

**1 Supporting Statement A for
Paperwork Reduction Act Submission**

**Wolf-Livestock Demonstration Project Grant Program
OMB Control No. 1018-NEW**

Terms of Clearance. None.

1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary.

The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (we, Service) will administer a competitive grant program as authorized by Congress through Subtitle C of the Omnibus Public Lands Management Act of 2009 (Pub .L. 111-11). The Wolf-Livestock Demonstration Project Grant Program (WLDPGP) has two purposes:

(1) To assist livestock producers in undertaking proactive, nonlethal activities to reduce the risk of livestock loss due to predation by wolves; and

(2) To compensate livestock producers for livestock losses due to such predation.

Included in the authorization language was direction that the program be established as a grant program to States and tribes, that the Federal cost-share not exceed 50 percent, and that funds be expended equally between the two purposes. Qualifying grants must include a minimum of 50 percent non-Federal cost share.

Half of the funds associated with this program will provide financial compensation to eligible States and tribes with documented depredation by wolves. The other half of the funds will be used to support the program objective of developing proactive projects to reduce the loss of livestock associated with gray wolf depredation. The term "livestock" means cattle, swine, horses, mules, sheep, goats, livestock guard animals, and other domestic animals, as determined by the Secretary. Activities and losses may occur on Federal, State, or private land, or land owned by, or held in trust for the benefit of, an Indian tribe.

The authorization of appropriations is anticipated to continue for 5 years. Funds will be made available following approval of this request. Grant amounts will be contingent upon the quality and number of proposals received.

2. Indicate how, by whom, how frequently, and for what purpose the information is to be used. If the information collected will be disseminated to the public or used to support information that will be disseminated to the public, explain how the collection complies with all applicable Information Quality Guidelines.

State and tribal governments may compete for grant funds by providing proposals addressing wolf numbers, livestock depredation compensation information, and other factors to receive funds set aside for the depredation compensation portion of the program. States and tribes may also compete for grant dollars with proposals that describe in detail project locations, nonlethal wolf deterrence strategies, and other factors to obtain funds for the prevention portion of the program. Applications must provide the basic information necessary to determine the appropriateness and eligibility of potential projects. We will competitively score and rank all eligible applications. Narratives must describe:

- For depredation compensation grants:
 - The numbers of past depredation events and the anticipated need for future depredation dollars.
 - How the value of reimbursement is determined and the procedures that will be used to verify that available funds will be used to compensate for losses caused by wolves.
- For prevention grants:
 - Types of activities the requested funds will be used to support (e.g., range riders, guard dogs, fladry).
 - Efforts to encourage participation in prevention activities and how grant funds will promote such participation.
 - How the grantee will assess the effectiveness of funded prevention activities and report those results to the Service
- Key cooperators (e.g., Wildlife Services, NGOs) and their respective roles in the program.
- Extent of any public involvement.
- Procedures for maintaining records that will support reporting how the funds were expended.
- How the required non-Federal cost-share will be achieved.

Award recipients must ensure accurate recordkeeping, and provide annual and final performance reports to document the progress and accomplishments of the projects. Recipients also must provide financial information at the end of the project that documents the actual award amount spent and the non-Federal match provided to the project.

Information collected under this program is used to respond to the Executive Branch of the Federal Government, Congress, and the general public for requirements such as agency performance information (GPRA), budget reports and justifications, general public requests for information, data requests by other Federal financial assistance programs, and Congressional inquiries and reports.

3. Describe whether, and to what extent, the collection of information involves the use of automated, electronic, mechanical, or other technological collection techniques or other forms of information technology; e.g., permitting electronic submission of responses, and the basis for the decision for adopting this means of collection. Also describe any consideration of using information technology to reduce burden [and specifically how this collection meets GPEA requirements].

We strongly encourage respondents to submit applications electronically through Grants.gov; however, we will accept hard-copy applications via mail. Reports may be submitted via e-mail, facsimile, or mail.

4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.

The information collected is unique to each location, situation, and proposal, and is necessary for evaluating and selecting projects that make significant contributions to program objectives. No other office or agency collects this information.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities, describe the methods used to minimize burden.

We collect only the minimum information necessary for participation in the grant program. This information collection does not affect small entities as only States and tribes can apply.

6. Describe the consequence to Federal program or policy activities if the collection is not conducted or is conducted less frequently, as well as any technical or legal obstacles to reducing burden.

Elimination of the information collection would result in elimination of the grant programs because it would be impossible to determine the eligibility, resource values, or relative merit of proposed projects. Reducing the frequency of collection would reduce grant opportunities and associated funds for recipients.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner:

- * requiring respondents to report information to the agency more often than quarterly;
- * requiring respondents to prepare a written response to a collection of information in fewer than 30 days after receipt of it;
- * requiring respondents to submit more than an original and two copies of any document;
- * requiring respondents to retain records, other than health, medical, government contract, grant-in-aid, or tax records, for more than three years;
- * in connection with a statistical survey, that is not designed to produce valid and reliable results that can be generalized to the universe of study;
- * requiring the use of a statistical data classification that has not been reviewed and approved by OMB;
- * that includes a pledge of confidentiality that is not supported by authority established in statute or regulation, that is not supported by disclosure and data security policies that are consistent with the pledge, or which unnecessarily impedes sharing of data with other agencies for compatible confidential use; or
- * requiring respondents to submit proprietary trade secrets, or other confidential information unless the agency can demonstrate that it has instituted procedures to protect the information's confidentiality to the extent permitted by law.

There are no circumstances that require us to collect the information in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

8. Provide the date and page number of publication in the Federal Register of the agency's notice, required by 5 CFR 1320.8(d), soliciting comments on the information collection prior to submission to OMB. Summarize public comments received in response to that notice (or in response to a PRA statement) and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments.

Describe efforts to consult with persons outside the agency to obtain their views on the availability of data, frequency of collection, the clarity of instructions and recordkeeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported. [Please list the names, titles, addresses, and phone numbers of persons contacted.]

On April 2, 2012, a notice of our intent to request that OMB approve information collection for the Wolf-Livestock Demonstration Project Grant Program was published in the *Federal Register* (77 FR 19682). In that notice, we solicited comments for 60 days, ending on June 1, 2012. One comment was received expressing opinions about the WLDPGP funding allocations and wolf management in general, but did not address the information collection requirements. No changes were made to the information collection requirements as a result of this comment.

We contacted the following five individuals regarding the information collection process:

Russ Morgan, Wolf Coordination, Oregon Department of Fish and Wildlife. 541 962-1831
Carter Neimeyer, Contractor; Retired Biologist, US Fish and Wildlife Service. 208 921-5930
Howard Hutchinson, Mexican Wolf Interdiction Team. 505 629-1303
George Edwards, Montana Livestock Loss Reduction & Mitigation Board. 406 444-5609
April Howard, Biologist, San Carlos Apache Tribe of Arizona. 928 475-2343

All individuals were asked to review the necessity of the information (grant applications and reports) requested, the practical utility of the information requested, and the annual burden hours for preparing applications and reports for both the compensation and prevention portion of the grant program. George Edwards agreed that our estimated hours were appropriate. April Howard noted that the application would require cross program coordination and would probably require about 12 hours. Completion times will vary depending on the complexity of the proposal. Our burden estimates in item 12 are based on our experience in administering grant programs, and we believe they reflect an accurate average for most submissions.

9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents, other than remuneration of contractors or grantees.

No gifts or payments, other than grant money awarded to grantees, are made to respondents.

10. Describe any assurance of confidentiality provided to respondents and the basis for the assurance in statute, regulation, or agency policy.

There is no assurance of confidentiality. Once submitted, the information becomes public information and is not protected under the Privacy Act.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature, such as sexual behavior and attitudes, religious beliefs, and other matters that are commonly considered private.

We do not ask questions of a sensitive nature.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information.

We estimate that 22 States and tribes will submit 42 responses totaling 456 annual burden hours.

The estimated dollar value of the annual burden hours is \$17,164 (rounded). We used the Bureau of Labor Statistics Occupational Employment and Wages, May 2011 to determine wage information. Table 19-1023 lists the mean hourly wage for State zoologists and wildlife biologists as \$25.09. To calculate benefits, we multiplied this rate by 1.5 in accordance with BLS News Release USDL-12-1830, September 11, 2012.

Activity	Annual Number of Responses	Completion Time (hours) Per Response	Total Annual Burden Hours	\$ Value of Annual Burden Hours (\$37.64/hour)
Applications	22	8	176	\$6,624.64
Reports and recordkeeping	20	14	280	10,539.20
Totals	42		456	\$17,163.84

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual [nonhour] cost burden to respondents or recordkeepers resulting from the collection of information.

There is no nonhour cost burden to respondents.

14. Provide estimates of annualized costs to the Federal Government.

The total estimated annual cost to the Federal Government for processing and reviewing proposals and reviewing reports as a result of this collection of information is \$8,589.00. This estimate includes salary and benefits (\$1,989.00), as well as other costs associated with proposal review, selection, and report review (\$6,600.00). Table 14.1 shows Federal staff and grade levels performing various tasks associated with this information collection. WLDPGP staff will develop and post application instructions.

Information collection costs also include expenses associated with proposal solicitation, review, and selection, including travel and travel arrangement costs for meetings, site visits, and printing (see Table 14.2). We used Office of Personnel Management Salary Table 2012-DCB http://www.opm.gov/oca/12tables/pdf/dcb_h.pdf to determine the hourly wages and multiplied the hourly wage by 1.5 to account for benefits, in accordance with BLS News Release USDL-12-1830, September 11, 2012.

Table 14.1 – Fish and Wildlife Salary/Benefits

Action	Position and Grade	Hourly Rate	Hourly Rate including Benefits	Total Annual Hours	Annual Cost*
Administrative Work Associated with Application Process	Program Analyst GS 9/5	\$28.04	\$42.06	4	\$168.00
	Wildlife Biologist/Grant Administrator GS 13/5	\$48.35	\$72.53	4	\$290.00
Proposal Review	Wildlife Biologist/Grant Administrator GS 13/5	\$48.35	\$72.53	6	\$435.00
Proposal Selection	Grant Administrator- GS 12/5	\$40.66	\$60.99	5	\$305.00
	Wildlife Biologist GS 13/5	\$48.35	\$72.53	5	\$363.00
	Wildlife Administrator (Grants Branch Chief) GS 14/5	\$57.13	\$85.70	3	\$257.00
Report Review	Wildlife Administrator (Grants Branch Chief) GS 14/5	\$57.13	\$85.70	2	\$171.00
Total					\$1,989.00

*rounded

Table 14.2 – Other Costs

Travel	Site Visits (As Needed for Project Evaluation)	Printing/ FedEx	Other	Total
\$4,800	\$1,250	\$300	\$250	\$6,600

15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments.

This is a new collection.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication.

We will not publish data from this information collection.

17. If seeking approval to not display the expiration date for OMB approval of the information collection, explain the reasons that display would be inappropriate.

We will display the OMB control number and expiration date on appropriate materials.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.