

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

**Survey of Rancher Opinions about  
Wildlife and Jaguar Habitat Management  
OMB Control Number 1018-XXXX**

**Terms of Clearance. None.** This is a new collection.

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

Under the Endangered Species Act of 1973 as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.), the Secretary of the Interior has the authority to designate plant and animal species as threatened or endangered and to designate critical habitat for species listed as threatened and endangered. Designation of a species as threatened or endangered provides legal protections for that species intended to prevent its extinction and recover the species to the point where it is no longer threatened or endangered. Critical habitat is habitat of a threatened or endangered species that is critical to its existence.

Recently, we (U.S Fish and Wildlife Service) proposed designation of critical habitat for the endangered jaguar (*Panthera onca*) in southern Arizona and southwestern New Mexico. The critical habitat area includes more than 764,000 acres of private, State, and Federal lands. The critical habitat provides habitat for jaguar and its prey, and is also relied upon by the cattle ranching industry. Ranching is economically and culturally important in the region. The primary land use of the region is ranching. Ranchers, through implementation of range management practices and other conservation efforts, can have a significant impact on the restoration and maintenance of jaguar habitat in the critical habitat region.

The United States Geological Survey Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit at the University of Arizona is conducting a survey of southern Arizona and southwestern New Mexico ranchers to determine knowledge and attitudes about jaguar and wildlife habitat and habitat management, concerns about cattle depredation by jaguar and mountain lions, and interest in participation in payment for ecosystem services approaches to provide incentives to improve jaguar habitat. We will use information from this survey to determine rancher attitudes and to develop educational resources for ranchers addressing the above issues.

**2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used.**

The University of Arizona will distribute this survey to ranchers in southern Arizona and southwest New Mexico. Ranchers will be identified through property ownership records for Pima, Santa Cruz, Cochise, and Hidalgo Counties; grazing allotment records provided by the U.S. Forest Service and the Bureau of Land Management; and in cooperation with rancher organizations in the region. The University of Arizona will use ranchers' responses to the questionnaire to measure ranchers' awareness and attitudes of:

- wildlife habitat management generally, current engagement in wildlife habitat management, and the impacts of jaguar on wildlife habitat management activities or intentions;
- jaguar critical habitat in Southern Arizona and Southwestern New Mexico and its impact on ranchers' operations;
- payment for ecosystem services programs, the types of program structures that may be

- acceptable to them, if they are interested in learning more about programs and potentially participating, and the impacts of Endangered Species Act regulations on potential participation;
- Farm Bill conservation programs; e.g., the Environmental Quality Improvement Program and the Wildlife Habitat Improvement Program, as a proxy for interest in other payment for ecosystem services programs; and
  - Livestock depredation by jaguars and mountain lions.

The majority of the survey consists of closed-ended questions to simplify statistical analysis of the results. We will use standard parametric and nonparametric statistical approaches to analyze survey data as appropriate. We include a basic set of demographics questions to allow for testing on the impacts of a number of potential response variables (e.g., willingness to participate in a payments for ecosystem services program, current and planned participation in wildlife/jaguar habitat management, etc.) on demographics based explanatory variables (e.g., age, years ranching, education, percent income from ranching, etc.). We will also test to determine if there are differences in the groups that elected to respond to the survey online versus by mail, and differences between ranchers located within, adjacent to, or outside of the proposed critical habitat units.

#### Hypotheses:

1. Ranchers are supportive of wildlife management on public and private lands.
2. Ranchers have a range of opinions about jaguar presence in the United States, but will be generally more neutral or positive than negative.
3. Ranchers are more concerned about the proposed jaguar critical habitat designation than they are about presence of jaguar in the United States; opinions about the proposed jaguar critical habitat designation are generally more negative than positive.
4. Ranchers are generally unfamiliar with payment for ecosystem services programs and are therefore unsure about their willingness to participate.
5. Ranchers' willingness to participate in payment for ecosystem services programs is impacted by real and perceived implications of Endangered Species Act regulations; they are more willing to participate if given regulatory assurances relative to endangered species (e.g., Safe Harbor Agreements).
6. Ranchers are more concerned about livestock depredation from mountain lions than jaguars.

This is a one-time data collection. The information obtained will give the Service insight into rancher attitudes toward jaguar habitat management on public and private lands. The results will also inform the development of a series of education workshops and publications produced by the University of Arizona to address ranchers' concerns.

A final report will be provided to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. In addition, results of the survey will be reported at public workshops and used in the development of publications targeted to ranchers in the study region. Analysis of the survey results will inform one or more peer-reviewed publications related to rancher attitudes toward jaguar habitat management and payment for ecosystem services.

- 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].**

This survey will be mailed to survey respondents and made available online for electronic submission. Mailed surveys will include postage-paid reply envelopes to enable easy response at no cost to respondents. Each survey respondent will receive a unique code that will allow us to track online and paper responses to ensure we do not receive more than one response from the same respondent. The unique participant codes also will allow us to send reminders to nonrespondents and thank you letters to respondents. Survey responses will be recorded by survey code. Once the survey is complete, the list of participant codes will be deleted from the address spreadsheet to ensure anonymity of individual responses. Analysis will be conducted using only participant codes, not respondent names or addresses. It will not be possible to link participant codes with respondent names or addresses.

During analysis of the results, we will conduct separate analyses of data received from respondents completing the survey on paper and those completing the survey online. This will allow us to determine and account for potential bias in responses resulting from different response methods.

**4. Describe efforts to identify duplication.**

To date, there has been no comprehensive effort to gather information about the attitudes and opinions of ranchers impacted by the designation of critical habitat for jaguar in the United States. While some ranchers submitted comments and participated in public meetings related to listing of jaguar as an endangered species and designation of jaguar critical habitat, it is unknown if the opinions expressed in these comments are representative of the ranching community as a whole.

A second information collection related to jaguar critical habitat is currently planned in Southern Arizona. However, this second effort is a qualitative survey focused on urban residents and interest groups outside the ranching community. The study population for the study of urban residents is distinctly different from the rancher survey, which is focused on respondents living in rural areas. In addition, the focus of the survey is different, with the rancher survey focused more on the impacts of jaguar habitat on ranching activities. We have coordinated with the group leading the second survey to ensure there is no overlap in recipients

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

Ranchers are small business owners. To minimize the burden on ranchers, we have made the survey as short as possible and will provide two response options (paper and online). This is a one-time survey, so there is no ongoing burden on ranchers.

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

If this information were not collected, it would adversely impact our understanding of ranchers' attitudes and opinions about wildlife and jaguar habitat management and payment for ecosystem services. Ranchers, through grazing activities, play a significant role in the use and management of most of the lands within the designated jaguar critical habitat area. Understanding ranchers' opinions will improve our ability to effectively promote jaguar critical

habitat and provide educational resources to ranchers. This is a one-time collection. Therefore, it cannot be collected less frequently.

- 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 the information to be collected in a manner inconsistent with OMB guidelines.

- 8. If applicable, 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.**

On December 17, 2013, we published in the Federal Register (78 FR 76315) a notice soliciting public comment on this information collection for 60 days. The comment period ended on February 18, 2014. We received three comments:

*Comment:* One commenter objected to the survey and stated that it is a waste of taxpayer dollars. The commenter did not address the information collection requirements, and we have not made any changes to the information collection.

*Comment:* Two commenters requested inclusion of New Mexico ranchers in the survey sample. *Response:* Ranchers located in southwestern New Mexico (Hidalgo County) will be included in the survey sample. The survey sample will include ranchers and ranch managers in Pima, Santa Cruz, and Cochise Counties in Arizona and Hidalgo County in New Mexico.

In addition to the Federal Register notice, we pretested the survey with seven individuals and solicited comments about the survey cover letter, instructions, and the time it took to complete the survey. See item 4 of Supporting Statement B.

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

We will not provide any payment, gift, or other remuneration to respondents.

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

We do not provide assurance of confidentiality of responses, but will separate responses from names and personally identifiable information. Each rancher contacted will be advised that the survey will be conducted in accordance with the Privacy Act of 1974 (5 USC 552a). Ranchers will not be asked to write their names on the survey, and will be assured that their name or identity will not be associated with their responses.

**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 325 ranchers will submit 796 responses totaling 132 burden hours.

We estimate the total dollar value of the annual burden hours for this collection to be \$5,758 (rounded). The Bureau of Labor Statistics (BLS) May 2013 State Occupational Employment and Wage Estimates—Arizona ([http://bls.gov/oes/current/oes\\_az.htm#00-0000](http://bls.gov/oes/current/oes_az.htm#00-0000)) lists the mean hourly wage for ranchers in Arizona as \$31.16. To determine benefits, we multiplied the hourly rate by 1.4 in accordance with BLS News Release 14-1075, resulting in an hourly cost factor of \$43.62.

ACTIVITY	NO. OF ANNUAL RESPONSES	COMPLETION TIME PER RESPONSE	TOTAL ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS	\$ VALUE OF ANNUAL BURDEN HOURS (\$43.62/HR)
Initial Contact	325	2.5 minutes	14	\$ 610.68
Reminders	243	1 minute	4	174.48
Complete Survey	228	30 minutes	114	\$4,972.68
<b>Total</b>	<b>796</b>		<b>132</b>	<b>\$5,757.84</b>

**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. The survey is accompanied by a postage-paid return envelope. Respondents also have the option to respond online. There is no fee for completing the survey or any other costs associated with responding to this survey.

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

The total Federal cost to administer this survey is \$150,361. This includes \$140,919 for the University of Arizona to develop, administer, and analyze the survey and prepare reports, and \$9,442 in Fish and Wildlife Service salary costs to coordinate and oversee the survey. We used Office of Personnel Management Salary Table 2014-RUS to determine average hourly Federal wages. We multiplied the hourly wage by 1.5 to account for benefits in accordance with BLS news release USDL 14-1075. All project coordination, administration, and review is done from the FWS Arizona Ecological Services Office (Tucson), FWS Region 2 Regional Office, and USGS.

<b>ACTION</b>	<b>POSITION AND GRADE</b>	<b>HOURLY RATE</b>	<b>HOURLY RATE INCLUDING BENEFITS</b>	<b>TOTAL ANNUAL HOURS</b>	<b>ANNUAL COST</b>
Project coordination, administration, and deliverable review	Fish and Wildlife Biologist GS 11 Step 6	\$32.41	\$48.62	40	\$1,944.80
	Fish and Wildlife Biologist GS 11 Step 9	\$35.19	\$52.79	40	\$2,111.60
	Contracting Officer Representative GS 13 Step 5	\$44.88	\$67.32	80	\$5,385.60
<b>Total</b>					<b>\$9,442.00</b>

**15. Explain the reasons for any program changes or adjustments in hour or cost burden.**

This is a new collection.

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

All responses will be collected, categorized, entered into a database, and analyzed using statistical analysis software; e.g., R, JMP, etc. Analysis will use standard statistical analysis techniques for continuous and categorical variables and for parametric and nonparametric data. Specific analysis techniques will depend on the data resulting from the survey.

The contractor will prepare a final report. In addition, one or more peer-reviewed publications will be prepared based on the results of the survey. The results of the data analysis will inform the development of educational workshops targeted at the ranching community.

**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 the survey forms.

**18. Explain each exception to the certification statement.**

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.