5	1.5%	0.6%	0.7%	3.1%	364	9	602	22
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	255	11.7%	0.9%	10.1%	13.6%	2,169	207	2,334	57
	Northern	91	12.1%	1.7%	9.2%	15.8%	749	56	567	14
	Central	49	10.9%	1.8%	7.8%	14.9%	451	49	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	63	10.4%	1.6%	7.7%	13.9%	606	51	562	12
	Southern	52	14.3%	2.2%	10.6%	19.1%	364	51	602	22
<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	Statewide	579	26.7%	1.1%	24.5%	29.0%	2,169	611	2,334	57
	Northern	195	26.1%	2.1%	22.1%	30.5%	749	142	567	14
	Central	133	29.6%	2.3%	25.2%	34.3%	451	170	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	152	25.1%	2.2%	21.0%	29.7%	606	131	562	12
	Southern	98	27.0%	2.2%	23.0%	31.5%	364	168	602	22
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,261	58.1%	1.3%	55.6%	60.6%	2,169	1,427	2,334	57
	Northern	434	58.0%	2.4%	53.2%	62.6%	749	346	567	14
	Central	258	57.3%	2.6%	52.3%	62.2%	451	365	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	369	60.9%	2.5%	56.0%	65.6%	606	356	562	12
	Southern	200	54.9%	2.6%	49.8%	59.9%	364	360	602	22
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	Statewide	49	2.3%	0.4%	1.7%	3.1%	2,169	61	2,334	57
	Northern	18	2.3%	0.7%	1.3%	4.2%	749	15	567	14
	Central	7	1.5%	0.5%	0.8%	2.7%	451	13	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	17	2.7%	0.8%	1.6%	4.7%	606	19	562	12
	Southern	8	2.3%	0.8%	1.2%	4.5%	364	14	602	22

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? Most people are fairly honest.



Table 124. Careful Dealing with Others

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	10	0.4%	0.2%	0.2%	0.9%	2,171	11	2,336	55
	Northern	5	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.8%	749	4	567	14
	Central	3	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	1.9%	451	4	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.9%	607	1	563	11
	Southern	1	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.5%	365	2	603	21
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	136	6.2%	0.7%	5.1%	7.7%	2,171	121	2,336	55
	Northern	39	5.2%	1.1%	3.4%	8.0%	749	24	567	14
	Central	26	5.7%	1.3%	3.6%	8.8%	451	27	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	47	7.8%	1.4%	5.4%	11.1%	607	37	563	11
	Southern	23	6.3%	1.3%	4.2%	9.6%	365	33	603	21
<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	Statewide	514	23.7%	1.1%	21.6%	25.9%	2,171	544	2,336	55
	Northern	164	21.8%	2.0%	18.2%	26.0%	749	124	567	14
	Central	98	21.8%	2.1%	18.1%	26.2%	451	140	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	190	31.3%	2.3%	26.9%	36.1%	607	162	563	11
	Southern	62	17.0%	1.8%	13.9%	20.8%	365	118	603	21
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,227	56.5%	1.3%	54.0%	59.0%	2,171	1,379	2,336	55
	Northern	430	57.5%	2.4%	52.7%	62.1%	749	338	567	14
	Central	261	58.0%	2.5%	53.0%	62.9%	451	355	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	296	48.7%	2.5%	43.9%	53.6%	607	297	563	11
	Southern	240	65.6%	2.4%	60.8%	70.2%	365	389	603	21
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	Statewide	285	13.1%	0.9%	11.5%	15.0%	2,171	281	2,336	55
	Northern	111	14.8%	1.7%	11.7%	18.6%	749	77	567	14
	Central	62	13.8%	1.9%	10.6%	17.9%	451	77	603	9
	Indianapolis M.A.	73	12.0%	1.7%	9.1%	15.7%	607	66	563	11
	Southern	39	10.6%	1.6%	7.9%	14.2%	365	61	603	21

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? You have to be careful with dealing with others.



Table 125. Trust Others

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	56	2.6%	0.4%	1.9%	3.5%	2,167	60	2,328	63
	Northern	27	3.6%	0.9%	2.2%	5.8%	747	20	565	16
	Central	10	2.2%	0.8%	1.1%	4.3%	449	14	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	6	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.4%	609	6	564	10
	Southern	13	3.6%	1.0%	2.1%	6.0%	362	20	599	25
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	280	12.9%	0.9%	11.3%	14.8%	2,167	257	2,328	63
	Northern	98	13.2%	1.7%	10.2%	16.9%	747	65	565	16
	Central	61	13.6%	1.9%	10.3%	17.8%	449	64	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	65	10.6%	1.6%	7.9%	14.1%	609	57	564	10
	Southern	56	15.4%	2.1%	11.8%	19.9%	362	71	599	25
<b>Neither disagree nor agree</b>	Statewide	669	30.9%	1.2%	28.6%	33.2%	2,167	714	2,328	63
	Northern	228	30.5%	2.2%	26.3%	35.1%	747	167	565	16
	Central	154	34.3%	2.4%	29.7%	39.2%	449	203	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	179	29.5%	2.3%	25.3%	34.1%	609	164	564	10
	Southern	107	29.6%	2.3%	25.3%	34.3%	362	180	599	25
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,100	50.8%	1.3%	48.3%	53.3%	2,167	1,235	2,328	63
	Northern	372	49.8%	2.4%	45.0%	54.5%	747	297	565	16
	Central	219	48.8%	2.6%	43.8%	53.8%	449	310	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	334	54.9%	2.5%	50.0%	59.7%	609	316	564	10
	Southern	176	48.5%	2.6%	43.5%	53.6%	362	312	599	25
<b>Strongly Agree</b>	Statewide	61	2.8%	0.5%	2.1%	3.9%	2,167	62	2,328	63
	Northern	22	2.9%	0.9%	1.7%	5.2%	747	16	565	16
	Central	5	1.1%	0.4%	0.5%	2.2%	449	9	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	24	4.0%	1.0%	2.4%	6.6%	609	21	564	10
	Southern	10	2.9%	1.0%	1.5%	5.5%	362	16	599	25

Note: How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? I generally trust others.



Table 126. Scientific Expertise of Division of Forestry

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	13	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.1%	2,166	16	2,329	62
	Northern	7	0.9%	0.4%	0.4%	2.3%	744	6	565	16
	Central	4	0.9%	0.4%	0.3%	2.3%	449	5	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	606	1	563	11
	Southern	2	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.8%	367	4	603	21
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	39	1.8%	0.3%	1.3%	2.5%	2,166	51	2,329	62
	Northern	4	0.6%	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	744	5	565	16
	Central	9	2.0%	0.6%	1.1%	3.6%	449	14	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	16	2.6%	0.8%	1.4%	4.6%	606	15	563	11
	Southern	10	2.6%	0.8%	1.4%	4.9%	367	17	603	21
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,086	50.1%	1.3%	47.6%	52.6%	2,166	1,205	2,329	62
	Northern	372	50.0%	2.4%	45.3%	54.8%	744	282	565	16
	Central	226	50.4%	2.6%	45.4%	55.5%	449	316	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	300	49.5%	2.5%	44.7%	54.4%	606	287	563	11
	Southern	187	50.9%	2.6%	45.9%	55.9%	367	320	603	21
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	365	16.9%	1.0%	15.0%	18.9%	2,166	346	2,329	62
	Northern	113	15.2%	1.8%	12.0%	19.1%	744	76	565	16
	Central	83	18.5%	2.1%	14.7%	23.0%	449	94	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	107	17.7%	2.0%	14.1%	21.9%	606	88	563	11
	Southern	62	17.0%	2.0%	13.4%	21.3%	367	88	603	21
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	663	30.6%	1.2%	28.4%	33.0%	2,166	711	2,329	62
	Northern	248	33.3%	2.3%	29.0%	37.9%	744	196	565	16
	Central	127	28.3%	2.3%	24.0%	33.0%	449	169	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	182	30.1%	2.3%	25.8%	34.8%	606	172	563	11
	Southern	106	28.9%	2.3%	24.6%	33.7%	367	174	603	21

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF employs people with the scientific expertise necessary to manage forests and woodlands in Indiana.



Table 127. Division of Forestry Knows How to Manage Forests

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	13	0.6%	0.2%	0.3%	1.2%	2,159	12	2,317	74
	Northern	8	1.1%	0.5%	0.4%	2.8%	739	6	560	21
	Central	3	0.6%	0.4%	0.2%	2.4%	447	2	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	606	1	561	13
	Southern	2	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	1.8%	366	3	600	24
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	52	2.4%	0.4%	1.8%	3.3%	2,159	61	2,317	74
	Northern	16	2.2%	0.7%	1.2%	4.2%	739	12	560	21
	Central	11	2.4%	0.7%	1.4%	4.1%	447	17	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	16	2.7%	0.8%	1.5%	4.9%	606	15	561	13
	Southern	9	2.4%	0.7%	1.3%	4.2%	366	17	600	24
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,096	50.8%	1.3%	48.2%	53.3%	2,159	1,210	2,317	74
	Northern	362	49.0%	2.4%	44.2%	53.8%	739	282	560	21
	Central	239	53.5%	2.6%	48.4%	58.5%	447	322	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	301	49.7%	2.5%	44.8%	54.6%	606	286	561	13
	Southern	193	52.8%	2.6%	47.7%	57.8%	366	320	600	24
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	343	15.9%	1.0%	14.1%	17.9%	2,159	337	2,317	74
	Northern	106	14.4%	1.7%	11.3%	18.1%	739	75	560	21
	Central	69	15.5%	1.9%	12.1%	19.6%	447	85	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	107	17.7%	2.0%	14.2%	21.9%	606	90	561	13
	Southern	60	16.4%	2.0%	12.8%	20.6%	366	87	600	24
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	655	30.3%	1.2%	28.1%	32.7%	2,159	697	2,317	74
	Northern	246	33.3%	2.3%	29.0%	38.0%	739	185	560	21
	Central	125	28.0%	2.3%	23.7%	32.7%	447	170	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	181	29.9%	2.3%	25.6%	34.5%	606	169	561	13
	Southern	103	28.0%	2.3%	23.8%	32.7%	366	173	600	24

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF employs people who know what needs to be done to manage forests and woodlands in Indiana.



Table 128. Division of Forestry Cares About Indiana's Forests

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	15	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	1.3%	2,167	16	2,326	65
	Northern	8	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.7%	744	5	564	17
	Central	3	0.7%	0.4%	0.2%	2.4%	449	3	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	608	2	564	10
	Southern	3	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.4%	366	6	600	24
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	24	1.1%	0.2%	0.7%	1.6%	2,167	32	2,326	65
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.4%	744	4	564	17
	Central	9	1.9%	0.6%	1.0%	3.5%	449	13	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	5	0.9%	0.4%	0.3%	2.2%	608	6	564	10
	Southern	6	1.6%	0.6%	0.8%	3.4%	366	9	600	24
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	1,052	48.6%	1.3%	46.1%	51.1%	2,167	1,196	2,326	65
	Northern	355	47.7%	2.4%	43.0%	52.5%	744	282	564	17
	Central	230	51.1%	2.6%	46.1%	56.1%	449	319	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	277	45.6%	2.5%	40.8%	50.5%	608	273	564	10
	Southern	190	52.0%	2.6%	47.0%	57.0%	366	322	600	24
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	502	23.2%	1.1%	21.0%	25.4%	2,167	469	2,326	65
	Northern	160	21.5%	2.0%	17.8%	25.8%	744	109	564	17
	Central	102	22.7%	2.2%	18.6%	27.4%	449	121	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	164	27.0%	2.3%	22.8%	31.7%	608	132	564	10
	Southern	76	20.7%	2.2%	16.7%	25.2%	366	107	600	24
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	574	26.5%	1.1%	24.3%	28.8%	2,167	613	2,326	65
	Northern	217	29.2%	2.2%	25.1%	33.8%	744	164	564	17
	Central	106	23.6%	2.2%	19.6%	28.1%	449	142	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	160	26.3%	2.2%	22.3%	30.8%	608	151	564	10
	Southern	91	24.8%	2.2%	20.8%	29.3%	366	156	600	24

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF employs people who care about Indiana's forests and woodlands.



Table 129. Division of Forestry has Shared Values

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	20	0.9%	0.2%	0.6%	1.5%	2,161	23	2,327	64
	Northern	10	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	3.0%	737	8	562	19
	Central	6	1.3%	0.6%	0.5%	3.0%	450	6	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	607	2	563	11
	Southern	4	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.4%	367	7	602	22
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	79	3.7%	0.5%	2.8%	4.7%	2,161	85	2,327	64
	Northern	21	2.9%	0.8%	1.6%	5.0%	737	15	562	19
	Central	15	3.4%	0.9%	2.0%	5.6%	450	22	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	27	4.5%	1.0%	2.9%	6.9%	607	25	563	11
	Southern	16	4.2%	1.1%	2.6%	6.9%	367	23	602	22
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	860	39.8%	1.2%	37.4%	42.3%	2,161	987	2,327	64
	Northern	285	38.7%	2.3%	34.2%	43.4%	737	235	562	19
	Central	203	45.2%	2.6%	40.2%	50.2%	450	273	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	220	36.2%	2.4%	31.7%	41.0%	607	215	563	11
	Southern	152	41.4%	2.5%	36.6%	46.4%	367	264	602	22
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	267	12.3%	0.9%	10.7%	14.2%	2,161	251	2,327	64
	Northern	84	11.4%	1.6%	8.6%	15.0%	737	54	562	19
	Central	61	13.6%	1.9%	10.3%	17.8%	450	69	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	78	12.9%	1.7%	9.9%	16.6%	607	66	563	11
	Southern	43	11.6%	1.7%	8.7%	15.4%	367	62	602	22
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	935	43.3%	1.3%	40.8%	45.8%	2,161	981	2,327	64
	Northern	337	45.7%	2.4%	41.0%	50.5%	737	250	562	19
	Central	164	36.5%	2.4%	31.9%	41.4%	450		600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	281	46.2%	2.5%	41.4%	51.1%	607	255	563	11
	Southern	153	41.7%	2.5%	36.9%	46.8%	367	246	602	22

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF employs people who share similar values as me about the environment.





Table 130. Division of Forestry is Approachable

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	15	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	1.2%	2,162	17	2,323	68
	Northern	7	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.7%	741	4	562	19
	Central	3	0.7%	0.4%	0.3%	2.0%	449	5	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.2%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	607	3	562	12
	Southern	3	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.4%	365	5	600	24
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	58	2.7%	0.4%	1.9%	3.6%	2,162	60	2,323	68
	Northern	25	3.4%	0.9%	1.9%	5.8%	741	15	562	19
	Central	6	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.3%	449	10	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	15	2.4%	0.7%	1.4%	4.4%	607	14	562	12
	Southern	12	3.2%	0.8%	1.9%	5.3%	365	21	600	24
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	585	27.0%	1.1%	24.9%	29.3%	2,162	676	2,323	68
	Northern	191	25.7%	2.1%	21.8%	30.0%	741	150	562	19
	Central	145	32.2%	2.4%	27.7%	37.0%	449	194	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	145	23.9%	2.1%	20.1%	28.2%	607	148	562	12
	Southern	105	28.7%	2.3%	24.4%	33.3%	365	184	600	24
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	160	7.4%	0.7%	6.1%	8.8%	2,162	170	2,323	68
	Northern	57	7.7%	1.3%	5.5%	10.8%	741	41	562	19
	Central	30	6.8%	1.4%	4.5%	10.0%	449	36	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	41	6.7%	1.2%	4.7%	9.7%	607	39	562	12
	Southern	31	8.5%	1.4%	6.1%	11.7%	365	54	600	24
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,346	62.2%	1.2%	59.8%	64.6%	2,162	1,400	2,323	68
	Northern	461	62.3%	2.4%	57.5%	66.8%	741	352	562	19
	Central	265	59.0%	2.5%	54.0%	63.8%	449	354	599	13
	Indianapolis M.A.	404	66.6%	2.3%	62.0%	71.0%	607	358	562	12
	Southern	215	58.8%	2.5%	53.8%	63.6%	365	336	600	24

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF employs people who are easy to talk to.



Table 131. Division of Forestry Helps People

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	7	0.3%	0.1%	0.1%	0.8%	2,165	8	2,326	65
	Northern	3	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	2.1%	742	2	563	18
	Central	2	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.9%	449	2	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.1%	0.1%	0.0%	0.4%	607	1	562	12
	Southern	2	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.8%	366	3	601	23
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	35	1.6%	0.3%	1.1%	2.4%	2,165	40	2,326	65
	Northern	10	1.4%	0.6%	0.6%	3.3%	742	6	563	18
	Central	7	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.7%	449	8	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	10	1.7%	0.6%	0.9%	3.3%	607	11	562	12
	Southern	8	2.1%	0.6%	1.1%	3.7%	366	15	601	23
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	892	41.2%	1.3%	38.7%	43.7%	2,165	972	2,326	65
	Northern	308	41.5%	2.4%	36.9%	46.3%	742	222	563	18
	Central	190	42.3%	2.5%	37.4%	47.3%	449	265	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	246	40.5%	2.4%	35.8%	45.4%	607	228	562	12
	Southern	147	40.2%	2.5%	35.4%	45.2%	366	257	601	23
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	258	11.9%	0.9%	10.3%	13.7%	2,165	247	2,326	65
	Northern	74	10.0%	1.5%	7.4%	13.4%	742	51	563	18
	Central	51	11.3%	1.7%	8.4%	15.1%	449	58	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	84	13.8%	1.8%	10.7%	17.6%	607	68	562	12
	Southern	49	13.5%	1.9%	10.3%	17.6%	366	70	601	23
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	974	45.0%	1.3%	42.5%	47.5%	2,165	1,059	2,326	65
	Northern	347	46.7%	2.4%	42.0%	51.4%	742	282	563	18
	Central	200	44.5%	2.6%	39.6%	49.6%	449	267	600	12
	Indianapolis M.A.	266	43.9%	2.5%	39.1%	48.8%	607	254	562	12
	Southern	160	43.8%	2.5%	38.9%	48.8%	366	256	601	23

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF employs people who care about helping people like me if I have a forest-related issue.



Table 132. Division of Forestry Listens

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	19	0.9%	0.2%	0.5%	1.5%	2,156	23	2,317	74
	Northern	7	1.0%	0.5%	0.3%	2.7%	739	5	560	21
	Central	6	1.2%	0.5%	0.5%	2.9%	446	7	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.3%	0.2%	0.1%	1.0%	608	3	563	11
	Southern	5	1.3%	0.6%	0.6%	3.0%	364	8	597	27
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	74	3.4%	0.4%	2.6%	4.4%	2,156	85	2,317	74
	Northern	23	3.1%	0.9%	1.8%	5.4%	739	15	560	21
	Central	17	3.7%	0.9%	2.2%	6.1%	446	22	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	19	3.1%	0.8%	1.9%	5.1%	608	21	563	11
	Southern	15	4.1%	0.9%	2.6%	6.3%	364	27	597	27
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	619	28.7%	1.2%	26.5%	31.0%	2,156	694	2,317	74
	Northern	198	26.8%	2.2%	22.8%	31.3%	739	151	560	21
	Central	139	31.1%	2.4%	26.6%	35.9%	446	195	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	183	30.1%	2.3%	25.8%	34.7%	608	170	563	11
	Southern	99	27.3%	2.2%	23.1%	31.9%	364	178	597	27
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	173	8.0%	0.7%	6.8%	9.5%	2,156	179	2,317	74
	Northern	56	7.5%	1.3%	5.4%	10.5%	739	44	560	21
	Central	34	7.5%	1.4%	5.2%	10.7%	446	41	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	44	7.2%	1.3%	5.1%	10.2%	608	39	563	11
	Southern	40	11.0%	1.8%	8.0%	15.0%	364	55	597	27
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,271	59.0%	1.3%	56.5%	61.4%	2,156	1,336	2,317	74
	Northern	455	61.5%	2.4%	56.8%	66.1%	739	345	560	21
	Central	252	56.5%	2.5%	51.4%	61.4%	446	332	597	15
	Indianapolis M.A.	360	59.2%	2.4%	54.4%	63.9%	608	330	563	11
	Southern	205	56.3%	2.6%	51.3%	61.2%	364	329	597	27

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF listens to the public.



Table 133. Division of Forestry Equal Treatment

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	17	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	1.4%	2,145	19	2,297	94
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.4%	0.1%	2.0%	733	3	555	26
	Central	7	1.5%	0.7%	0.6%	3.7%	448	8	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	2	0.4%	0.3%	0.1%	1.9%	600	2	553	21
	Southern	4	1.1%	0.5%	0.5%	2.8%	364	6	593	31
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	75	3.5%	0.5%	2.7%	4.5%	2,145	83	2,297	94
	Northern	20	2.7%	0.8%	1.5%	4.8%	733	13	555	26
	Central	14	3.1%	0.8%	1.9%	5.0%	448	21	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	26	4.4%	1.0%	2.8%	6.9%	600	23	553	21
	Southern	15	4.2%	1.0%	2.6%	6.8%	364	26	593	31
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	546	25.5%	1.1%	23.3%	27.7%	2,145	627	2,297	94
	Northern	174	23.7%	2.1%	19.9%	28.0%	733	134	555	26
	Central	141	31.4%	2.4%	26.9%	36.3%	448	188	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	138	23.0%	2.0%	19.1%	27.3%	600	138	553	21
	Southern	94	25.8%	2.2%	21.7%	30.3%	364	167	593	31
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	187	8.7%	0.7%	7.4%	10.3%	2,145	184	2,297	94
	Northern	62	8.5%	1.4%	6.1%	11.6%	733	46	555	26
	Central	31	6.8%	1.3%	4.6%	9.9%	448	40	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	52	8.6%	1.4%	6.2%	11.9%	600	44	553	21
	Southern	43	11.7%	1.9%	8.5%	15.9%	364	54	593	31
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,320	61.5%	1.3%	59.1%	64.0%	2,145	1,384	2,297	94
	Northern	474	64.7%	2.3%	60.0%	69.1%	733	359	555	26
	Central	256	57.1%	2.6%	52.0%	62.0%	448	339	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	382	63.7%	2.4%	58.9%	68.3%	600	346	553	21
	Southern	208	57.1%	2.6%	52.1%	62.1%	364	340	593	31

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF treats all members of the public equally.



Table 134. Division of Forestry Input Processes

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	17	0.8%	0.2%	0.4%	1.3%	2,159	18	2,317	74
	Northern	4	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%	740	3	562	19
	Central	8	1.8%	0.8%	0.8%	4.1%	447	7	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	606	2	560	14
	Southern	4	1.1%	0.5%	0.4%	2.7%	366	6	599	25
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	83	3.9%	0.5%	3.0%	4.9%	2,159	95	2,317	74
	Northern	37	0.5%	0.3%	0.1%	1.7%	740	3	562	19
	Central	15	3.5%	0.8%	2.2%	5.5%	447	24	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	20	3.3%	0.8%	2.0%	5.4%	606	20	560	14
	Southern	11	3.0%	0.7%	1.9%	4.7%	366	26	599	25
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	665	30.8%	1.2%	28.5%	33.2%	2,159	726	2,317	74
	Northern	211	28.5%	2.2%	24.4%	33.0%	740	161	562	19
	Central	146	32.6%	2.4%	28.1%	37.4%	447	202	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	192	31.8%	2.3%	27.3%	36.5%	606	170	560	14
	Southern	116	31.8%	2.4%	27.3%	36.7%	366	193	599	25
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	141	6.5%	0.7%	5.3%	8.0%	2,159	135	2,317	74
	Northern	43	5.8%	1.2%	3.9%	8.6%	740	31	562	19
	Central	25	5.6%	1.2%	3.6%	8.6%	447	32	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	41	6.7%	1.3%	4.5%	9.9%	606	32	560	14
	Southern	32	8.8%	1.7%	6.0%	12.8%	366	40	599	25
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,252	58.0%	1.3%	55.5%	60.5%	2,159	1,343	2,317	74
	Northern	446	60.2%	2.4%	55.5%	64.8%	740	342	562	19
	Central	253	56.6%	2.5%	51.5%	61.5%	447	331	596	16
	Indianapolis M.A.	352	58.0%	2.5%	53.1%	62.8%	606	336	560	14
	Southern	202	55.3%	2.6%	50.2%	60.2%	366	334	599	25

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF has specific procedures to request input from people like me when making management decisions about Indiana's forest and woodlands.



Table 135. Division of Forestry Considers Public Input

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	29	1.4%	0.3%	0.9%	2.1%	2,160	31	2,318	73
	Northern	9	1.2%	0.6%	0.4%	3.0%	742	5	563	18
	Central	11	2.5%	0.9%	1.3%	4.9%	449	12	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	3	0.5%	0.3%	0.2%	1.6%	604	4	560	14
	Southern	6	1.7%	0.6%	0.8%	3.4%	365	10	597	27
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	136	6.3%	0.6%	5.2%	7.6%	2,160	159	2,318	73
	Northern	43	5.8%	1.1%	3.9%	8.4%	742	33	563	18
	Central	33	7.3%	1.3%	5.2%	10.2%	449	46	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	42	6.9%	1.2%	4.9%	9.7%	604	43	560	14
	Southern	19	5.1%	1.0%	3.5%	7.5%	365	37	597	27
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	607	28.1%	1.2%	25.9%	30.4%	2,160	668	2,318	73
	Northern	214	28.8%	2.2%	24.7%	33.3%	742	162	563	18
	Central	133	29.6%	2.3%	25.2%	34.3%	449	185	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	161	26.6%	2.2%	22.5%	31.2%	604	148	560	14
	Southern	100	27.4%	2.3%	23.1%	32.1%	365	173	597	27
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	125	5.8%	0.6%	4.7%	7.2%	2,160	111	2,318	73
	Northern	33	4.5%	1.1%	2.8%	7.1%	742	21	563	18
	Central	25	5.6%	1.3%	3.5%	8.9%	449	24	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	38	6.3%	1.2%	4.3%	9.2%	604	30	560	14
	Southern	29	7.9%	1.5%	5.3%	11.5%	365	36	597	27
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,263	58.4%	1.3%	55.9%	60.9%	2,160	1,349	2,318	73
	Northern	444	59.8%	2.4%	55.0%	64.4%	742	342	563	18
	Central	247	55.1%	2.6%	50.0%	60.0%	449	331	598	14
	Indianapolis M.A.	360	59.6%	2.4%	54.7%	64.3%	604	335	560	14
	Southern	212	58.0%	2.5%	52.9%	62.9%	365	341	597	27

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF generally considers the opinions and needs of people like me when making management decisions about Indiana's forests and woodlands.



Table 136. Division of Forestry Has Unbiased Communication

	Region	Weighted						Unweighted		
		Count	Valid Percent	Standard Error	95% Confidence Interval		Total Count	Count	Total Count	Missing Cases
<b>Strongly disagree</b>	Statewide	15	0.7%	0.2%	0.4%	1.2%	2,151	18	2,311	80
	Northern	6	0.8%	0.5%	0.2%	2.6%	738	3	559	22
	Central	5	1.0%	0.5%	0.4%	2.4%	445	7	595	17
	Indianapolis M.A.	1	0.2%	0.1%	0.0%	0.8%	601	2	557	17
	Southern	3	0.9%	0.5%	0.3%	2.4%	366	6	600	24
<b>Disagree</b>	Statewide	84	3.9%	0.5%	3.1%	5.0%	2,151	99	2,311	80
	Northern	31	4.2%	1.0%	2.6%	6.6%	738	22	559	22
	Central	16	3.6%	0.8%	2.3%	5.6%	445	28	595	17
	Indianapolis M.A.	27	4.5%	1.0%	2.9%	6.8%	601	27	557	17
	Southern	10	2.7%	0.7%	1.6%	4.6%	366	22	600	24
<b>Agree</b>	Statewide	683	31.7%	1.2%	29.4%	34.2%	2,151	736	2,311	80
	Northern	219	29.7%	2.2%	25.5%	34.3%	738	160	559	22
	Central	158	35.4%	2.5%	30.7%	40.3%	445	209	595	17
	Indianapolis M.A.	186	30.9%	2.3%	26.6%	35.7%	601	170	557	17
	Southern	120	32.8%	2.5%	28.2%	37.8%	366	197	600	24
<b>Strongly agree</b>	Statewide	200	9.3%	0.8%	7.9%	11.0%	2,151	187	2,311	80
	Northern	69	9.3%	1.5%	6.8%	12.6%	738	47	559	22
	Central	31	7.0%	1.5%	4.6%	10.5%	445	34	595	17
	Indianapolis M.A.	58	9.6%	1.5%	7.0%	13.1%	601	45	557	17
	Southern	43	11.7%	1.7%	8.7%	15.5%	366	61	600	24
<b>Don't know</b>	Statewide	1,169	54.4%	1.3%	51.8%	56.9%	2,151	1,271	2,311	80
	Northern	414	56.1%	2.4%	51.3%	60.8%	738	327	559	22
	Central	236	52.9%	2.6%	47.9%	57.9%	445	317	595	17
	Indianapolis M.A.	329	54.8%	2.5%	49.9%	59.6%	601	313	557	17
	Southern	190	51.9%	2.6%	46.8%	56.9%	366	314	600	24

Note: What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? The DoF communicates unbiased information about Indiana's forests and woodlands to the public.



Table 137. Sampling Strata

Sampling Strata	Inclusion Probability
Northern region	0.0016
Central region	0.0030
Indianapolis Metro region	0.0021
Southern region	0.0037

Table 138. Normalized Weights

Weighting Group	Sample Count	Final Weight
Northern region, male, 18 to 44	76	2.6985
Northern region, female, 18 to 44	40	2.2020
Central region, male, 18 to 44	67	1.4923
Central region, female, 18 to 44	38	2.6985
Indy Metro area, male, 18 to 44	87	2.0147
Indy Metro area, female, 18 to 44	52	2.6985
Southern region, male, 18 to 44	75	1.1920
Southern region, female, 18 to 44	34	2.2806
Northern region, male, 45 to 64	130	1.1509
Northern region, female, 45 to 64	78	2.6985
Central region, male, 45 to 64	139	0.5987
Central region, female, 45 to 64	78	1.1455
Indy Metro area, male, 45 to 64	139	0.8082
Indy Metro area, female, 45 to 64	76	1.5464
Southern region, male, 45 to 64	140	0.4782
Southern region, female, 45 to 64	79	0.9149
Northern region, male, 65+	184	0.5865
Northern region, female, 65+	73	1.1222
Central region, male, 65+	180	0.3051
Central region, female, 65+	110	0.5838
Indy Metro area, male, 65+	138	0.4119
Indy Metro area, female, 65+	82	0.7881
Southern region, male, 65+	177	0.2483
Southern region, female, 65+	119	0.4663
<b>Total Sample Size</b>	2,391	





# Appendix B. Survey Questions

---

*Note: Question format has been modified.*

**Public Survey About Indiana’s Forests and Woodlands Background and Instructions** This survey is part of a research project conducted by Purdue University (IRB-2024-1054, PI Ma), in collaboration with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources. The goal of this survey is to gain an updated understanding of Hoosiers’ attitudes toward, familiarity with, and interests in forest and forest management in Indiana. If you are at least 18 years old, we would love to hear from you. **Even if you have little to no experience with Indiana’s forests and woodlands,** we would still like to learn about your general thoughts and opinions. If a question does not apply to you, you will be instructed to skip ahead. Please answer questions in a way that accurately reflects your own personal opinions, feelings, and experiences. Your participation in this survey is voluntary. At any time, you may choose to skip a question. Your responses will remain confidential, and your identity will not be disclosed. **Definition** Approximately 35% of land in the United States is forest land. In Indiana, forest land covers approximately 20% of the state. Forest land is sometimes referred to as woods, woodlands, timberland, and for the purpose of this survey, is defined<sup>1</sup> as “a land area at least 1 acre in size, not maintained as lawn, where trees are the predominant vegetation type.” Forest land does not include Christmas tree farms, orchards, nurseries, or land that is mowed for lawn.

Survey ID Important: Please first enter the **unique survey ID** that belongs to you. You can find this survey ID (one letter and four numbers; e.g., A1234) on **the paper survey you received in the bottom left corner of the front cover.** Your responses will remain confidential. We only use this survey ID to track survey completion and to send reminders to those who have not completed this survey. Please enter your unique survey ID below to avoid receiving unnecessary reminders from us. Thank you for your help!

**Q1.** About how long have you lived in Indiana?

- \_\_\_\_\_ years (Round to the nearest year in the space below)
- Less than one year



**Q2.** A person can think of themselves in a variety of ways. Please indicate whether or not you are... (Check all that apply)

- A gardener
- A hunter
- An angler (person who fishes)
- A birder or wildlife watcher
- A nature lover
- Someone who enjoys non-motorized outdoor activities (e.g., walking, hiking, running, cycling, kayaking, camping)
- Someone who enjoys motorized outdoor activities (e.g., ATV riding, snowmobiling)
- A member of a land-based non-profit organization (e.g., Indiana Forest & Woodland Owners Association, a land trust)
- A member of a conservation-focused non-profit organization (e.g., The Nature Conservancy, Audubon Society, Indiana Bowhunter Association)
- An urban resident
- A suburban resident
- A rural resident
- A forest or woodland owner
- A farmer or agricultural producer
- None of the above

**Q3.** Which of the following have you or any member of your household done in any privately or publicly owned forests and woodlands in Indiana in the past 12 months? (Check all that apply)

- Walking, hiking, or running
- Cycling
- Having a picnic
- Camping
- Birding or wildlife watching
- Gathering non-timber forest products (e.g., mushrooms, nuts, berries, moss, etc.)
- Fishing
- Hunting
- Kayaking, canoeing, or paddling
- Collecting firewood
- Harvesting timber
- Other, please specify:



**Q4.** In the last 12 months, which Indiana State Forest(s) have you visited? (Check all that apply)

- Clark
- Ferdinand
- Frances Slocum
- Greene-Sullivan
- Harrison-Crawford
- Jackson-Washington
- Martin
- Morgan-Monroe
- Mountain Tea
- Owen-Putnam
- Pike
- Ravinia
- Salamonie River
- Selmier
- Yellowwood
- I didn't visit any State Forest in the last 12 months.
- I don't know the name of the State Forest I visited.
- I don't know whether I visited a State Forest.

**Q 5.** In the last 12 months, which Indiana State Park(s) have you visited? (Check all that apply)

- Brown County
- Chain O'Lakes
- Charlestown
- Clifty Falls
- Falls of the Ohio
- Fort Harrison
- Harmonie
- Indiana Dunes
- Lincoln
- McCormick's Creek
- Mounds
- O'Bannon Woods
- Ouabache
- Pokagon
- Potato Creek
- Prophetstown
- Shades
- Shakamak
- Spring Mill
- Summit Lake
- Tippecanoe River
- Turkey Run
- Versailles
- Whitewater Memorial
- I didn't visit any State Park in the last 12 months.
- I don't know the name of the State Park I visited.
- I don't know whether I visited a State Park.



**Q 6.** In the last 12 months, which Indiana Fish & Wildlife Area(s) have you visited? (Check all that apply)

- Atterbury
- Blue Grass
- Chinook
- Crosley
- Deer Creek
- Fairbanks Landing
- Glendale
- Goose Pond
- Hillenbrand
- Hovey Lake
- Jasper-Pulaski
- J.E. Roush Lake
- Kankakee
- Kingsbury
- LaSalle
- Pigeon River
- Splinter Ridge
- Sugar Ridge
- Tri-County
- Wabashiki
- Wilbur Wright
- Willow Slough
- Winamac
- I didn't visit any Fish & Wildlife Area in the last 12 months.
- I don't know the name of the Fish & Wildlife Area I visited.
- I don't know whether I visited a Fish & Wildlife Area.

**Q 7.** In the last five years, have you purchased any lumber or wood products for:

- Your home / personal use
- Your community (e.g., church group, sports team, etc.)
- Your work / professional use

**Q 8.** How many years have you owned woodlands in Indiana?

- \_\_\_\_\_ years (Round to the nearest year in the space below)
- I am not a woodland owner

**Q 9.** How many acres of woodlands do you own in Indiana?

- \_\_\_\_\_ acres (Round to the nearest acre in the space below)

**Q 10.** Have you cut or harvested timber from your woodlands in Indiana since you owned the property? (Check only one)

- Yes
- No

**Q 11.** Indiana has 4.8 million acres of forests (just over 20% of the state's land base). The State Forest System makes up about 3% of Indiana's forests. What do you think about this amount of state-owned forests in Indiana? (Check only one)

- Not enough
- About right
- Too much
- No opinion



**Q 12.** What do you consider a healthy forest? (Check all that apply)

- A forest that has not been harvested
- A forest that has animals running around
- A forest that supports biodiversity
- A forest that has multiple age classes of trees (mature and young trees)
- A forest that has mostly mature trees
- A forest that is green
- A forest that is full of native trees and shrubs from Indiana
- A forest that does not have a house in it
- A forest that supports non-motorized recreation activities such as hiking
- A forest that supports hunting
- Other, please specify:

**Q13.** To what extent do you think the following factors / conditions represent a current threat to Indiana's forests / woodlands? (Check one box for each row)

[Not a threat; Somewhat threat; Moderate threat; A very big threat]

- Insects or diseases
- Cutting or harvesting trees for wood products
- Cutting or harvesting trees to create diverse wildlife habitats
- Unplanned fires or wildfires
- Planned or prescribed fires
- Climate change
- Wind or ice storms
- Drought or lack of water
- Air pollution
- Water pollution
- Spread of non-native plants and animals
- Land conversion to row crop agriculture
- Land conversion to housing development
- Land conversion to industrial or other development
- Misuse of woodlands (e.g., vandalism, dumping)
- Trespassing or poaching
- Other, please specify:



**Q 14.** How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about the values of Indiana's forests and woodlands? (Check one box for each row)

[Strongly disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly agree; Don't know]

- Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they produce wood and wood products for people.
- Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they provide jobs and income for people.
- Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they produce environmental benefits to people (e.g., clean air, clear water, carbon storage, etc.).
- Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they support biodiversity (including providing habitat for game and non-game wildlife species).
- Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable if they provide outdoor recreation for people (e.g., hiking, camping, hunting, etc.).
- Indiana forests and woodlands are valuable just because they exist even if they do not produce direct benefits to people.

**Q 15.** How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands are currently managed? (Check one box for each row)

[Strongly disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly agree; Don't know]

- The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient wood and wood products that people need.
- The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient jobs and income for people.
- The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient environmental benefits for people.
- The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed sufficiently support biodiversity (including providing habitat for game and non-game wildlife species).
- The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed produce sufficient outdoor recreational opportunities for people.
- The ways that Indiana forests and woodlands are currently managed place too much emphasis on providing benefits to people.



**Q 16.** How much do you agree or disagree with each of the following statements about how Indiana's forests and woodlands should be managed? (Check one box for each row)

[Strongly disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly agree; Don't know]

- Indiana forests and woodlands should be left untouched by humans.
- In Indiana, our future needs for wood and wood products should be met by the trees we grow in the state.
- In Indiana, we are growing enough trees to replace the ones we harvest.
- We should import wood and wood products we use from other states or countries instead of harvesting Indiana trees.
- The amount of forests and woodlands in Indiana is shrinking.
- Sometimes it is necessary to cut Indiana trees to make room for new homes.
- Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to protect Indiana forests and woodlands from the spread of insects and diseases.
- Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to protect Indiana forests and woodlands from wildfire.
- Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to help grow more diverse forests that support biodiversity.
- Sometimes it is necessary to remove some trees to improve the health of Indiana forests and woodlands.
- To help absorb and store carbon from Earth's atmosphere, no trees should be harvested from Indiana forests and woodlands.
- Indiana forests and woodlands should be managed for a balance of wood products and other environmental, biodiversity, and outdoor recreation benefits.
- Any activities that involve harvesting Indiana trees should be overseen by professional foresters.

**Q 17.** How familiar are you with the Indiana Department of Natural Resources (DNR)? (Check only one)

- Never heard of it
- Slightly familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Moderately familiar
- Extremely familiar

**Q 18.** Have you ever met anyone working for the Indiana DNR? (Check only one)

- Yes
- No
- Don't know



**Q 19.** How familiar are you with the Division of Forestry within Indiana DNR? (Check only one)

- Never heard of it
- Slightly familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Moderately familiar
- Extremely familiar

**Q 20.** What first comes to mind when you think of the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry? (Check all that apply)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| • Camping                                 | • Parks                                 |
| • Environmental conservation              | • Planting trees                        |
| • Cutting trees / timber / timber harvest | • Smokey Bear                           |
| • Fishing                                 | • Streams / lakes                       |
| • Wildfire fighting                       | • Water quality                         |
| • Forest management / forests             | • Wildlife / wildlife management        |
| • Helping forest / private landowners     | • Wildlife viewing (e.g., birdwatching) |
| • Hunting (game / game management)        | • I don't know what it does             |
| • Natural resources                       | • I've never heard of it                |
| • Outdoor recreation / recreation         | • Other, please specify:                |

**Q 21.** How likely or unlikely are you to do any of the following activities in the next 12 months? (Check one box for each row)

[Very unlikely; Unlikely; Likely; Very likely]

- Visit a State Forest
- Visit a State Wildlife Area
- Visit a State Park
- Follow Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF) on social media
- Volunteer my personal time and effort to help with the work of Indiana DNR DoF
- Attend public meetings organized by the Indiana DNR DoF
- Support an initiative that raises funds to support the work of Indiana DNR DoF
- Contact elected officials or government agencies to support the work of Indiana DNR DoF
- Vote for candidates or ballot issues to support forest management and conservation





**Q22 - description.** Companies and consumers around the world want to know that their wood products come from well-managed forests. Forest certification by a third party such as the Forest Stewardship Council® (FSC®), is a way to prove a forest is managed to provide wood products while protecting water quality, soil, plants, wildlife, and other features. Indiana landowners can voluntarily join the Private Forestland Green Certification Program (FSC-C071226) which provides certification for qualified applicants through FSC®.

**Q22a** Before reading this description, what was your level of familiarity with this Private Forestland Green Certification Program in Indiana? (Check only one)

- Never heard of it
- Slightly familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Moderately familiar
- Extremely familiar

**Q22b** After reading the description about the Private Forestland Green Certification Program in Indiana, what is your opinion about this program? (Check only one)

- Very against
- Against
- Neither against nor supportive
- Supportive
- Very supportive

**Q23 - description.** Indiana's Classified Forest and Wildlands Program encourages timber production, watershed protection, and wildlife habitat management on private lands in Indiana. To participate, landowners need to develop and follow a professionally written management plan. In return, landowners receive a property tax reduction and other assistance from state natural resource professionals.

**Q23a** Before reading this description, what was your level of familiarity with this Classified Forest and Wildlands Program in Indiana? (Check only one)

- Never heard of it
- Slightly familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Moderately familiar
- Extremely familiar

**Q23b** After reading the description about Indiana's Classified Forest and Wildlands Program, what is your opinion about this program? (Check only one)

- Very against
- Against
- Neither against nor supportive
- Supportive
- Very supportive



**Q24 - description.** The Family Forest Carbon Program was developed by two national nonprofits, the American Forest Foundation and The Nature Conservancy, to help private forest owners implement sustainable forest management practices that result in healthier forests, higher-quality timber, improved wildlife habitat and increased carbon storage. The program enables private forest owners to access the voluntary carbon market, providing income they can use toward forest management costs or to help pay property taxes. The program is not available in Indiana but is available in 19 other states.

**Q24a** Before reading this description, what was your level of familiarity with this national Family Forest Carbon Program? (Check only one)

- Never heard of it
- Slightly familiar
- Somewhat familiar
- Moderately familiar
- Extremely familiar

**Q24b** After reading the description about the national Family Forest Carbon Program, what is your opinion about introducing or developing it or a similar program in Indiana? (Check only one)

- Very against
- Against
- Neither against nor supportive
- Supportive
- Very supportive



**Q25.** What do you think about each of the following statements about the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry (DoF)? (Check one box for each row) I think that...

[Strongly disagree; Disagree; Agree; Strongly agree; Don't know]

- It is the job of DoF to advise Indiana landowners on how many and what kinds of trees they might harvest and sell.
- The DoF employs people with the scientific expertise necessary to manage forests and woodlands in Indiana.
- The DoF employs people who know what needs to be done to manage forests and woodlands in Indiana.
- The DoF employs people who care about Indiana's forests and woodlands.
- The DoF employs people who share similar values as me about the environment.
- The DoF employs people who are easy to talk to.
- The DoF employs people who care about helping people like me if I have a forest-related issue.
- The DoF listens to the public.
- The DoF treats all members of the public equally.
- The DoF has specific procedures to request input from people like me when making management decisions about Indiana's forests and woodlands.
- The DoF generally considers the opinions and needs of people like me when making management decisions about Indiana's forests and woodlands.
- The DoF communicates unbiased information about Indiana's forests and woodlands to the public.

**Q26.** On a scale of 1 to 10, how poorly or well do you think the Indiana DNR Division of Forestry is doing in terms of managing forests and woodlands in Indiana? (1 = Very poorly; 10 = Very well)

**Q27.** About how often would you say you hear or read something about trees, tree-covered areas, woodlands, or forests in general? (Check only one)

- |                        |                        |
|------------------------|------------------------|
| • Everyday             | • Once a year          |
| • Several times a week | • Once every few years |
| • Once a week          | • Never                |
| • Once a month         |                        |

**Q 28.** Have you looked for information about Indiana's trees, forests and woodlands in the past 12 months? (Check only one)

- Yes
- Not in the last 12 months, but I did a while back.
- I've never looked for information about Indiana forest and woodland.



**Q29.** How trustworthy do you consider the following potential information sources about trees, forests, and woodlands in Indiana, and which source have you used in the last 12 months? (For column 1, check one box for each row; for column 2, check one box for each row)

Col. 1 [Not trustworthy; Somewhat trustworthy; Moderately trustworthy; Very trustworthy]

Col. 2 [Yes; No]

- Indiana DNR website or newsletters
- Conservation Officers
- District Foresters
- Private forestry professionals (e.g., consulting forester, urban forester, arborist) Other private natural resources professionals (e.g., private nursery, landscaper) Companies that make wood products
- Indiana Forestry & Woodland Owners Association
- Federal agencies (e.g., USDA Forest Service)
- Non-profit environmental organizations (e.g., The Nature Conservancy, land trust)
- Purdue Extension
- University websites, videos, and publications
- TV shows and documentaries
- News media (e.g., newspaper, radio, TV)
- Social media (e.g., Facebook, X, Instagram)
- YouTube videos
- Podcasts
- Sporting magazines (e.g., Field & Stream)
- My friends and family
- Landowners in my area
- Other, please specify:

**Q30.** How much do you agree or disagree with the following statements? (Check one box for each row)

[Strongly disagree; Disagree; Neither disagree nor agree; Agree; Strongly agree]

- I find it hard to trust others
- Most people are fairly honest
- You have to be careful when dealing with others
- I generally trust others

**Q31.** Do you own or rent your primary residence? (Check only one)

- Own
- Rent
- Neither own nor rent



**Q32.** Which of the following best describes your primary residence? (Please select the closest match)

- A condominium or apartment
- Boat, RV, van, etc.
- A single-family home detached from any other house
- A single-family home attached to one or more houses (e.g., duplexes, triplexes, and quadruplexes)
- A mobile home

**Q32.** How many acres of land is this house or mobile home on? (Check only one)  
[Display only if NOT Condominium/apartment, Boat/RV/Van]

- Less than 1 acre
- 1 to 9.9 acres
- 10 or more acres

**Q33.** In which **year** were you born?

**Q34.** With what gender do you identify? (Check only one)

- Man
- Woman
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

**Q35.** On a scale of political ideology, individuals can be arranged from strongly liberal to strongly conservative. Which of the following best describes your views? (Check only one)

- Strongly liberal
- Liberal
- Slightly liberal
- Middle of the road
- Slightly conservative
- Conservative
- Strongly conservative

**Q36.** What is the highest level of school that you have completed? (Check only one)

- Less than 12th grade
- Some college
- Bachelor's degree
- High school / GED
- Associate's degree
- Advanced degree (e.g., MD, JD, a graduate degree)
- Prefer not to answer

**Q37.** What is your approximate annual household income, before taxes? (Check only one)

- Less than \$25,000
- \$25,000 to \$49,999



- \$50,000 to \$99,999
- \$100,000 to \$149,999
- \$150,000 to \$199,999
- \$200,000 or more
- Prefer not to answer

**Q38.** Do you consider yourself...? (Check all that apply)

- White
- Black or African American
- Hispanic, Latino, or Spanish origin
- Asian or Asian American
- American Indian or Alaska Native
- Native Hawaiian or other Pacific Islander
- Other
- Prefer not to answer

**Q39.** Have you ever worked in the forestry or wood products industry? (Check only one)

- Yes, I currently work in the forestry or wood products industry.
- Yes, I worked in the forestry or wood products industry in the past.
- No, I've never worked in the forestry or wood products industry.

