

FERAL SWINE SURVEY

OMB No. 0535-0256

The National Agricultural Statistics Service is seeking approval to renew and change a survey that will collect data related to the number of feral swine in the US and the amount and type of damages caused by them. In the previous collection that was conducted in 2015 the primary focus was on the amount of damage that was caused to cropland and pastureland. The target population was all farmers who produced one or more of the following crops: soybeans, wheat, rice, peanuts or sorghum in any of the following States: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, North Carolina, Mississippi, Missouri, South Carolina, and Texas.

The focus for the 2017 survey will involve 13 states (Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas), and the target population will be producers of cattle, hogs, sheep and/or goats.

A. JUSTIFICATION

- 1. Explain the circumstances that make the collection of information necessary. Identify any legal or administrative requirements that necessitate the collection. Attach a copy of the appropriate section of each statute and regulation mandating or authorizing the collection of information.**

On April 2, 2014 the Undersecretary for USDA's Marketing and Regulatory Programs, Edward Avalos announced that the USDA was kicking off a national effort to reduce the devastating damage caused by feral swine. In 2015 the benchmark survey was conducted in 11 States (Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, South Carolina, and Texas) to measure the amount of damage, feral hogs caused to crops in these states. The target population within these states consisted of farm operations who have historically produced one or more of the following crops: Corn, soybeans, wheat, rice, peanuts, or sorghum (Texas only).

The results of this benchmark survey shows that in the 11 surveyed States, there was an estimated \$190 million in damage to crops for the six target crops. The published findings from this benchmark survey can be found at <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S0261219416301557>.

In 2017, this survey will be conducted in the following 13 States: Alabama, Arkansas, California, Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, Mississippi, Missouri, North Carolina, Oklahoma, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, to measure the damage to livestock that is associated with the presence of feral swine. These States have high feral swine densities and a significant presence of cattle, hogs, sheep and/or goats. The eradication of feral swine is a high priority of the Secretary and is authorized by the Animal Health Protection Act (Title 7 U.S.C. 8301 *et seq.*) and the 2014 Farmbill.

The USDA's Feral Swine Damage Management's (FSDM) \$20 million program aims to help states deal with a rapidly expanding population of invasive wild swine. "Feral swine are one of the most destructive invaders a state can have," said Undersecretary Avalos. "They have expanded their range from 17 to 39 states in the last 30 years and cause damage to crops, kill young livestock, destroy property, harm natural resources, and carry diseases that threaten other animals as well as people and water supplies. It's critical that we act now to begin appropriate management of this costly problem."

On Feb 3, 1999, Executive Order 13112 was signed by President Clinton establishing the National Invasive Species Council. The Executive Order requires that a Council of Departments dealing with invasive species be created. Currently there are 13 Departments and Agencies on the Council. (*Executive Order 13112 of February 3, 1999—Invasive Species **Federal Register**: Feb 8, 1999 (Volume 64, Number 25)*).

The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services' (WS) National Wildlife Research Center (NWRC) is the only Federal research organization devoted exclusively to resolving conflicts between people and wildlife through the development of effective, selective, and socially responsible methods, tools, and techniques. As increased urbanization leads to a loss of traditional wildlife habitat, the potential for conflicts between people and wildlife increases. Such conflicts can take many forms, including property and natural resource damage, human health and safety concerns, and disease transmission among wildlife, livestock, and humans.

The high reproductive rate and adaptability of feral swine has resulted in populations that have dramatically increased in size and distribution. This invasive animal now occurs across much of the United States where it causes a range of agricultural and environmental damage through depredation, rooting, and wallowing activities. Furthermore, feral swine compete with native wildlife and livestock for habitats, are carriers of exotic and endemic diseases, and transmit parasites to livestock and humans. Feral swine are

considered a major emerging threat to American agriculture (Seward et al. 2004). Recent data show that the proportions of U.S. counties with agricultural production that also have feral swine present are increasing.

This initial livestock survey will be used to create a benchmark for the following objectives:

1. Describe the monetary loss for livestock caused by feral swine to producers of cattle, hogs, sheep and/or goats in each of the surveyed states due to predation by feral swine.
2. Describe the monetary loss for livestock caused by feral swine to producers of cattle, hogs, sheep and/or goats in each of the surveyed states due to diseases carried by feral swine.
3. Describe the monetary costs for any medical treatments on livestock due to the presence of, or contact with, feral swine.
4. Describe the monetary loss to livestock farmers caused by feral swine to the total crops produced on farms in each of the surveyed states.
5. Describe the monetary loss to property caused by feral swine for producers of cattle, hogs, sheep, and/or goats in each of the surveyed states.
6. Describe feral swine control costs incurred by producers of cattle, hogs, sheep, and/or goats in each of the surveyed states. Variables that will be measured include hunting, trapping, use of fencing, or the use of repellents. No data will be collected on the use of chemical or physical contraception usage.
7. Describe the total net income to producers of cattle, hogs, sheep, and/or goats in each of the surveyed states for allowing the hunting or trapping of feral swine on their operations.

Based on the results of this survey, Wildlife Service plans to publish state level data if possible. Also, there may be a follow-up survey to measure the effectiveness of control measures implemented by Wildlife Services. This follow-up survey will also be contingent upon availability of funding.

General authority for these data collection activities is granted under U.S. Code Title 7, Section 2204. This statute specifies that "The Secretary of Agriculture shall procure and preserve all information concerning agriculture which he can obtain ... by the collection of statistics ... and shall distribute them among agriculturists."

- 2. Indicate how, by whom, and for what purpose the information is to be used. Except for a new collection, indicate the actual use the agency has made of the information received from the current collection.**

The purpose of the proposed survey is to develop national and State estimates of the costs of feral swine damage to agriculture, animal health, and property, as well as costs of controls and benefits from feral swine hunting. These estimates will be used by APHIS to determine which areas have the greatest amount of damage and where to focus efforts at dealing with the feral swine problem. Financial costs will be measured because these are easily comparable across different states and commodities.

Given the wide range of damages covered in the survey, and the fact that we are relying on estimates based on human memory, there may be compound problems that are difficult to quantify or to identify a single cause. APHIS representatives and NASS survey methodologists recognize this and took care to design the questionnaire to target only damage and losses directly attributable to feral swine.

The feral swine survey is designed to establish crucial baseline levels of damage to American producers of economically important livestock (cattle, hogs, sheep and/or goats). APHIS seeks to work cooperatively and with the assistance of other agencies at the international, Federal, State, Territorial, Tribal, and local levels, and with the cooperation of private management interests, to provide a system for allocation of project resources, and to identify management methods which may be used to address feral swine damage.

- 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.**

NASS's Questionnaire Repository System (QRS) was built to enable the creation of comparable paper and web survey instruments for almost any survey. For the 2017 Feral Swine Survey NASS will develop a Computer Assisted Web Interview (CAWI), along with a computer assisted telephone interview (CATI) for data collection from non-respondents to the mail or internet questionnaire.

- 4. Describe efforts to identify duplication. Show specifically why any similar information already available cannot be used or modified for use for the purposes described in Item 2 above.**

The National Agricultural Statistics Service cooperates with State Departments of Agriculture and land grant universities to conduct agricultural surveys. These surveys meet both State and federal needs, thus eliminating duplication and minimizing reporting burden on the agriculture industry. There have been some recent studies attempting to quantify the damage done by feral swine, but those are at the State-level only. Other than the survey conducted by NASS in 2015 of crop farmers in 11 targeted States, the next most recent national-level estimates of agricultural losses from feral swine are from 2004 and 2005. APHIS needs current data that is comparable across all affected States.

5. If the collection of information impacts small businesses or other small entities (Item 5 of OMB Form 83-I), describe any methods used to minimize burden.

This information collection will not have a significant economic impact on small entities.

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.

This Information Collection Request (ICR) is for a one time survey to be conducted in 2017 with the target population being farm operators who produce cattle, hogs, sheep and/or goats in 13 target States. This survey is necessary in order to complete the mission of the USDA/Feral Swine Damage Management (FSDM) program, which is to reduce the current level of feral swine damage to American agriculture. The initial study was conducted in 2015 and the target population was farm operators who produced one or more of the following crops: corn, soybeans, wheat, rice, peanuts, or sorghum (Texas only) in 11 target States. The results from the 2017 survey will be combined with the 2015 data to give a more complete picture of the extent of total damage caused by feral swine in the United States. APHIS in conjunction with State and local governments will use the data collected by this survey to focus their efforts on reducing or at least restricting the damages caused by feral swine. In the absence of this survey it will be impossible to measure progress and the value of the services provided by FSDM. This survey may need to be repeated in three years as a component of efforts to evaluate the effectiveness of the FSDM programs.

7. Explain any special circumstances that would cause an information collection to be conducted in a manner inconsistent with the general information guidelines in 5 CFR 1320.5.

There are no special circumstances associated with this information collection.

- 8. Provide a copy and identify 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 and describe actions taken by the agency in response to these comments.**

The Federal Register Notice soliciting comments was published on August 31, 2016 on pages 59978 – 59980. NASS received one public comment from Ms. Jean Public. The comment is attached to this submission.

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 record-keeping, disclosure, or reporting format (if any), and on the data elements to be recorded, disclosed, or reported.

The National Wildlife Research Center consulted with the following individuals in the development of their survey.

Bobby Acord
Acord Consulting, LLC
221 East Pointe Road
Rock Point, NC 28457
910-210-3368

Gray Anderson Ph.D.
Tennessee Wildlife Resources Agency
P.O. Box 40747
Nashville, Tennessee 37204
Mobile: 615-788-6428
E-mail: Gray.Anderson@tn.gov

Bob Duncan, Director
Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries
4010 W. Broad Street, P.O. Box 11104
Richmond, VA 23230-1104
Office: 804-367-9231
E-mail: Bob.Duncan@dgif.virginia.gov

William H. Clay, Deputy Administrator
USDA, APHIS, Wildlife Services

1400 Independence Avenue, SW
Room 1624 South Agriculture Building
Washington, DC 20250-3042

Dale Nolte, Ph.D.
APHIS National Feral Swine Damage Management Program Manager
USDA/APHIS/Wildlife Services
4101 LaPorte Avenue
Fort Collins, Colorado 80521
Telephone: 970-266-6049
E-mail: Dale.L.Nolte@aphis.usda.gov

Larry Clark, Ph.D.
Director
National Wildlife Research Center
USDA-APHIS-WS
4101 La Porte Ave.
Fort Collins, CO 80521
Ph: (970) 266-6036
Fx: (970) 266-6040
E-mail: larry.clark@aphis.usda.gov

9. Explain any decision to provide any payment or gift to respondents.

There are no payments or gifts to respondents.

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

Questionnaires include a statement that individual reports are kept confidential. U.S. Code Title 18, Section 1905 and U.S. Code Title 7, Section 2276 provide for the confidentiality of reported information. All employees of NASS and all enumerators hired and supervised under a cooperative agreement with the National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA) must read the regulations and sign a statement of compliance

Additionally, NASS and NASS contractors comply with OMB Implementation Guidance, "Implementation Guidance for Title V of the E-Government Act, Confidential Information Protection and Statistical Efficiency Act of 2002 (CIPSEA), (Public Law 107-347). CIPSEA supports NASS' pledge of confidentiality to all respondents and facilitates the agency's efforts to reduce burden by supporting statistical activities of collaborative agencies through designation of NASS agents; subject to the limitations and penalties described in CIPSEA.

The following CIPSEA Pledge statement will appear on all future NASS questionnaires.

The information you provide will be used for statistical purposes only. Your responses will be kept confidential and any person who willfully discloses ANY identifiable information about you or your operation is subject to a jail term, a fine, or both. This survey is conducted in accordance with the Confidential Information Protection provisions of Title V, Subtitle A, Public Law 107-347 and other applicable Federal laws. For more information on how we protect your information please visit: <https://www.nass.usda.gov/confidentiality>.

11. Provide additional justification for any questions of a sensitive nature.

There are no questions of a sensitive nature.

12. Provide estimates of the hour burden of the collection of information. The statement should indicate the number of respondents, frequency of response, annual hour burden, and an explanation of how the burden was estimated. If this request for approval covers more than one form, provide separate hour burden estimates for each form and aggregate the hour burdens in Item 13 of OMB Form 83-I. Provide estimates of annualized cost to respondents for the hour burdens for collections of information, identifying and using appropriate wage rate categories.

Burden hours based on the average completion time per questionnaire are summarized below.

Cost to the public of completing a questionnaire is assumed to be comparable to the hourly rate of those requesting the data. Reporting time of 9,280 hours is multiplied by \$25 per hour for a total cost to the public of \$232,000. NASS regularly checks the Bureau of Labor Statistics' [Occupational Employment Statistics](#) (Published March 30, 2016). Mean wage rates for bookkeepers, farm managers, and farm supervisors are averaged to obtain the wage for the burden cost. The May 2015 mean wage for bookkeepers is \$18.74. The mean wage for farm managers is \$33.60. The mean wage for farm supervisors is \$23.22. The mean wage of the three is \$25.19.

Feral Pig Survey - Burden Estimate 2017 - 2019												
Survey	Sample Size	Waves of Data Collection	Responses				Non-response				Total Burden Hours	
			Resp. Count	Waves x Count	Min./ Resp.	Burden Hours	Non-resp. Count	Waves x Count	Min./ Nonr.	Burden Hours		
Questionnaires												
Feral Pig Survey - Mailing	12,000	1	2,400	2,400	45	1,800	9,600	9,600	2	320	2,120	
Phone Enumeration for Non-response	9,600	1	7,200	7,200	45	5,400	2,400	2,400	2	80	5,480	
Total	12,000		9,600	9,600		7,200	2,400	12,000		400	7,600	
Publicity Materials Mailed with Questionnaire												
Cover Letter, Information Brochure, and EDR instructions	12,000	1	9,600	9,600	10	1,600	2,400	2,400	2	80	1,680	
Total	12,000		9,600	9,600		1,600	2,400	2,400		80	1,680	
Totals	12,000		9,600	9,600		8,800	2,400	12,000		480	9,280	

* This survey will only be conducted once during the three year approval period. Potentially, this survey will be repeated every three years.

13. Provide an estimate of the total annual cost burden to respondents or record-keepers resulting from the collection of information.

There are no capital/start-up or ongoing operation/maintenance costs associated with this information collection.

14. Provide estimates of annualized cost to the Federal government; provide a description of the method used to estimate cost which should include quantification of hours, operational expenses, and any other expense that would not have been incurred without this collection of information.

The total cost to the Federal Government for the 2017 Feral Swine Survey is approximately \$280,000. About \$215,000 is for Federal salaries, \$50,000 for telephone and field enumeration by National Association of State Departments of Agriculture (NASDA) enumerators, and \$15,000 for printing, postage, data processing, etc.

15. Explain the reasons for, any program changes or adjustments reported in Items 13 or 14 of the OMB Form 83-I (reasons for changes in burden).

There will be an estimated increase in number of responses by 2,160 and an increase in respondent burden by 3,088 hours. Both of these increases are due to two program changes. We have changed the target population from crop farmers to livestock farmers and we have added two additional States (OK and TN) to the targeted area.

16. For collections of information whose results will be published, outline plans for tabulation and publication. Address any complex analytical techniques that will be used. Provide the time schedule for the entire project, including beginning and ending dates of the collection of information, completion of report, publication dates, and other actions.

Questionnaires will be mailed around the middle of June, 2017. Operations that do not respond by mail or internet within a couple of weeks will be attempted by phone or personal enumeration. After data collection is complete, the data will be edited for reasonableness and completeness. The data will then be summarized. The summarized data will be shared with The Animal and Plant Health Inspection Service (APHIS), Wildlife Services' (WS) National Wildlife Research Center (NWRC). The data will be published around October, 2018. The data tables and narrative that will be included in the publication will be similar to the publication that was issued in 2016, which is attached to this information collection request.

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.

There is no request for approval of non-display of the expiration date.

18. Explain each exception to the certification statement identified in Item 19, “Certification for Paperwork Reduction Act Submissions” of OMB Form 83-I.

There are no exceptions to the certification statement.

November 2016

Revised January 2017