

Consultation Process: Responses to Standard Questions

Henry Uhden
Wyoming Department of Agriculture

Questions:

1. The ICR is intended to require that respondents provide certain data so that the Agency can utilize them. Based on the instructions, is it clear to respondents what they are required to do and how to submit such data? If not, what suggestions do you have to clarify the instructions?

Yes

2. Do respondents understand what they are required to submit or maintain in their records? Is the reporting form clear, logical, and easy to complete?

Yes

3. The Government Paperwork Elimination Act requires agencies make available to the public electronic reporting alternatives to paper-based submissions by 2003, unless there is a strong reason for not doing so. If the Agency were able to ensure the security of CBI that might be transmitted over the Internet and the reporting form could be completed electronically, would you be interested in submitting it electronically?

Yes

Current electronic reporting alternatives include the use of “web forms”/XML based submissions via the Agency’s internet site and magnetic media-based submissions (i.e., on diskette, CD-ROM, etc.) Are you interested in using, or are they currently utilizing, electronic reporting/record-keeping options?

Yes

4. Where a reporting requirement includes a signature requirement, consider whether a secure electronic signature method (such as Private Key Infrastructure) should be *required* if submitting electronically; whether a less secure method (such as the use of PINs and passwords) would be more appropriate; or, whether a signed cover sheet may be sufficient for the Agency’s purposes when data is submitted on disk.

A signed cover sheet is sufficient.

5. If you prefer one method to another, does your choice balance burdens and costs against electronic data and signature security integrity?

No

6. If an electronic reporting option is not offered because of CBI-related concerns, would you be more inclined to submit CBI on diskette than on paper? What benefits would you realize? (Burden reduction? Greater efficiency in compiling the information?).

N/A

7. The labor rates included in the Agency's estimated burden hours and costs are a U.S. average that includes costs for overhead and benefits. These estimates include only burden hours and costs associated with the paperwork involved with this ICR (i.e., the Agency does not include estimated burden hours and costs for usual and customary business practices such as R&D, marketing, etc.). Are the estimated burden hours and labor rates accurate?

N/A

8. Are there other costs that should be accounted for that may have been missed, such as capital/start-up/M&O expenditures? If so, please provide an explanation of how you arrived at your estimate of burden and cost if substantially different than EPA's estimate.

N/A

Consultation on the Livestock Protection Collar (LPC) 1080 Information Collection Request (ICR)

APHIS' Wildlife Services and Environmental Services have considered their current reporting requirements and how their reporting process would be applicable to implementing the ICR.

We are providing the following responses to the list of questions:

1. The ICR is intended to require that respondents provide certain data so that the Agency can utilize them. Based on the instructions, is it clear to respondents what they are required to do and how to submit such data? If not, what suggestions do you have to clarify the instructions?

Response: Yes, data reporting and submission requirements are clear.

2. Do respondents understand what they are required to submit or maintain in their records? Is the reporting form clear, logical, and easy to complete?

Response: Yes, we use a standard government Wildlife Services form to record collected data.

3. The Government Paperwork Elimination Act requires agencies make available to the public electronic reporting alternatives to paper-based submissions by 2003, unless there is a strong reason for not doing so. If the Agency were able to ensure the security of CBI that might be transmitted over the Internet and the reporting form could be completed electronically, would you be interested in submitting it electronically? Current electronic reporting alternatives include the use of "web forms"/XML based submissions via the Agency's internet site and magnetic media-based submissions (i.e., on diskette, CD-ROM, etc.) Are you interested in using, or are they currently utilizing, electronic reporting/record-keeping options?

Response: Yes, paper or electronic reporting is fine depending upon who would be responsible for the initial development and implementation of an electronic reporting process for APHIS.

4. Where a reporting requirement includes a signature requirement, consider whether a secure electronic signature method (such as Private Key Infrastructure) should be *required* if submitting electronically; whether a less secure method (such as the use of PINs and passwords) would be more appropriate; or, whether a signed cover sheet may be sufficient for the Agency's purposes when data is submitted on disk.

Response: N/A Our annual report is submitted with a signed cover sheet.

5. If you prefer one method to another, does your choice balance burdens and costs against electronic data and signature security integrity?

Response: N/A

6. If an electronic reporting option is not offered because of CBI-related concerns, would you be more inclined to submit CBI on diskette than on paper? What benefits would you realize? (Burden reduction? Greater efficiency in compiling the information?).

Response: Paper

7. The labor rates included in the Agency's estimated burden hours and costs are a U.S. average that includes costs for overhead and benefits. These estimates include only burden hours and costs associated with the paperwork involved with this ICR (i.e., the Agency does not include estimated burden hours and costs for usual and customary business practices such as R&D, marketing, etc.). Are the estimated burden hours and labor rates accurate?

Response: Reasonably so, probably an overestimate.

8. Are there other costs that should be accounted for that may have been missed, such as capital/start-up/M&O expenditures? If so, please provide an explanation of how you arrived at your estimate of burden and cost if substantially different than EPA's estimate.

Response: N/A.

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION

Type: Phone Call (outgoing)

To: Henry Uhden Wyoming Dept. Ag. Cheyenne, WY 307-777-6674	From: William W. Jacobs IRB RD/OPP	Date: 6/7/2006 Time: 11:50 AM
--	--	----------------------------------

Subject: ICR for 1080 Livestock Protection Collars

Summary of Communication:

I telephoned Mr. Uhden as part of my activities associated with revising the information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) pertaining to submission of annual monitoring reports regarding use of Sodium Fluoroacetate (Compound 1080) toxic collars.

Mr. Uhden informed me that he expected that there would be no use of the Livestock Protection Collar (35978-8) registered to the Wyoming Department of Agriculture (WDA) in the next few coming years, as has been the case for the past several years. Mr. Uhden cited the labor-intensity of the method and its unsuitability to large sheep operations, especially those in rangeland areas in the western part of the State. (Labeling for 1080 collar products prohibits their use on unfenced rangelands.) In eastern Wyoming, where there are some fenced-pasture sheep operations, interest in using the collar has dwindled to essentially zero. Mr. Uhden stated that no one had requested training or certification in collar use or had expressed any desire to rent them over the past several years.

Mr. Uhden reaffirmed his statement in a telephone conversation of 7/14/2003 to the effect that it takes him about 2 hours or less to prepare a letter informing EPA that there is no use and that all 35978-8 collars are in possession of the WDA. He said that this year's report took a bit less time because he sent his letter to me as an attachment to an e-mail message.

Mr. Uhden and I then spoke briefly about various other issues unrelated to 1080 collars.

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION

Type: Phone Call (outgoing)

To: Kenneth Dial
USDA/APHIS
4700 Riverdale Road
Riverdale, MD 20737-1237
301-734-8378

From: William W. Jacobs
IRB
RD/OPP

Date: 6/7/06
Time: 10:00 AM

Subject: Monitoring Reports for 1080 Livestock Protection Collars

Summary of Communication:

I telephoned Mr. Dial to ask a few questions regarding the monitoring report requirement that is a condition of the registration of APHIS's Livestock Protection Collar product, EPA Reg. No. 56228-22, pursuant to the need to update the information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB). As Mr. Dial did not answer his phone, I left a recorded message for him.

Mr. Dial called me back at 1:23 PM, and we spoke briefly then. I indicated the nature of my earlier call and suggested that I FAX to him a copy of the e-mail note that he sent to me on 8/1/2003 (at the time of the last updating of the ICR) concerning time and wage data for preparing monitoring reports. He agreed to receive the FAX and to update it, based on current information, after consultation with others in his program. I sent the promised FAX message to Mr. Dial on 6/7/06.

On 6/13/06, Mr. Dial sent me an e-mail message containing the relevant information.



Kenneth.Dial@aphis.usda.gov
v
06/13/2006 01:35 PM

To Bill Jacobs/DC/USEPA/US@EPA
cc Jeffery.W.Jones@aphis.usda.gov
bcc
Subject Estimates for LPC Annual Reporting

Bill -

Here again is our best guess to provide you with the information you requested regarding the use of time per person and requirements for filling out the Annual Livestock Protection Collar Report (LPC). The information provided is based on usage of the collars at various locations from three states, Virginia, West Virginia, and Ohio. These are the only states currently using the collars.

Based on one operation per wildlife field specialist who normally averages 20 to 15 hours per week. The number of operations in a given state that use LPC's may vary depending upon certain requirements and factors. Usually each operation can vary in length from several weeks to two months. The following is an estimate or comparison bases upon the activity in the three states:

WS Specialist	\$ 27.00 per hour
20 -25 hours	
per week	Total \$ 540.00 - \$ 675.00
District Supervisor	GS-11/12, \$ 32.00 per hour
5 - 8 hours	
week	Total \$ 160.00 - \$ 256.00
State Director	GS-13/14, \$ 45.00 per hour
10 - 12 hours	
hours per year	Total \$ 450.00 - \$ 540.00
Operations Support Staff (OSS)	GS-12/13, \$ 38.00 per hour
12 - 14 hours	
hours per year	Total \$ 456.00 - \$ 532.00
Environmental Services (ES)	GS-12/13, \$ 38.00 per hour
32 - 40 hours	
hours per year	Total \$ 1,216.00 - \$ 1520.00

Based upon this years annual report, there were 29 operations conducted by Wildlife Services applicators. These totals are an estimate of the amount of time involved in completion, reviewing , and forwarding the LPC data to ES for final submission to EPA..

If you have any further questions regarding this information, please call me (301) 734-8378 or e-mail kenneth.dial@aphis.usda.gov.

RECORD OF COMMUNICATION

Type: Phone Calls (outgoing & return)

To: Bonnie Rabe New Mexico Dept. Ag. (NMDA) Las Cruces, NM	From: William W. Jacobs IRB RD/OPP	Dates: 6/8/2006 and 6/12/06 Time: 11:50am and 11:15am
--	--	--

Subject: Monitoring and Reporting of Livestock Protection Use in New Mexico

Summary of Communication:

I called Ms. Rabe's number to ask her some questions pursuant to updating the information collection request (ICR) to the Office of Management and Budget (OMB) regarding the annual reporting requirement for the New Mexico Department of Agriculture's Livestock Protection Collar product, EPA Reg. No. 39508-2. The woman who answered the phone told me that Ms. Rabe was at a meeting at that time but would be given a message to return my call when she returned to her office.

On Monday, 6/12/06, I was called by Marjorie Lewis of the NMDA who informed me that Bonnie Rabe had asked her to follow up on my call of 6/8/06. I discussed with Ms. Lewis the reason for my earlier call and asked her if she would be able to supply information on hours associated with compiling data for annual reports and also information on hourly rates.

Ms. Lewis asked me if a notice on updating the ICR had been published. I told her that the notice had not been published but that I had been informed that I could contact people involved with the monitoring reports either before the notice was put out for comment or after the comment period had ended.

Ms. Lewis indicated that she would be likely to e-mail some relevant information to me.