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EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted for the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) to determine the attitudes toward and opinions on wildlife, particularly coyote, mountain lion, and javelina, among urban residents of Phoenix and Tucson. The study entailed a telephone survey of residents of the two cities over the age of 18. The sample was pulled proportionally to the cities’ respective populations; therefore, no weighting of the results was necessary. The sample consisted of 72% Phoenix residents and 28% Tucson residents.

For the survey, telephones were selected as the preferred sampling medium because of the universality of telephone ownership. The telephone survey questionnaire was developed cooperatively by Responsive Management and the AGFD. Responsive Management conducted a pre-test of the questionnaire, and revisions were made to the questionnaire based on the pre-test. Interviews were conducted Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday noon to 5:00 p.m., and Sunday from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., local time.

The survey was conducted in June 2005. Responsive Management obtained a total of 1,500 completed interviews. The software used for data collection was Questionnaire Programming Language 4.1. The analysis of data was performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software as well as proprietary software developed by Responsive Management. Throughout this report, findings of the telephone survey are reported at a 95% confidence interval. For the entire sample, the sampling error is at most plus or minus 2.53 percentage points. For the sample of Phoenix residents, the sampling error is at most plus or minus 2.96 percentage points. For the sample of Tucson residents, the sampling error is at most plus or minus 4.88 percentage points.

WILDLIFE ISSUES FACING ARIZONA

- Habitat loss and habitat fragmentation are perceived as the most important wildlife issues facing residents living in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona; however, nuisance wildlife and the dangers associated with wildlife are the next most important issues.
INFORMATION ABOUT WILDLIFE

- The top topics of interest among respondents are how to interact with wildlife appropriately, places to view wildlife, what to do with injured wildlife, the reality of wildlife threats to humans, and how to view wildlife. Respondents most commonly indicated that direct mail was the best way to provide them with information, although TV and newspapers are also preferred mediums. In a separate question, a majority of respondents indicated that they access the Internet daily.

CONTACTS WITH THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

- A fifth of respondents (20%) have contacted the AGFD for information on or assistance with wildlife in cities, towns, or suburban areas, typically making that contact by telephone. Most people who contacted the AGFD were satisfied with the contact (82%), with most of those being very satisfied.

ATTITUDES TOWARD WILDLIFE

General Attitudes Toward Wildlife

- Most commonly, respondents indicate that they enjoy seeing and having wildlife around their home, although nearly as many overall say that they do not have wildlife around their home. Nonetheless, substantial percentages (11% overall, 10% of Phoenix residents, and 16% of Tucson residents) express concerns about wildlife problems—the sum of those who answered any of the three “nuisance” answers (I enjoy seeing wildlife but worry about the problems they cause, I regard wildlife as a nuisance, and I regard wildlife as dangerous).

- The highest ranked wildlife value of the six values about which the survey asked (ranked by percentage giving a “very important” answer) is that wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona. (Note that all values except one—that the respondent has the opportunity to view wildlife around his/her home—have a majority saying the value is very important.) The second ranked wildlife value among respondents overall is that wildlife populations are being properly managed around the respondent’s home.
A large majority of respondents (72%) think the wildlife populations around their home should remain the same rather than be increased (13%) or decreased (8%).

- Those who think the populations should be increased most commonly want to improve the chance of seeing wildlife or say that the ecosystem needs more wild animals.
- Those who think the populations should be decreased most commonly cite safety reasons or nuisance-related reasons.

**Attitudes Toward the Arizona Game and Fish Department’s Wildlife Management**

- Ratings of the AGFD’s wildlife management program in the respondent’s area are positive: 57% rate it as excellent or good, while only 11% rate it as fair or poor (with only 2% rating it poor); the remainder don’t know.

- When asked how they would like the AGFD to provide more assistance to city, town, and suburban residents with managing wildlife around their homes, respondents expressed desires for more information and education about wildlife. A substantial percentage (18%) indicated that the AGFD does not need to provide more assistance.

- Respondents were read twelve tasks of the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas, and they were asked to rate the importance of each task on a scale of 0 to 10.

  - Regarding respondents overall, in a ranking of the mean for each question, the most important tasks of the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas are:
    - providing information to the public about wildlife in urban areas,
    - assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat,
    - providing education programs about urban wildlife,
    - rescuing abandoned or injured wildlife, and
    - assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat.

  - The least important programs are
    - assisting businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts and
    - providing opportunities for people to view and/or photograph wildlife in urban areas.
Among respondents overall, in a ranking of programs by the percent rating them at a 10 in importance, the most important programs (all that had at least 50% giving it a rating of 10) are:

- assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat,
- providing information to the public about wildlife in urban areas,
- assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat,
- removing dead animals from roads and yards, and
- rescuing abandoned or injured wildlife.

Responsibility and Funding for Wildlife Management

- Overwhelmingly (76%), respondents feel that the AGFD should have the primary responsibility for management of wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas of Arizona.
- There is less agreement regarding respondents’ opinions on funding for urban wildlife management: 43% said taxes in general, 29% said state government (not including the AGFD), 28% said the AGFD, and 22% said the city or county government.

- When respondents were asked specifically about nuisance animals in residential areas, the majority (67%) said the AGFD should have primary management responsibility, although a quarter (25%) said that city or county governments should have primary management responsibility.
- When asked from where funding should come for managing nuisance wildlife in residential areas, respondents gave answers distributed among many different sources: 39% said taxes in general, 26% said the state government (not including the AGFD), 23% said the AGFD, and 20% said city or county governments.

- When respondents were asked specifically about animals that become nuisances to businesses, such as golf courses, a slight majority (56%) said the AGFD should have primary
management responsibility, but a substantial percentage (29%) said that the business owners should have primary management responsibility.

- When asked from where funding should come for managing wildlife that becomes a nuisance to businesses, respondents most commonly said the business owners should have the burden of funding the management of the nuisance wildlife (42%), with somewhat smaller percentages saying that taxes in general (24%) or the AGFD (23%) should provide funding.

- Finally, respondents were asked about responsibility for (and funding of) nuisance wildlife management in public areas, such as parks, in Arizona. A large majority (69%) think the AGFD should have primary management responsibility.

- Taxes in general (41%), the AGFD (28%), the state government (not including the AGFD) (24%), and city or county governments (20%) were the most commonly named sources for funding nuisance wildlife management in public places such as parks.

Nuisance Wildlife and Attitudes Regarding Feeding Wildlife

- Small percentages of respondents had problems with coyotes (5%), mountain lions (less than 1%), and javelinas (4%) in the past 2 years. Regarding other wildlife, 12% of respondents had problems with wild animals other than coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas. The most frequently named other animals were reptiles/amphibians and birds.

- The typical problems caused by the other wildlife (other than coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas) were their presence in general, structural damage to the house, garden damage, threats to humans, yard damage, and threats to pets.

- The AGFD is rated well in its response to homeowner requests for assistance with nuisance animals, with excellent and good ratings (31% combined) far exceeding fair and poor ratings (5% combined); the large majority answered, “Don’t know.”

- Support is overwhelming for controlling nuisance animals that have caused property damage: 81% of respondents support doing so. Trapping and relocation is the overwhelmingly
preferred method for controlling nuisance wildlife in urban and suburban areas (72% of those who support controlling nuisance wildlife).

- A large majority (75%) disagree that it is okay to feed wildlife or leave food out for wildlife, with most of those in strong disagreement, and a large majority (73%) would support a law making feeding wildlife, in certain situations and/or areas, illegal.

- A little more than a quarter of respondents (27%) indicated that he/she personally, a family member, or a neighbor fed wildlife around his/her home. Of those respondents who fed or whose family members or neighbors fed wildlife, a large majority (68%) disagreed that the wildlife feeding caused subsequent conflicts of problems with wildlife; however, 23% agreed.
  - Those who said the feeding caused a problem cited as problems the animals’ presence in general, problems with garbage or pets, and threats to humans.

- The previous section discussed responsibility and funding for nuisance wildlife management. In short, the report indicated that the majority of respondents (67%) said the AGFD should have primary responsibility for managing nuisance animals in residential areas, although a quarter (25%) said that city or county governments should have primary responsibility.
  - Also as previously discussed, when asked from where funding should come for managing nuisance wildlife in residential areas, respondents gave answers distributed among many different sources: 39% said taxes in general, 26% said the state government (not including the AGFD), 23% said the AGFD, and 20% said city or county governments.

- The previous section discussed animals that may become nuisances to businesses, such as golf courses, and a slight majority (56%) said the AGFD should have primary responsibility for management of such nuisance wildlife, but a substantial percentage (29%) said that the business owners should have primary responsibility.
  - When asked from where funding should come for managing wildlife that becomes a nuisance to businesses, respondents most commonly said the business owners should have the burden of funding the management of the nuisance wildlife (42%), with
somewhat smaller percentages saying that taxes in general (24%) or the AGFD (23%) should provide funding.

Also, the previous section indicated that respondents were asked about responsibility for (and funding of) nuisance wildlife management in public areas, such as parks, in Arizona, and a large majority (69%) think the AGFD should have primary management responsibility.

- Taxes in general (41%), the AGFD (28%), the state government (not including the AGFD) (24%), and city or county governments (20%) were the most commonly named sources for funding nuisance wildlife management in public places such as parks.

### PARTICIPATION IN WILDLIFE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

- Just under a majority (44%) of respondents participated in viewing wildlife around home in the past 2 years; about a fifth fed wildlife (20%), photographed wildlife (19%), and/or maintained plantings to benefit wildlife (17%).

- Birds and mammals were the types of wildlife most frequently viewed and photographed, but substantial percentages viewed and photographed reptiles and amphibians. Birds were overwhelmingly the type of wildlife that respondents fed or for which they maintained plantings.
  - The most commonly viewed mammals were coyotes, rabbits, javelinas, bobcats, and squirrels.
  - Coyotes, javelinas, rabbits, deer, bobcats, and squirrels were the most commonly photographed mammals.
  - Rabbits were the type of mammal most commonly fed, about double the percentage who fed squirrels. Additionally, substantial percentages fed coyotes or javelinas.
  - The overwhelming majority of those who maintained plantings for wildlife did so for birds; second on the list was insects, closely followed by mammals.

- A majority of those who viewed wildlife did so daily. Photographing wildlife was most commonly a monthly or semi-annual activity. Of those who fed wildlife, just over a majority
did so daily. Respondents most commonly maintained their plantings for wildlife daily or weekly.

ISSUES REGARDING COYOTES

Knowledge of Coyotes
➤ Residents overall are about evenly divided in their professed knowledge of coyotes, with 45% saying that they know a great deal or moderate amount, and 54% saying that they know a little or nothing about coyotes.

Attitudes Toward Coyotes
➤ The majority of respondents (58%) indicate that they have no coyotes around their home. Otherwise, respondents most commonly say that they enjoy seeing and having coyotes around their home (21%), more than all of the “nuisance” answers combined (18%).

➤ When asked directly about the nearest area to their home they would want to see coyotes, a majority of respondents (58%) said that they would want to see them in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas. Nonetheless, substantial percentages answered that they would like to see coyotes around their home (17%) or in nearby parks (14%).
- 8% do not want to see coyotes at all.

➤ The majority of respondents (68%) think the coyote population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (5%) or decreased (13%).
- Reasons that respondents give for increasing the coyote population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more coyotes.
- The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the coyote population are to improve pet and human safety and to reduce coyote-human conflicts.

➤ While a majority of respondents think the coyote population in their area should remain the same in size, there is also a majority (58%) in support of controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) coyote populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
Problems with Coyotes

- A small percentage of respondents (5%) have had problems with coyotes in the past 2 years.
  - The most common coyote problems were with pets (61% of those who had problems) and their presence in general (42%).

Attitudes Toward Controlling the Coyote Population

- Although a majority of respondents think the coyote population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (58%) support controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) coyote populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
  - Those who support controlling coyotes most commonly think the method that should be used is trapping and relocation.
  - When asked directly about lethal methods, 41% support some type of lethal methods.
  - When those who said they opposed lethal methods for controlling coyotes were asked about the use of lethal methods if other methods were not possible, 56% support lethal methods (but most of those only moderately supporting).

Attitudes Toward the Arizona Game and Fish Department’s Management of Coyotes

- Respondents give more positive than negative ratings to the AGFD’s management of coyotes in their area: 35% rate it excellent or good, while 11% rate it fair or poor (the majority answered, “Don’t know”).

- Recall that previously the report indicated that the majority of respondents (68%) think the coyote population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (5%) or decreased (13%).
  - Also recall reasons that respondents give for increasing the coyote population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more coyotes.
  - The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the coyote population include to improve pet and human safety and to reduce coyote-human conflicts.
ISSUES REGARDING MOUNTAIN LIONS

Knowledge of Mountain Lions

- A large majority of respondents (72%) profess to know a little or nothing about mountain lions; only 27% say they know a great deal or moderate amount.

Attitudes Toward Mountain Lions

- The overwhelming majority of respondents (89%) indicate that they do not have mountain lions around their home or in their area. Because such a high percentage of respondents gave this answer, another analysis was run only of those who did not give the answer that they have no mountain lions around their home or in their area. Of those, there are about equal percentages who enjoy seeing and having mountain lions around their home (32%) and who regard mountain lions as dangerous (33%). Indeed, a majority of those respondents not answering that there are no mountain lions around their home (53%) gave one of the three “nuisance” answers.

- Most commonly, respondents think the mountain lion population in Arizona is declining (33%), with another 15% saying mountain lions are endangered in Arizona and 1% saying they are extinct. About a fifth (19%) think the mountain lion population is stable and healthy.

- A majority of respondents (61%) feel confident that they know what to do to minimize the risk of danger from mountain lions. Just less than half (44%) feel that mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans, and about a fifth (21%) say that mountain lions are a threat to their safety. (Note that the question in this bullet regarding whether mountain lions are dangerous was asked differently than the attitude question reported previously in which a low percentage of respondents said that they regard mountain lions as dangerous. The previous question asked which statement would best describe their attitude toward mountain lions. The question reported in this bullet asked directly, “Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?” Those who agree in
this question that mountain lions are dangerous may not necessarily say that “dangerous” best describes their attitude toward mountain lions.)

- In the individual questions, respondents are about equally divided regarding whether mountain lions are dangerous to humans (44% agree, 44% disagree).
- Disagreement (72%) far exceeds agreement (21%) that mountain lions are a threat to personal safety.
- Agreement (60%) is about double the disagreement (32%) that the respondent is confident he/she knows how to minimize personal risk from mountain lions.

> When asked directly about the nearest area to their home they would want to see mountain lions, a large majority of respondents (72%) said that they would want to see them in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas. Small percentages answered that they would like to see mountain lions around their home (5%) or in nearby parks (8%).
- A substantial percentage (13%) do not want to see mountain lions at all.

> The majority of respondents (65%) think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (9%) or decreased (8%).
- Common reasons that respondents give for increasing the mountain lion population include that the ecosystem needs more mountain lions and to improve the chances of seeing one.
- Most commonly, reasons that respondents give for decreasing the mountain lion population are to improve human safety, to reduce mountain lion-human conflicts, and to improve pet safety.

> While a majority of respondents think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same in size, there is also a majority (59%) in support of controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) mountain lion populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
Problems with Mountain Lions
- A very small percentage of respondents (less than 1%) have had problems with mountain lions in the past 2 years.
  - The most common mountain lion problem was threats to humans (4 of the 9 respondents who reported a problem).

Attitudes Toward Controlling the Mountain Lion Population
- Although a majority of respondents think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (59%) support controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) mountain lion populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
  - The majority of those who support controlling mountain lions (58%) think the method that should be used is trapping and relocation.
  - When asked directly about lethal methods for controlling mountain lions, 46% support some type of lethal methods.
  - When those who said they opposed lethal methods for controlling mountain lions were asked about the use of lethal methods if other methods were not possible, 55% support lethal methods (but most of those only moderately supporting).

Attitudes Toward the Arizona Game and Fish Department’s Management of Mountain Lions
- Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with five statements about the AGFD’s management of mountain lions that reflect positively on the AGFD’s management (e.g., “The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions”). Each statement had a large majority in agreement (from 65% to 72%).
  - No statement had more than 10% in disagreement overall.
  - Those who disagree that the AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans most commonly say that the AGFD sides with humans too often.

- Respondents give more positive than negative ratings to the AGFD’s management of mountain lions in their area: 38% rate it excellent or good, while 9% rate it fair or poor (the majority answered, “Don’t know”).
Recall that previously the report indicated that the majority of respondents (65%) think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (9%) or decreased (8%).

- Also recall reasons that respondents give for increasing the mountain lion population include that the ecosystem needs more mountain lions and to improve the chances of seeing one.
- The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the mountain lion population are to improve human safety, to reduce mountain lion-human conflicts, and to improve pet safety.

ISSUES REGARDING JAVELINAS

Knowledge of Javelinas

- A large majority of respondents (68%) profess to know a little or nothing about javelinas, while 30% say they know a great deal or moderate amount.

Attitudes Toward Javelinas

- The overwhelming majority of respondents (80%) do not have javelinas around their home of in their area. Otherwise, a greater percentage said they enjoy seeing and having javelinas around their home (11%) than gave any of the “nuisance” answers combined (8%).

- When asked directly about the nearest area to their home they would want to see javelinas, a majority of respondents (62%) said that they would want to see them in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas. Nonetheless, substantial percentages answered that they would like to see javelinas around their home (13%) or in nearby parks (10%).
  - A substantial percentage (12%) do not want to see javelinas at all.

- The majority of respondents (66%) think the javelina population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (7%) or decreased (9%).
  - Common reasons that respondents give for increasing the javelina population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more javelinas.
• The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the javelina population are to improve human safety, that there are simply too many nuisance issues, and to reduce javelina-human conflicts.

➢ While a majority of respondents think the javelina population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (53%) also are in support of controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) javelina populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.

Problems with Javelinas
➢ A small percentage of respondents (4%) have had problems with javelinas in the past 2 years.
  • The most common javelina problems were with gardens (39% of those who had problems), their presence in general (33%), garbage (26%), and yards (26%).

Attitudes Toward Controlling the Javelina Population
➢ Although a majority of respondents think the javelina population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (53%) support controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) javelina populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
  • The majority of those who support controlling javelinas (53%) think the method that should be used is trapping and relocation.
  • When asked directly about lethal methods to control javelinas, 50% support lethal methods.
  • When those who said they opposed lethal methods for controlling javelinas were asked about the use of lethal methods if other methods were not possible, 55% support lethal methods (but most of those only moderately supporting).

Attitudes Toward the Arizona Game and Fish Department’s Management of Javelinas
➢ Respondents give more positive than negative ratings to the AGFD’s management of javelinas in their area: 32% rate it excellent or good, while 7% rate it fair or poor (the majority answered, “Don’t know”).
Previously, the report indicated that the majority of respondents (66%) think the javelina population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (7%) or decreased (9%).

- Recall that common reasons that respondents give for increasing the javelina population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more javelinas.
- The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the javelina population are to improve human safety, that there are simply too many nuisance issues, and to reduce javelina-human conflicts.

**SELECTED COMPARISONS OF COYOTE, MOUNTAIN LION, AND JAVELINA QUESTIONS**

- Knowledge levels are greater regarding coyotes than regarding mountain lions and javelinas.

- Of the three species in the survey, coyotes are the most prevalent (according to whether respondents say they have them around their homes); mountain lions are the least prevalent. Among those who did not answer, “I don’t have (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home or in my area,” mountain lions, not surprisingly, are considered the most dangerous.
  - In a related question, respondents were asked how near to their home they would want to see coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas. People appear most comfortable having coyotes around their home; they are least comfortable with mountain lions.

- The ranking of the three types of animals in the survey for causing problems are coyotes (the most problems), javelinas, and mountain lions (the fewest problems).
  - Coyotes overwhelmingly cause more problems with pets than do mountain lions or javelinas. Javelinas cause the most problems to gardens, yards, and garbage. Mountain lions create the greatest perceived threats to humans.
Results regarding whether populations of coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas should be increased, decreased, or kept the same are not much different among the three types of animals.

- Reasons for increasing the populations are about the same among the three types of animals, but reasons for decreasing show some marked differences. People more often want to decrease coyote populations for pet safety than they do for the mountain lion or javelina populations. Human safety as a reason for decreasing the population was most often given regarding mountain lions.

There is little difference across species regarding support or opposition to controlling populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas. However, differences emerge regarding how to control them: people are more likely to want to trap and relocate mountain lions than javelinas and especially coyotes. Regarding lethal methods, when respondents were asked about them directly, there are no marked differences across species.

There is little difference across species regarding opinions on the AGFD’s management of the species, except in reasons for giving poor ratings of the AGFD’s management programs. Respondents are much more likely to say the AGFD does a poor job addressing mountain lion-human conflicts than they are to say that about coyote-human or javelina-human conflicts. Additionally, respondents are more likely to say the javelina and coyote populations are at the wrong size than to say that the mountain lion population is at the wrong size. Finally, respondents are more likely to say there are many javelina-human and coyote-human conflicts than they are to say that there are many mountain lion-human conflicts.
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INTRODUCTION AND METHODOLOGY

This study was conducted for the Arizona Game and Fish Department (AGFD) to determine the attitudes toward and opinions on wildlife, particularly coyote, mountain lion, and javelina, among urban residents of Phoenix and Tucson. The study entailed a telephone survey of residents of the two cities over the age of 18. Specific aspects of the research methodology are discussed below.

For the survey, telephones were selected as the preferred sampling medium because of the universality of telephone ownership. In addition, a central polling site at the Responsive Management office allowed for rigorous quality control over the interviews and data collection. Responsive Management maintains its own in-house telephone interviewing facilities. These facilities are staffed by interviewers with experience conducting computer-assisted telephone interviews on the subjects of natural resources and outdoor recreation. The telephone survey questionnaire was developed cooperatively by Responsive Management and the AGFD. Responsive Management conducted a pre-test of the questionnaire, and revisions were made to the questionnaire based on the pre-test.

The sample was pulled proportionally to the cities’ respective populations; therefore, no weighting of the results was necessary. The sample consisted of 72% Phoenix residents and 28% Tucson residents.

To ensure the integrity of the telephone survey data, Responsive Management has interviewers who have been trained according to the standards established by the Council of American Survey Research Organizations. Methods of instruction included lecture and role-playing. The Survey Center Managers and other professional staff conducted project briefings with the interviewers prior to the administration of this survey. Interviewers were instructed on type of study, study goals and objectives, handling of survey questions, interview length, termination points and qualifiers for participation, interviewer instructions within the survey instrument, reading of the survey instrument, skip patterns, and probing and clarifying techniques necessary for specific questions on the survey instrument. The Survey Center Managers and statisticians monitored the data collection, including monitoring of the actual telephone interviews without the interviewers’
knowledge, to evaluate the performance of each interviewer and ensure the integrity of the data. After the surveys were obtained by the interviewers, the Survey Center Managers and/or statisticians edited each completed survey to ensure clarity and completeness.

Interviews were conducted Monday through Friday from 9:00 a.m. to 9:00 p.m., Saturday noon to 5:00 p.m., and Sunday from 5:00 p.m. to 9:00 p.m., local time. A five-callback design was used to maintain the representativeness of the sample, to avoid bias toward people easy to reach by telephone, and to provide an equal opportunity for all to participate. When a respondent could not be reached on the first call, subsequent calls were placed on different days of the week and at different times of the day. The survey was conducted in June 2005. Responsive Management obtained a total of 1,500 completed interviews.

The software used for data collection was Questionnaire Programming Language 4.1 (QPL). The survey data were entered into the computer as each interview was being conducted, eliminating manual data entry after the completion of the survey and the concomitant data entry errors that may occur with manual data entry. The survey instrument was programmed so that QPL branched, coded, and substituted phrases in the survey based on previous responses to ensure the integrity and consistency of the data collection. The analysis of data was performed using Statistical Package for the Social Sciences software as well as proprietary software developed by Responsive Management.

Throughout this report, findings of the telephone survey are reported at a 95% confidence interval. For the entire sample, the sampling error is at most plus or minus 2.53 percentage points. The sampling error was calculated using the formula described below, with a sample size of 1,500, and a total population of the two cities of 1,305,692 residents 18 years of age and older. For the sample of Phoenix residents, the sampling error is at most plus or minus 2.96 percentage points, using a sample size of 1,097 and a population of Phoenix of 938,610 residents 18 years of age and older; for the sample of Tucson residents, the sampling error is at most plus or minus 4.88 percentage points, using a sample size of 403 and a population of Tucson of 367,082 residents 18 years of age and older.
Sampling error equation:

\[
B = \left( \sqrt{\frac{N_p(0.25)}{N_s} - 0.25} \right) \left( \frac{N_p - 1}{N_p - 2} \right) (1.96)
\]

Where:  
- \( B \) = maximum sampling error (as decimal)  
- \( N_p \) = population size (i.e., total number who could be surveyed)  
- \( N_s \) = sample size (i.e., total number of respondents surveyed)


**Note:** This is a simplified version of the formula that calculates the maximum sampling error using a 50:50 split (the most conservative calculation because a 50:50 split would give maximum variation).

Note that some results may not sum to exactly 100% because of rounding. Additionally, rounding on the graphs may cause apparent discrepancies of 1 percentage point between the graphs and the reported results of combined responses (e.g., when “strongly support” and “moderately support” are summed to determine the total percentage in support).
WILDLIFE ISSUES FACING ARIZONA

- Habitat loss and habitat fragmentation are perceived as the most important wildlife issues facing residents living in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona; however, nuisance wildlife and the dangers associated with wildlife are the next most important issues.
- Phoenix and Tucson residents are nearly the same in their opinions regarding wildlife issues.
Q9. In your opinion, what are the most important wildlife issues facing Arizona residents living in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Don't know: 35%
- Habitat loss: 31%
- Habitat fragmentation: 14%
- Other: 10%
- Nuisance wildlife: 9%
- Dangers associated with wildlife: 4%
- There are none (no important issues): 4%
- Polluted water / water quality: 3%
- Wildlife health: 3%
- Not enough water / water quantity: 2%
- People feeding wildlife / wildlife becoming dependent on humans for food: 2%
- Exotic / invasive species: 2%
- Air pollution / air quality: 1%
- Poaching / illegal killing or removal: 1%
- Low populations: 1%
- Rattlesnake bites: 1%
- Lack of hunting/fishing access: 1%
- Not enough food / food supply: 1%
- Health of/Lack of Fish/Fishing: 1%
Q9. In your opinion, what are the most important wildlife issues facing Arizona residents living in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Don’t know: 31%
- Habitat loss: 29%
- Habitat fragmentation: 17%
- Other: 10%
- Nuisance wildlife: 9%
- Dangers associated with wildlife: 8%
- Polluted water/water quality: 3%
- Wildlife health: 3%
- Not enough water/water quantity: 2%
- People feeding wildlife/wildlife becoming dependent on humans for food: 2%
- Exotic/invasive species: 2%
- Air pollution/air quality: 2%
- Poaching/illegal killing or removal: 1%
- Low populations: 1%
- Rattlesnake bites: 1%
- Lack of hunting/fishing access: 1%
- Not enough food/food supply: 1%
- Health of/Lack of Fish/Fishing: 1%
- There are none (no important issues): 4%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Phoenix (n=1097)

Tucson (n=403)
INFORMATION ABOUT WILDLIFE

- Respondents were read a list of wildlife topics and asked if they would be interested in information about each topic (the respondent was informed that the question was for research only; no information was to be sent). The top topics are how to interact with wildlife appropriately, places to view wildlife, what to do with injured wildlife, the reality of wildlife threats to humans, and how to view wildlife. There is little difference between cities.

- Respondents most commonly (40%) indicated that direct mail was the best way to provide them with information, about double the percentage who said that TV (22%) or newspapers (21%) would be the best way.

- A not large, but still substantial, percentage of respondents (14%) had contacted another business or organization (other than the AGFD) for information on or assistance with wildlife. This compares with 20% who contacted the AGFD.

- A majority of respondents (58%) access the Internet daily; only 25% say they rarely or never access the Internet.
  - Phoenix residents are more likely to access the Internet than are Tucson residents.
Q246. Next, I am going to read you a list of topics about wildlife, and I would like to know if each is a topic you would be interested in. (Respondent was informed that no information was to be sent; survey was only measuring interest.)
Q246. I am going to read a list of topics about wildlife, and I would like to know if each is a topic in which you would be interested. (Respondent was informed that no information was to be sent; survey was only measuring interest.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Topic</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=1097)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=403)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>How to interact with wildlife appropriately</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Places to view wildlife</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>What to do with injured wildlife</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The reality of wildlife threats to humans</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to view wildlife</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dealing with nuisance animals</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife habitats</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife ecology</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>How to become active with local conservation efforts</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creating a backyard habitat</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None of these</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q250. What is the best way to provide you with information about wildlife around your home? (Respondent was informed that no information was to be sent; survey was only measuring interest.)
Q250. What is the best way to provide you with information about wildlife around your home? (Respondent was informed that no information was to be sent; survey was only measuring interest.)

[Bar chart showing responses to Q250]
Q257. Have you ever contacted any other business or organization for information on or assistance with wildlife?

- Yes: 14
- No: 85
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=1500)
Q258. May I ask what other business or organization you contacted for information on or assistance with wildlife?
Q266. Do you access the Internet daily, sometimes, rarely, or never?

- Daily: 58%
- Sometimes: 13%
- Rarely: 7%
- Never: 18%
- Don't know: 4%

(Percent n=1500)
Q266. Do you access the Internet daily, sometimes, rarely, or never?

- **Daily**
  - Phoenix: 60%
  - Tucson: 52%
- **Sometimes**
  - Phoenix: 14%
  - Tucson: 12%
- **Rarely**
  - Phoenix: 7%
  - Tucson: 8%
- **Never**
  - Phoenix: 16%
  - Tucson: 23%
- **Don't know**
  - Phoenix: 4%
  - Tucson: 4%
CONTACTS WITH THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT

- A fifth of respondents (20%) have contacted the AGFD for information on or assistance with wildlife in cities, towns, or suburban areas, with little difference between cities. Most people who contacted the AGFD were satisfied with the contact (82%), with most of those being very satisfied. There was little difference between cities in respondents’ satisfaction with their contacts with the AGFD.
- The telephone was the most-used medium to contact the AGFD (79%).

Q252. Have you ever contacted the Arizona Game and Fish Department for information on or assistance with wildlife in cities, towns, or suburban areas?

- Yes: 20
- No: 78
- Don’t know: 2

Percent (n=1500)
Q252. Have you ever contacted the Arizona Game and Fish Department for information on or assistance with wildlife in cities, towns, or suburban areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=1097)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=403)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
Q254. How did you contact the Department? 
(Asked of those who contacted the Department.)
Q254. How did you contact the Department?  
(Asked of those who contacted the Department.)

![Bar chart showing contact methods]

- **Telephone**: Phoenix (79), Tucson (81)
- **In-person**: Phoenix (20), Tucson (13)
- **E-mail or Internet**: Phoenix (5), Tucson (6)
- **Mail**: Phoenix (3), Tucson (2)
- **Other**: Phoenix (2), Tucson (3)
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (0), Tucson (1)
Q256. Overall, would you say you were satisfied or dissatisfied with the contact with the Department? (Asked of those who contacted the Department.)

- Very satisfied: 72
- Somewhat satisfied: 10
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 2
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 6
- Very dissatisfied: 9
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=303)
Q256. Overall, would you say you were satisfied or dissatisfied with the contact with the Department? (Asked of those who contacted the Department.)

Phoenix (n=215) vs Tucson (n=88)

- Very satisfied: 74% in Phoenix, 67% in Tucson
- Somewhat satisfied: 9% in Phoenix, 11% in Tucson
- Neither satisfied nor dissatisfied: 1% in Phoenix, 3% in Tucson
- Somewhat dissatisfied: 5% in Phoenix, 7% in Tucson
- Very dissatisfied: 9% in Phoenix, 9% in Tucson
- Don't know: 2% in both Phoenix and Tucson
ATTITUDES TOWARD WILDLIFE
GENERAL ATTITUDES TOWARD WILDLIFE

➢ Most commonly, respondents indicate that they enjoy seeing and having wildlife around their home, although nearly as many overall say that they do not have wildlife around their home. Nonetheless, substantial percentages (11% overall, 10% of Phoenix residents, and 16% of Tucson residents) express concerns about wildlife problems—the sum of those who answered any of the three “nuisance” answers (I enjoy seeing wildlife but worry about the problems they cause, I regard wildlife as a nuisance, and I regard wildlife as dangerous).

• Phoenix residents are much more likely than Tucson residents to answer that they do not have wildlife around their home; Tucson residents are more likely to express concerns.

➢ The highest ranked wildlife value of the six values about which the survey asked (ranked by percentage giving a “very important” answer) is that wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona. (Note that all values except one—that the respondent has the opportunity to view wildlife around his/her home—have a majority saying the value is very important.) The second ranked wildlife value among respondents overall and among Phoenix residents is that wildlife populations are being properly managed around the respondent’s home (this is the third ranked value among Tucson residents).

• Regarding differences among cities, Tucson residents are more likely than Phoenix residents to say that it is very important that wildlife exists around their home or on their property—perhaps a function of the fact that more Tucson residents than Phoenix residents have wildlife around their home in the first place. Perhaps Phoenix, being a larger city, has a lower percentage of residents concerned with having wildlife around their home simply because of the unlikelihood of wildlife being there. Likewise, Tucson residents are more likely than Phoenix residents to say that it is very important that they have the opportunity to view wildlife around their home.
A large majority of respondents (72%), with almost no differences between cities, think the wildlife populations around their home should remain the same rather than be increased (13%) or decreased (8%).

- Those who think the populations should be increased most commonly want to improve the chance of seeing wildlife or say that the ecosystem needs more wild animals, with little difference between cities.
- Those who think the populations should be decreased most commonly cite safety reasons or nuisance-related reasons, with Tucson residents much more likely than Phoenix residents to say to reduce wildlife-human conflicts.
Q12. Generally, which of the following statements best describes your feelings about wildlife around your home or in your area?

- I do not have wildlife around my home or in my area (40%)
- I enjoy seeing and having wildlife around my home or in my area (46%)
- I enjoy seeing a few animals around my home or in my area but worry about the problems they cause (9%)
- I generally regard wildlife around my home or in my area as a nuisance (1%)
- I generally regard wildlife around my home or in my area as dangerous (2%)
- I have no particular feeling about wildlife around my home or in my area (2%)
Q12. Generally, which of the following statements best describes your feelings about wildlife around your home or in your area?

- I do not have wildlife around my home or in my area
- I enjoy seeing and having wildlife around my home or in my area
- I enjoy seeing a few animals around my home or in my area but worry about the problems they cause
- I generally regard wildlife around my home or in my area as a nuisance
- I generally regard wildlife around my home or in my area as dangerous
- I have no particular feeling about wildlife around my home or in my area

Percent

Phoenix (n=1097)
Tucson (n=403)
Q44-49. Percent who think the following wildlife values are very important.

- Q48. Wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 64%
- Q49. Wildlife populations are being properly managed around your home: 56%
- Q44. Wildlife exists in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 53%
- Q45. Wildlife exists around your home and on your property: 53%
- Q46. People have the opportunity to view wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 51%
- Q47. You have the opportunity to view wildlife around your home and on your property: 43%
Q44-49. Percent who think the following wildlife values are somewhat or very unimportant.

- Q47. You have the opportunity to view wildlife around your home and on your property
  - Percent: 25

- Q45. Wildlife exists around your home and on your property
  - Percent: 16

- Q46. People have the opportunity to view wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona
  - Percent: 14

- Q44. Wildlife exists in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona
  - Percent: 11

- Q49. Wildlife populations are being properly managed around your home
  - Percent: 8

- Q48. Wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona
  - Percent: 6
Q44-49. Percent who think the following wildlife values are very important. (Phoenix residents.)

- Q48. Wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 64%
- Q49. Wildlife populations are being properly managed around your home: 55%
- Q44. Wildlife exists in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 52%
- Q46. People have the opportunity to view wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 51%
- Q45. Wildlife exists around your home and on your property: 49%
- Q47. You have the opportunity to view wildlife around your home and on your property: 40%
Q44-49. Percent who think the following wildlife values are somewhat or very unimportant. (Phoenix residents.)

Q47. You have the opportunity to view wildlife around your home and on your property

Q45. Wildlife exists around your home and on your property

Q46. People have the opportunity to view wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona

Q44. Wildlife exists in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona

Q49. Wildlife populations are being properly managed around your home

Q48. Wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona
Q44-49. Percent who think the following wildlife values are very important. (Tucson residents.)

- Q48. Wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 66%
- Q45. Wildlife exists around your home and on your property: 63%
- Q49. Wildlife populations are being properly managed around your home: 60%
- Q44. Wildlife exists in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 55%
- Q47. You have the opportunity to view wildlife around your home and on your property: 52%
- Q46. People have the opportunity to view wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 52%
Q44-49. Percent who think the following wildlife values are somewhat or very unimportant. (Tucson residents.)

- Q47. You have the opportunity to view wildlife around your home and on your property: 19%
- Q46. People have the opportunity to view wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 13%
- Q45. Wildlife exists around your home and on your property: 12%
- Q44. Wildlife exists in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 9%
- Q49. Wildlife populations are being properly managed around your home: 8%
- Q48. Wildlife populations are being properly managed in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona: 5%
Q80. In your opinion, should the wildlife populations around your home be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?
Q80. In your opinion, should the wildlife populations around your home be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?
Q82. What are the most important reasons wildlife populations should be increased?

- To improve chance of seeing wildlife: 42%
- Ecosystem needs more wild animals: 29%
- Because wild animals are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations: 26%
- Animal rights / wild animals have right to live and breed: 22%
- To increase number of wildlife viewers: 10%
- Other: 7%
- Don’t know: 4%
- To control other nuisance animals: 2%
Q82. What are the most important reasons wildlife populations should be increased?

- To improve chance of seeing wildlife
- Ecosystem needs more wild animals
- Because wild animals are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations
- Animal rights / wild animals have right to live and breed
- To increase number of wildlife viewers
- Other
- Don't know
- To control other nuisance animals

Phoenix (n=134)
Tucson (n=55)
Q85. What are the most important reasons wildlife populations should be decreased?

- To improve human safety: 33%
- To reduce wildlife-human conflicts: 24%
- To improve pet safety: 19%
- There are too many nuisance animal issues: 12%
- Other: 12%
- Don't know: 8%
- To improve the overall health of the wildlife populations: 7%
- To reduce vehicle collisions with wild animals: 6%
- To reduce the incidence of wildlife starvation: 5%
- To reduce agricultural losses from wildlife: 4%
- Ecosystem needs fewer wild animals: 3%
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by wildlife: 1%

Percent (n=113)
Q85. What are the most important reasons wildlife populations should be decreased?

Multiple Responses Allowed

- To improve human safety: Phoenix (n=33), Tucson (n=33)
- To reduce wildlife-human conflicts: Phoenix (n=18), Tucson (n=18)
- To improve pet safety: Phoenix (n=18), Tucson (n=23)
- There are too many nuisance animal issues: Phoenix (n=12), Tucson (n=10)
- Other: Phoenix (n=3), Tucson (n=14)
- Don’t know: Phoenix (n=8), Tucson (n=7)
- To improve the overall health of the wildlife populations: Phoenix (n=6), Tucson (n=10)
- To reduce vehicle collisions with wild animals: Phoenix (n=7), Tucson (n=3)
- To reduce the incidence of wildlife starvation: Phoenix (n=4), Tucson (n=10)
- To reduce agricultural losses from wildlife: Phoenix (n=5), Tucson (n=3)
- Ecosystem needs fewer wild animals: Phoenix (n=4), Tucson (n=0)
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by wildlife: Phoenix (n=1), Tucson (n=0)

Percent
ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT’S WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

➢ Ratings of the AGFD’s wildlife management program in the respondent’s area are positive: 57% rate it as excellent or good, while only 11% rate it as fair or poor (with only 2% rating it poor); the remainder don’t know. There is little difference between cities.
  • Reasons for giving excellent or good ratings are shown, as are reasons for poor ratings.

➢ When asked how they would like the AGFD to provide more assistance to city, town, and suburban residents with managing wildlife around their homes, respondents expressed desires for more information and education about wildlife. A substantial percentage (18%) indicated that the AGFD does not need to provide more assistance. There is little difference between cities.

➢ Respondents were read twelve tasks of the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas, and they were asked to rate the importance of each task on a scale of 0 to 10.
  • Regarding respondents overall (the results among Phoenix and Tucson residents are reported below), in a ranking of the mean for each question, the most important tasks of the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas are:
    o providing information to the public about wildlife in urban areas,
    o assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat,
    o providing education programs about urban wildlife,
    o rescuing abandoned or injured wildlife, and
    o assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat.
  • The least important programs are
    o assisting businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts and
    o providing opportunities for people to view and/or photograph wildlife in urban areas.
Among respondents overall, in a ranking of programs by the percent rating them at a 10 in importance, the most important programs (all that had at least 50% giving it a rating of 10) are:

- assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat,
- providing information to the public about wildlife in urban areas,
- assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat,
- removing dead animals from roads and yards, and
- rescuing abandoned or injured wildlife.

Another way to analyze the importance of programs is by summing their ranks by the means and by the percent giving a rating of 10. In this analysis, a lower score indicates more importance. In this analysis, the most important programs are:

- assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat,
- providing information to the public about wildlife in urban areas,
- rescuing abandoned or injured wildlife,
- assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat, and
- providing education programs about urban wildlife.

The importance of programs are also shown among Phoenix residents and Tucson residents. There are slight variations in the rankings of programs, but not any that demonstrate marked differences in opinions from city to city. For ease of comparison among respondents overall, tabulations are shown with the rankings by the mean, by the percent giving a rating of 10, by the percent giving a rating of 9 or 10, and by the percent giving a rating above the midpoint of 5. For Phoenix and Tucson residents, tabulations show rankings by mean, by the percent giving a rating of 10, and by the percent giving a rating of 9 or 10. Finally, a comparison of the rankings among respondents overall, among Phoenix residents, and among Tucson residents is shown.
Q69. Overall, would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's wildlife management program in your area as excellent, good, fair, or poor?

- Excellent: 22
- Good: 35
- Fair: 9
- Poor: 2
- Don't know: 31

Percent (n=1500)
Q69. Overall, would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's wildlife management program in your area as excellent, good, fair, or poor?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q69.](chart.png)

- **Excellent**: Phoenix (23), Tucson (21)
- **Good**: Phoenix (34), Tucson (38)
- **Fair**: Phoenix (8), Tucson (11)
- **Poor**: Phoenix (2), Tucson (4)
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (33), Tucson (26)

* Phoenix (n=1097)  
* Tucson (n=403)
Q72. Why do you rate the Department's wildlife management program as excellent or good?

- The Department does a good job addressing wildlife-human conflicts / nuisance issues: 29%
- The Department does a good job with its resources: 28%
- There are not many wildlife-human conflicts: 14%
- Don't know: 12%
- From PR through media, general impressions, observation: 9%
- Other: 9%
- Wildlife populations are at the right size: 9%
- Wildlife populations are healthy: 5%
- Everything seems fine (Have'nt noticed problem(s)): 4%
- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively: 3%
- There are plenty of wild animals to view / observe: 3%
- The Department uses scientific data to manage the wildlife populations in cities / towns / suburban areas: 2%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=861)
Q72. Why do you rate the Department's wildlife management program as excellent or good?

The Department does a good job addressing wildlife-human conflicts / nuisance issues

The Department does a good job with its resources

There are not many wildlife-human conflicts

Don't know

From PR through media, general impressions, observation.

Other

Wildlife populations are at the right size

Wildlife populations are healthy

Everything seems fine ( Haven't noticed problem(s) )

The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively

There are plenty of wild animals to view / observe

The Department uses scientific data to manage the wildlife populations in cities / towns / suburban areas

Percent

Phoenix (n=622)

Tucson (n=239)
Q78. Why do you rate the Department's Wildlife Management Program as poor?

- Doesn't manage well/don't like their methods: 47%
- The Department does a poor job addressing wildlife-human conflicts / nuisance issues: 27%
- No information on this: 20%
- Wildlife populations are at the wrong size: 16%
- The Department does a poor job in general: 14%
- Other: 14%
- There are many wildlife-human conflicts / nuisance issues: 11%
- The Department allows undue political influence: 11%
- Wildlife populations are unhealthy: 8%
- Don't know: 8%
- The Department does a poor job of providing wildlife viewing opportunities: 5%
- The Department does a poor job with its resources: 3%
- The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively: 3%
- The Department does not use scientific data to manage wildlife populations in cities / towns / suburban areas: 3%

Percent (n=37)
Q78. Why do you rate the Department's Wildlife Management Program as poor?

- Doesn't manage well/don't like their methods
- The Department does a poor job addressing wildlife-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- No information on this
- Wildlife populations are at the wrong size
- The Department does a poor job in general
- Other
- There are many wildlife-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- The Department allows undue political influence
- Wildlife populations are unhealthy
- Don't know
- The Department does a poor job of providing wildlife viewing opportunities
- The Department does a poor job with its resources
- The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively
- The Department does not use scientific data to manage wildlife populations in cities / towns / suburban areas

Multiple Responses Allowed

Phoenix (n=20)

Tucson (n=17)
Q225. In what ways would you like the Arizona Game and Fish Department to provide more assistance to city, town, and suburban residents with managing wildlife around their homes?

- Don't know: 44%
- Providing more information and education: 24%
- The Department does not need to provide more assistance: 18%
- Other: 8%
- Assistance in controlling/removing nuisance animals: 5%
- Assistance in controlling wildlife in general in cities/towns/suburban areas: 4%
- Developing habitat for wildlife: 3%
- Law enforcement efforts: 1%
- Technical assistance: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=1500)
Q225. In what ways would you like the Arizona Game and Fish Department to provide more assistance to city, town, and suburban residents with managing wildlife around their homes?

- Don't know
- Providing more information and education
- The Department does not need to provide more assistance
- Other
- Assistance in controlling / removing nuisance animals
- Assistance in controlling wildlife in general in cities / towns / suburban areas
- Developing habitat for wildlife
- Law enforcement efforts
- Technical assistance
- Providing wildlife deterrents / repellents (electric fencing, etc.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Phoenix (n=1097)

Tucson (n=403)
Q233-244. Mean ratings of importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas.

- Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? Mean: 8.61
- Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat? Mean: 8.47
- Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? Mean: 8.37
- Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds? Mean: 8.37
- Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat? Mean: 8.36
- Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals? Mean: 8.15
- Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)? Mean: 8.12
- Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards? Mean: 7.98
- Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road? Mean: 7.57
- Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks? Mean: 7.56
- Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)? Mean: 7.16
- Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? Mean: 6.66
Q233-244. Percent giving a rating of 10 in importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas.
Q233-244. Percent giving a rating of 9 or 10 in importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas.

Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?

Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?

Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?

Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?

Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?

Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?

Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?

Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?

Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?

Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q233-244. Percent giving a rating of greater than the midpoint (5) in importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas.

- Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds? 85
- Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards? 79
- Q235. How important is managing/assisting with nuisance animals? 88
- Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat? 86
- Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat? 85
- Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road? 77
- Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks? 76
- Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)? 84
- Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)? 70
- Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? 63
- Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? 90
- Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? 89
Q233-244. Mean ratings of importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas. (Phoenix residents.)

- Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat? 8.47
- Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? 8.44
- Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds? 8.31
- Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat? 8.26
- Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals? 8.21
- Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? 8.20
- Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards? 8.09
- Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)? 8.07
- Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks? 7.63
- Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road? 7.57
- Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)? 7.17
- Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas? 6.58
Q233-244. Percent giving a rating of 10 in importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas. (Phoenix residents.)

- Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
- Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?
- Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?
- Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
- Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
- Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
- Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
- Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?
- Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?
- Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?
- Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
- Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q233-244. Percent giving a rating of 9 or 10 in importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas. (Phoenix residents.)

Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?

Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?

Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?

Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?

Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?

Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?

Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?

Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over or underneath the road?

Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?

Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q233-244. Mean ratings of importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas. (Tucson residents.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question</th>
<th>Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?</td>
<td>9.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?</td>
<td>8.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?</td>
<td>8.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?</td>
<td>8.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?</td>
<td>8.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?</td>
<td>8.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?</td>
<td>7.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?</td>
<td>7.71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?</td>
<td>7.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?</td>
<td>7.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?</td>
<td>7.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?</td>
<td>6.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q233-244. Percent giving a rating of 10 in importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas. (Tucson residents.)

Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?

Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?

Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?

Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?

Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?

Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?

Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?

Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?

Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?

Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q233-244. Percent giving a rating of 9 or 10 in importance in each of the following areas for the AGFD in managing wildlife in urban areas. (Tucson residents.)

- Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
- Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
- Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
- Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?
- Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
- Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
- Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?
- Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?
- Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?
- Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?
- Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
- Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
## Overall

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Percent Rating It 10</th>
<th>10 Rank</th>
<th>Percent Rating It 10 or 9</th>
<th>10/9 Rank</th>
<th>Percent Rating It More than 5</th>
<th>More than 5 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>8.15</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>8.36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>85</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>77</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>7.56</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>8.12</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>7.16</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>6.66</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>8.61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>8.37</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>89</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Score (Sum of Shaded Ranks Above—the Lower the Score)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question Key

Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?
Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?
Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?
Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?
Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?
Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
### Phoenix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Percent Rating</th>
<th>10 Rank</th>
<th>Percent Rating 10 or 9</th>
<th>10/9 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>8.31</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>8.09</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>8.21</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>8.26</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>7.63</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>8.07</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>7.17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>6.58</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>8.44</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>8.20</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Score (Sum of Shaded Ranks Above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question Key

Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?
Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?
Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?
Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?
Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?
Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
### Tucson

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Percent Rating It 10</th>
<th>10 Rank</th>
<th>Percent Rating It 10 or 9</th>
<th>10/9 Rank</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>8.51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>7.71</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>7.98</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>8.47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>8.68</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>7.57</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>7.37</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>8.28</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>7.13</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>6.86</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>9.05</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>8.75</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Score (Sum of Shaded Ranks Above)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question Key

Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?
Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?
Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?
Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?
Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?
Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
### Rankings Overall and by City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Question Number</th>
<th>Mean Rank Overall</th>
<th>Mean Rank (Phoenix)</th>
<th>Mean Rank (Tucson)</th>
<th>10 Rank Overall</th>
<th>10 Rank (Phoenix)</th>
<th>10 Rank (Tucson)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>233</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>234</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>235</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>236</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>237</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>238</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>239</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>240</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>241</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>242</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>243</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>244</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Question Key

Q233. How important is rescuing abandoned or injured wild animals and birds?
Q234. How important is removing dead animals from roads and/or yards?
Q235. How important is managing / assisting with nuisance animals?
Q236. How important is assisting developers with planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q237. How important is assisting city or county organizations with urban planning and zoning that reduces damage to wildlife and wildlife habitat?
Q238. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife permeable roads, which are roads that allow wild animals to safely pass through passageways over top or underneath the road?
Q239. How important is assisting with the development of wildlife-friendly parks?
Q240. How important is assisting the public with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q241. How important is assisting local businesses with prevention of wildlife-human conflicts (e.g., reducing food sources to prevent wildlife damage)?
Q242. How important is providing opportunities for the public to view and/or photograph wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q243. How important is providing information to the public about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
Q244. How important is providing education programs, such as lectures and classes, about wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas?
RESPONSIBILITY AND FUNDING FOR WILDLIFE MANAGEMENT

- Overwhelmingly (76%), respondents feel that the AGFD should have the primary responsibility for management of wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas of Arizona, with little difference between cities.
  - There is less agreement regarding respondents’ opinions on funding for urban wildlife management: 43% said taxes in general, 29% said state government (not including the AGFD), 28% said the AGFD, and 22% said the city or county government. Note that multiple answers were allowed, so some respondents may have named some combination of the answers shown on the graph.

- When respondents were asked specifically about nuisance animals in residential areas, the majority (67%) said the AGFD should have primary management responsibility, although a quarter (25%) said that city or county governments should have primary management responsibility. (Again, multiple answers were allowed.)
  - When asked from where funding should come for managing nuisance wildlife in residential areas, respondents gave answers distributed among many different sources: 39% said taxes in general, 26% said the state government (not including the AGFD), 23% said the AGFD, and 20% said city or county governments.

- When respondents were asked specifically about animals that become nuisances to businesses, such as golf courses, a slight majority (56%) said the AGFD should have primary management responsibility, but a substantial percentage (29%) said that the business owners should have primary management responsibility. There were little differences between cities. (Note that multiple answers were allowed.)
  - When asked from where funding should come for managing wildlife that becomes a nuisance to businesses, respondents most commonly said the business owners should have the burden of funding the management of the nuisance wildlife (42%), with somewhat smaller percentages saying that taxes in general (24%) or the AGFD (23%) should provide funding.
Finally, respondents were asked about responsibility for (and funding of) nuisance wildlife management in public areas, such as parks, in Arizona. A large majority (69%) think the AGFD should have primary management responsibility.

- Taxes in general (41%), the AGFD (28%), the state government (not including the AGFD) (24%), and city or county governments (20%) were the most commonly named sources for funding nuisance wildlife management in public places such as parks.
Q190. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona?

- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 76%
- City or county governments: 19%
- Other state government: 10%
- Property owners/residents: 10%
- Community groups like homeowners' associations: 7%
- Community service groups: 7%
- Don't know: 5%
- Business owners: 5%
- Business/commercial associations: 4%
- Other: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=565)
Q190. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas in Arizona?

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Arizona Game and Fish Department
  - Phoenix (n=408): 75%
  - Tucson (n=157): 79%
- City or county governments
  - Phoenix: 18%
  - Tucson: 23%
- Other state government
  - Phoenix: 8%
  - Tucson: 17%
- Property owners / residents
  - Phoenix: 10%
  - Tucson: 10%
- Community groups like homeowners' associations
  - Phoenix: 6%
  - Tucson: 9%
- Community service groups
  - Phoenix: 5%
  - Tucson: 10%
- Don't know
  - Phoenix: 6%
  - Tucson: 4%
- Business owners
  - Phoenix: 4%
  - Tucson: 9%
- Business / commercial associations
  - Phoenix: 3%
  - Tucson: 7%
- Other
  - Phoenix: 1%
  - Tucson: 2%
Q193. Where do you think funding for management of wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas should come from?

- Taxes in general: 43%
- State government (not including AGFD): 29%
- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 28%
- City or county governments: 22%
- Property owners / residents: 11%
- Community groups like homeowners' associations: 9%
- Community service groups: 9%
- Business owners: 8%
- Business / commercial associations: 8%
- Don't know: 7%
- Other: 5%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q193. Where do you think funding for management of wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas should come from?

- Taxes in general: 41% (Phoenix), 31% (Tucson)
- State government (not including AGFD): 27% (Phoenix), 13% (Tucson)
- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 26% (Phoenix), 34% (Tucson)
- City or county governments: 19% (Phoenix), 27% (Tucson)
- Property owners / residents: 10% (Phoenix), 13% (Tucson)
- Community groups like homeowners' associations: 8% (Phoenix), 11% (Tucson)
- Community service groups: 8% (Phoenix), 12% (Tucson)
- Business owners: 7% (Phoenix), 13% (Tucson)
- Business / commercial associations: 7% (Phoenix), 12% (Tucson)
- Don't know: 9% (Phoenix), 3% (Tucson)
- Other: 6% (Phoenix), 4% (Tucson)
Q196. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of nuisance animals in residential areas in Arizona?

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 67%
- City or county governments: 25%
- Property owners / residents: 11%
- Other state government: 11%
- Don't know: 6%
- Community groups like homeowners' associations: 6%
- Other: 2%

Percent (n=586)
Q196. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of nuisance animals in residential areas in Arizona?

- Arizona Game and Fish Department: Phoenix 66%, Tucson 70%
- City or county governments: Phoenix 24%, Tucson 27%
- Property owners / residents: Phoenix 9%, Tucson 15%
- Other state government: Phoenix 10%, Tucson 12%
- Don’t know: Phoenix 7%, Tucson 6%
- Community groups like homeowners’ associations: Phoenix 5%, Tucson 9%
- Other: Phoenix 2%, Tucson 2%
Q199. Where do you think funding for management of nuisance animals in residential areas should come from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Responses Allowed</th>
<th>Percent (n=579)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes in general</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government (not including AGFD)</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Game and Fish Department</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or county governments</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owners / residents</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups like homeowners associations</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q199. Where do you think funding for management of nuisance animals in residential areas should come from?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Responses Allowed</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=429)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=150)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Taxes in general</td>
<td>41%</td>
<td>33%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State government (not including AGFD)</td>
<td>28%</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona Game and Fish Department</td>
<td>23%</td>
<td>25%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City or county governments</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property owners / residents</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>13%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community groups like homeowners associations</td>
<td>9%</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>11%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
Q202. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of animals that become a nuisance for businesses, such as golf courses, in Arizona?

- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 56%
- Business owners: 29%
- City or county governments: 13%
- Don't know: 8%
- Other state government: 8%
- Other business/commercial associations: 2%
- Other: 2%

Percent (n=571)
Q202. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of animals that become a nuisance for businesses, such as golf courses, in Arizona?

- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 56% in Phoenix, 57% in Tucson
- Business owners: 26% in Phoenix, 30% in Tucson
- City or county governments: 10% in Phoenix, 13% in Tucson
- Don't know: 13% in Phoenix, 13% in Tucson
- Other state government: 8% in Phoenix, 8% in Tucson
- Other: 3% in Phoenix, 2% in Tucson
- Business / commercial associations: 1% in Phoenix, 2% in Tucson

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Phoenix (n=427)
Tucson (n=144)
Q205. Where do you think funding for management of animals that become a nuisance for businesses, such as golf courses, should come from?

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Business owners: 42%
- Taxes in general: 24%
- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 23%
- State government (not including AGFD): 12%
- City or county governments: 12%
- Don't know: 9%
- Business / commercial associations: 8%
- Other: 4%

Percent (n=547)
Q205. Where do you think funding for management of animals that become a nuisance for businesses, such as golf courses, should come from?
Q208. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of nuisance animals in public areas, such as parks, in Arizona?

- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 69%
- City or county governments: 18%
- Group / agency responsible for the public area's maintenance: 12%
- Don't know: 7%
- Other state government: 5%
- Community service groups: 4%
- Other business or organization: 3%
- Other: 2%
Q208. Who should have the primary responsibility for management of nuisance animals in public areas, such as parks, in Arizona?

---

Multiple Responses Allowed

- **Arizona Game and Fish Department**: Phoenix (n=397) - 68%, Tucson (n=142) - 73%
- **City or county governments**: Phoenix (n=397) - 19%, Tucson (n=142) - 18%
- **Group / agency responsible for the public area’s maintenance**: Phoenix (n=397) - 13%, Tucson (n=142) - 11%
- **Don’t know**: Phoenix (n=397) - 7%, Tucson (n=142) - 8%
- **Other state government**: Phoenix (n=397) - 5%, Tucson (n=142) - 8%
- **Community service groups**: Phoenix (n=397) - 4%, Tucson (n=142) - 5%
- **Other business or organization**: Phoenix (n=397) - 2%, Tucson (n=142) - 4%
- **Other**: Phoenix (n=397) - 1%, Tucson (n=142) - 3%
Q211. Where do you think funding for management of nuisance animals in public areas, such as parks, should come from?

- Taxes in general: 41%
- Arizona Game and Fish Department: 28%
- State government (not including AGFD): 24%
- City or county governments: 20%
- Group / agency responsible for the public area’s maintenance: 13%
- Don’t know: 8%
- Community service groups: 7%
- Other business or organization: 7%
- Other: 4%
Q211. Where do you think funding for management of nuisance animals in public areas, such as parks, should come from?

- Taxes in general: Phoenix (n=398) 41%, Tucson (n=158) 34%
- Arizona Game and Fish Department: Phoenix (n=398) 26%, Tucson (n=158) 23%
- State government (not including AGFD): Phoenix (n=398) 24%, Tucson (n=158) 23%
- City or county governments: Phoenix (n=398) 19%, Tucson (n=158) 16%
- Group / agency responsible for the public area’s maintenance: Phoenix (n=398) 12%, Tucson (n=158) 16%
- Don’t know: Phoenix (n=398) 8%, Tucson (n=158) 9%
- Community service groups: Phoenix (n=398) 7%, Tucson (n=158) 8%
- Other business or organization: Phoenix (n=398) 6%, Tucson (n=158) 8%
- Other: Phoenix (n=398) 4%, Tucson (n=158) 6%
NUISANCE WILDLIFE AND ATTITUDES REGARDING FEEDING WILDLIFE

- Subsequent sections of this report include detailed discussions of problems with coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas, but briefly, 5% of respondents have had problems with coyotes in the past 2 years, less than 1% have had problems with mountain lions, and 4% have had problems with javelinas. Regarding other wildlife, 12% of respondents had problems with wild animals other than coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas, with little difference between cities. The most frequently named other animals were reptiles/amphibians and birds. Tucson residents were more likely than Phoenix residents to name reptiles/amphibians and bobcats.
  - The typical problems caused by the other wildlife (other than coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas) were their presence in general, structural damage to the house, garden damage, threats to humans, yard damage, and threats to pets.

- The AGFD is rated well in its response to homeowner requests for assistance with nuisance animals, with excellent and good ratings (31% combined) far exceeding fair and poor ratings (5% combined); the large majority answered, “Don’t know.” There were little differences between cities.
  - Reasons for rating excellent or good, as well as reasons for rating poor, are shown.

- Support is overwhelming for controlling nuisance animals that have caused property damage: 81% of respondents support doing so, with little difference between cities. Trapping and relocation is the overwhelmingly preferred method for controlling nuisance wildlife in urban and suburban areas (72% of those who support controlling nuisance wildlife).

- A large majority (75%) disagree that it is okay to feed wildlife or leave food out for wildlife, with most of those in strong disagreement, and a large majority (73%) would support a law making feeding wildlife, in certain situations and/or areas, illegal.
  - Phoenix residents are slightly more likely than are Tucson residents to agree that feeding wildlife is okay, and they are slightly less likely to support a law making it illegal.
• A little more than a quarter of respondents (27%) indicated that he/she personally, a family member, or a neighbor fed wildlife around his/her home. Of those respondents who fed or whose family members or neighbors fed wildlife, a large majority (68%) disagreed that the wildlife feeding caused subsequent conflicts of problems with wildlife; however, 23% agreed. There was little difference between cities on this question.
  • Those who said the feeding caused a problem cited as problems the animals’ presence in general, problems with garbage or pets, and threats to humans.

• The previous section of the report discussed responsibility and funding for nuisance wildlife management. In short, the report indicated that the majority of respondents (67%) said the AGFD should have primary responsibility for managing nuisance animals in residential areas, although a quarter (25%) said that city or county governments should have primary responsibility.
  • Also as previously discussed, when asked from where funding should come for managing nuisance wildlife in residential areas, respondents gave answers distributed among many different sources: 39% said taxes in general, 26% said the state government (not including the AGFD), 23% said the AGFD, and 20% said city or county governments.

• The previous section of the report discussed animals that may become nuisances to businesses, such as golf courses, and a slight majority (56%) said the AGFD should have primary responsibility for management of such nuisance wildlife, but a substantial percentage (29%) said that the business owners should have primary responsibility.
  • When asked from where funding should come for managing wildlife that becomes a nuisance to businesses, respondents most commonly said the business owners should have the burden of funding the management of the nuisance wildlife (42%), with somewhat smaller percentages saying that taxes in general (24%) or the AGFD (23%) should provide funding.

• Also, the previous section of the report indicated that respondents were asked about responsibility for (and funding of) nuisance wildlife management in public areas, such as
parks, in Arizona, and a large majority (69%) think the AGFD should have primary
management responsibility.

- Taxes in general (41%), the AGFD (28%), the state government (not including the
  AGFD) (24%), and city or county governments (20%) were the most commonly named
  sources for funding nuisance wildlife management in public places such as parks.
Q176. Have you had any problems with any other wild animals?

- Yes: 12
- No: 88

Percent (n=1500)
Q176. Have you had any problems with any other wild animals?

- Yes: 11 (Phoenix: n=1097) 14 (Tucson: n=403)
- No: 89 (Phoenix: n=1097) 86 (Tucson: n=403)
Q178. Which other wild animals have caused you problems? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Other: 35%
- Reptiles / amphibians: 16%
- Birds: 14%
- Rabbits: 8%
- Squirrels: 8%
- Bobcats: 6%
- Skunks: 5%
- Moles / gophers: 4%
- Muskrats: 2%
- Bear: 2%
- Raccoons: 2%
- Woodchucks / groundhogs: 1%
- Elk: 1%
- Deer: 1%
- Opossums: 1%
- Don't know: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q178. Which other wild animals have caused you problems? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Other: 41%
- Reptiles / amphibians: 25%
- Birds: 16%
- Rabbits: 9%
- Squirrels: 11%
- Bobcats: 13%
- Skunks: 7%
- Moles / gophers: 4%
- Muskrats: 3%
- Bear: 2%
- Raccoons: 3%
- Woodchucks / groundhogs: 2%
- Elk: 1%
- Deer: 1%
- Opossums: 1%
- Don't know: 1%
Q181. What kind of problems did the wildlife cause? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Their presence in general: 42%
- Structural damage to home: 16%
- Gardens: 16%
- Threat to humans: 16%
- Yards: 14%
- Other: 14%
- Pets: 13%
- Garbage: 6%
- Don't know: 3%
- Vehicle collision: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=173)
Q181. What kind of problems did the wildlife cause? ( Asked of those who had problems.)

- Their presence in general: Phoenix (42%), Tucson (42%)
- Structural damage to home: Phoenix (24%), Tucson (13%)
- Gardens: Phoenix (16%), Tucson (15%)
- Threat to humans: Phoenix (18%), Tucson (14%)
- Yards: Phoenix (16%), Tucson (14%)
- Other: Phoenix (18%), Tucson (7%)
- Pets: Phoenix (15%), Tucson (13%)
- Garbage: Phoenix (9%), Tucson (5%)
- Don't know: Phoenix (2%), Tucson (3%)
- Vehicle collision: Phoenix (0%), Tucson (2%)

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Phoenix (n=118)

Tucson (n=55)
Q213. Currently, the Arizona Game and Fish Department manages wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas. In general, how well does the Department respond to homeowner requests for assistance with nuisance animals?

- Excellent: 15
- Good: 16
- Fair: 3
- Poor: 2
- Don't know: 63

Percent (n=1500)
Q213. Currently, the Arizona Game and Fish Department manages wildlife in cities, towns, and suburban areas. In general, how well does the Department respond to homeowner requests for assistance with nuisance animals?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q213 in Phoenix and Tucson](chart.png)

- **Excellent**: Phoenix (15), Tucson (16)
- **Good**: Phoenix (17), Tucson (16)
- **Fair**: Phoenix (3), Tucson (3)
- **Poor**: Phoenix (2), Tucson (3)
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (63), Tucson (62)
Q216. Why do you rate the Department's response to homeowners' requests for assistance with nuisance animals as excellent or good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Percent (n=475)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Department responds quickly</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The methods used to assist with nuisance animals are effective</td>
<td>27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department employees who respond are helpful / knowledgeable</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Word of mouth/personal experience</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't see them/doesn't seem to be a problem</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heard through the media</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not heard anything bad</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They do a good job</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q216. Why do you rate the Department’s response to homeowners’ requests for assistance with nuisance animals as excellent or good?

- The Department responds quickly: 52% Phoenix (n=347), 32% Tucson (n=128)
- The methods used to assist with nuisance animals are effective: 25% Phoenix, 32% Tucson
- The Department employees who respond are helpful / knowledgeable: 20% Phoenix, 24% Tucson
- Don’t know: 12% Phoenix, 13% Tucson
- Other: 5% Phoenix, 4% Tucson
- Word of mouth/personal experience: 5% Phoenix, 3% Tucson
- Don’t see them/doesn’t seem to be a problem: 2% Phoenix, 2% Tucson
- Heard through the media: 2% Phoenix, 2% Tucson
- Not heard anything bad: 2% Phoenix, 2% Tucson
- They do a good job: 0% Phoenix, 0% Tucson

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q222. Why do you rate the Department’s response to homeowners’ requests for assistance with nuisance animals as poor?

- The Department does not respond at all: 61%
- The methods used to assist with nuisance animals are ineffective: 19%
- The Department employees who respond are not helpful / knowledgeable: 19%
- The Department does not respond quickly enough: 16%
- Other: 10%
- Don’t know: 3%
Q222. Why do you rate the Department's response to homeowners' requests for assistance with nuisance animals as poor?

The Department does not respond at all: 62%

The methods used to assist with nuisance animals are ineffective: 31%

The Department employees who respond are not helpful / knowledgeable: 23%

The Department does not respond quickly enough: 23%

Other: 11%

Don't know: 0%
Q227. Do you support or oppose controlling or removing nuisance animals that have caused property damage?

- Strongly support: 49%
- Moderately support: 32%
- Neither support nor oppose: 4%
- Moderately oppose: 5%
- Strongly oppose: 5%
- Don't know: 5%

Percent (n=1500)
Q227. Do you support or oppose controlling or removing nuisance animals that have caused property damage?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q227.]

- **Strongly support**: Phoenix (n=1097) 50, Tucson (n=403) 33
- **Moderately support**: Phoenix (n=1097) 32, Tucson (n=403) 33
- **Neither support nor oppose**: Phoenix (n=1097) 4, Tucson (n=403) 4
- **Moderately oppose**: Phoenix (n=1097) 5, Tucson (n=403) 6
- **Strongly oppose**: Phoenix (n=1097) 5, Tucson (n=403) 6
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (n=1097) 5, Tucson (n=403) 4
Q229. How do you think nuisance wildlife should be controlled in urban and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)

- Trapping and relocation: 72%
- Don't know: 16%
- Other: 6%
- Recreational firearm hunting: 4%
- Trapping and euthanasia: 4%
- Professionals or sharpshooters: 3%
- Biological birth control: 2%
- Recreational archery hunting: 2%
- Poison: 1%
- Chemical repellents: 1%
- Erecting fences: 1%
- Recreational trapping: 1%

Percent (n=1217)
Q229. How do you think nuisance wildlife should be controlled in urban and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)

- Trapping and relocation
- Don’t know
- Other
- Recreational firearm hunting
- Trapping and euthanasia
- Professionals or sharpshooters
- Biological birth control
- Recreational archery hunting
- Poison
- Chemical repellents
- Erecting fences
- Recreational trapping

Multiple Responses Allowed

Phoenix (n=897)

Don't know: 16
Other: 6
Recreational firearm hunting: 4
Trapping and euthanasia: 5
Professionals or sharpshooters: 3
Biological birth control: 2
Recreational archery hunting: 3
Poison: 2
Chemical repellents: 2
Erecting fences: 2
Recreational trapping: 1

Percent
Q50. Do you agree or disagree that it is okay to feed wildlife or to leave food out for wildlife?

- Strongly agree: 4
- Moderately agree: 10
- Neither agree nor disagree: 8
- Moderately disagree: 17
- Strongly disagree: 58
- Don't know: 3

Percent (n=537)
Q50. Do you agree or disagree that it is okay to feed wildlife or to leave food out for wildlife?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q50 for Phoenix (n=400) and Tucson (n=137).](chart.png)
Q51. Would you support or oppose a law making it illegal to feed wildlife in certain areas or in situations in which feeding wildlife might cause nuisance problems?

- Strongly support: 44
- Moderately support: 29
- Neither support nor oppose: 5
- Moderately oppose: 10
- Strongly oppose: 8
- Don't know: 4

(Percent (n=550))
Q51. Would you support or oppose a law making it illegal to feed wildlife in certain areas or in situations in which feeding wildlife might cause nuisance problems?
Q183. Have you, a family member, or a neighbor fed wildlife around your home?

- Yes: 27
- No: 72
- Don't know: 1

Percent (n=1500)
Q183. Have you, a family member, or a neighbor fed wildlife around your home?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phoenix (n=1097)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=403)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Yes</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q184. Do you agree or disagree that the feeding of wildlife by you, a family member, or a neighbor has caused conflicts or problems with wildlife around your home? (Asked of those who fed or whose family/neighbor fed wildlife.)

- Strongly agree: 13
- Moderately agree: 10
- Neither agree nor disagree: 4
- Moderately disagree: 16
- Strongly disagree: 52
- Don't know: 4

Percent (n=407)
Q184. Do you agree or disagree that the feeding of wildlife by you, a family member, or a neighbor has caused conflicts or problems with wildlife around your home? (Asked of those who fed or whose family/neighbor fed wildlife.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=297)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=110)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>53</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
Q186. Specifically, what were the problems that feeding wildlife caused? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Their presence in general: 48%
- Other: 24%
- Garbage: 15%
- Pets: 15%
- Threat to humans: 15%
- Yards: 7%
- Gardens: 7%
- Don't know: 6%
- Structural damage to home: 5%
- Vehicle collision: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=95)
Q186. Specifically, what were the problems that feeding wildlife caused? (Asked of those who had problems.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=66)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=29)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Their presence in general</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat to humans</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Structural damage to home</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle collision</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Multiple Responses Allowed
PARTICIPATION IN WILDLIFE-RELATED ACTIVITIES

- Just under a majority (44%) of respondents participated in viewing wildlife around home in the past 2 years; about a fifth fed wildlife (20%), photographed wildlife (19%), and/or maintained plantings to benefit wildlife (17%).
  - Tucson residents were more likely than Phoenix residents to view wildlife around home or to photograph wildlife.

- Birds and mammals were the types of wildlife most frequently viewed and photographed, but substantial percentages viewed and photographed reptiles and amphibians. Birds were overwhelmingly the type of wildlife that respondents fed or for which they maintained plantings.
  - 82% of wildlife viewers viewed birds, 62% of them viewed mammals, and 18% viewed reptiles and amphibians.
  - The percentages who birdwatched were about the same between the two cities, but Tucson residents were more likely to say that they viewed mammals.
  - The most commonly viewed mammals were coyotes, rabbits, javelinas, bobcats, and squirrels. While the percentages who viewed coyote and rabbit were about the same between the two cities, Tucson residents were much more likely to view javelinas, bobcats, and squirrels.
  - 73% of photographers photographed birds, and somewhat fewer (46%) photographed mammals; 14% photographed reptiles and amphibians.
  - Tucson residents more commonly photographed mammals than did Phoenix residents.
  - Coyotes, javelinas, rabbits, deer, bobcats, and squirrels were the most commonly photographed mammals, with Tucson residents more likely to photograph javelinas and bobcats than were Phoenix residents. On the other hand, Phoenix residents were more likely to photograph coyotes and elk.
  - 92% of those who fed wildlife fed birds; only 15% fed mammals, with little difference between cities. Rabbits were the type of mammal most commonly fed, about double the percentage who fed squirrels. Additionally, substantial percentages fed coyotes or javelinas, with Tucson residents more likely than Phoenix residents to feed javelinas.
  - 88% of those who maintained plantings for wildlife did so for birds; second on the list was insects, closely followed by mammals.
A majority of those who viewed wildlife did so daily (53%), with little difference in frequency among Phoenix and Tucson residents.

Photographing wildlife was most commonly a monthly or semi-annual activity.

Of those who fed wildlife, just over a majority (53%) did so daily.

Respondents most commonly maintained their plantings for wildlife daily or weekly.
Q14. I am going to read a list of various activities, and I would like to know if you've participated in each within the past 2 years.

- None: 45%
- Wildlife viewing around your home: 44%
- Feeding wildlife around your home: 20%
- Photographing wildlife around your home: 19%
- Maintaining plantings around your home where the benefit to wildlife is the primary reason: 17%

Percent (n=1500)
Q14. I am going to read a list of various activities, and I would like to know if you've participated in each within the past 2 years.

- None: Phoenix 49%, Tucson 36%
- Wildlife viewing around your home: Phoenix 41%, Tucson 54%
- Feeding wildlife around your home: Phoenix 20%, Tucson 20%
- Photographing wildlife around your home: Phoenix 17%, Tucson 25%
- Maintaining plantings around your home where the benefit to wildlife is the primary reason: Phoenix 17%, Tucson 17%
Q17. What type of wildlife did you typically view around your home? (Asked of those who viewed wildlife.)

- Birds: 82%
- Mammals: 62%
- Reptiles and amphibians: 18%
- Insects: 4%
- Don’t know: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q19. Type of mammals viewed around respondent's home. (Asked of those who viewed mammals.)

- Coyotes: 64 percent
- Rabbits: 50 percent
- Javelinas: 31 percent
- Bobcats: 11 percent
- Squirrels: 9 percent
- Other: 9 percent
- Deer: 8 percent
- Mountain lions: 5 percent
- Raccoons: 2 percent
- Elk: 1 percent
- Moles / gophers: 1 percent
- Bear: 1 percent
- Woodchucks / groundhogs: 1 percent
Q17. What type of wildlife did you typically view around your home? (Asked of those who viewed wildlife.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- **Birds**: Phoenix (n=449) 84%, Tucson (n=217) 78%
- **Mammals**: Phoenix (n=449) 56%, Tucson (n=217) 75%
- **Reptiles and amphibians**: Phoenix (n=449) 15%, Tucson (n=217) 23%
- **Insects**: Phoenix (n=449) 4%, Tucson (n=217) 3%
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (n=449) 1%, Tucson (n=217) 1%
- **Fish**: Phoenix (n=449) 1%, Tucson (n=217) 0%
Q19. Type of mammals viewed around respondent's home. (Asked of those who viewed mammals.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Coyotes: 66%
- Rabbits: 51%
- Javelinas: 50%
- Bobcats: 22%
- Squirrels: 13%
- Other: 10%
- Deer: 12%
- Mountain lions: 9%
- Raccoons: 8%
- Elk: 2%
- Moles / gophers: 2%
- Bear: 1%
- Woodchucks / groundhogs: 1%
- Skunks: 1%
- Don't know: 1%

Phoenix (n=251)
Tucson (n=162)
Q23. What type of wildlife did you typically photograph around your home? (Asked of those who photographed wildlife.)

- Birds: 73%
- Mammals: 46%
- Reptiles and amphibians: 14%
- Insects: 3%
- Don't know: 2%
- Fish: 1%
Q25. Types of mammals that respondent photographed around home. (Asked of those who photographed mammals.)

- Coyotes: 38
- Javelinas: 37
- Rabbits: 26
- Deer: 16
- Bobcats: 15
- Squirrels: 10
- Elk: 7
- Mountain lions: 4
- Other: 4
- Bear: 3
- Don't know: 2
- Skunks: 1
- Raccoons: 1
- Woodchucks / groundhogs: 1

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q23. What type of wildlife did you typically photograph around your home? (Asked of those who photographed wildlife.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Wildlife Type</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=188)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=102)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Birds</td>
<td>76%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mammals</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>58%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reptiles and Amphibians</td>
<td>13%</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insects</td>
<td>4%</td>
<td>2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>3%</td>
<td>1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish</td>
<td>2%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q25. Types of mammals that respondent photographed around home. (Asked of those who photographed mammals.)

- Coyotes: 45%
- Javelinas: 54%
- Rabbits: 29%
- Deer: 17%
- Bobcats: 25%
- Squirrels: 12%
- Elk: 12%
- Mountain lions: 7%
- Other: 7%
- Bear: 4%
- Don't know: 3%
- Skunks: 2%
- Raccoons: 2%
- Woodchucks / groundhogs: 2%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Phoenix (n=75)

Tucson (n=59)
Q29. What type of wildlife did you typically feed around your home? (Asked of those who fed wildlife.)

- Birds: 92%
- Mammals: 15%
- Don't know: 2%
- Reptiles and amphibians: 1%
- Fish: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=295)
Q31. Types of mammals that respondent fed around home. (Asked of those who fed mammals.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Multiple Responses Allowed</th>
<th>Percent (n=44)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Squirrels</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Javelinas</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coyotes</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stray cats and dogs</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Raccoons</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ducks</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rabbits</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q29. What type of wildlife did you typically feed around your home? (Asked of those who fed wildlife.)

- **Birds**: Phoenix (n=215) - 93%, Tucson (n=80) - 89%
- **Mammals**: Phoenix - 14%, Tucson - 16%
- **Don't know**: Phoenix - 2%, Tucson - 3%
- **Reptiles and amphibians**: Phoenix - 1%, Tucson - 3%
- **Fish**: Phoenix - 1%, Tucson - 0%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q31. Types of mammals that respondent fed around home. (Asked of those who fed mammals.)

- Rabbits: Phoenix (n=31) - 58%, Tucson (n=13) - 54%
- Squirrels: Phoenix (n=31) - 31%, Tucson (n=13) - 19%
- Javelinas: Phoenix (n=31) - 23%
- Coyotes: Tucson (n=13) - 13%
- Stray cats and dogs: Phoenix (n=31) - 6%, Tucson (n=13) - 0%
- Raccoons: Phoenix (n=31) - 3%, Tucson (n=13) - 0%
- Rabbits: Phoenix (n=31) - 3%, Tucson (n=13) - 0%
- Ducks: Phoenix (n=31) - 3%, Tucson (n=13) - 0%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q35. What type of wildlife did you typically maintain plantings for around your home? (Asked of those who maintained plantings for wildlife.)

- Birds: 88%
- Insects: 14%
- Mammals: 13%
- Reptiles and amphibians: 8%
- Don't know: 4%
- Fish: 1%

Percent (n=253)
Q37. Types of mammals for which respondent maintained plantings around home. (Asked of those who maintained plantings for mammals.)

- Squirrels: 19
- Javelinas: 13
- Coyotes: 9
- Bobcats: 6
- Deer: 6
- Mountain lions: 3
- Elk: 3
- Raccoons: 3
- Other: 3
- Don’t know: 3

Percent (n=32)
Q35. What type of wildlife did you typically maintain plantings for around your home? (Asked of those who maintained plantings for wildlife.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- **Birds**: Phoenix (88%), Tucson (17%)
- **Insects**: Phoenix (13%), Tucson (12%)
- **Mammals**: Phoenix (13%), Tucson (12%)
- **Reptiles and amphibians**: Phoenix (8%), Tucson (10%)
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (3%), Tucson (6%)
- **Fish**: Phoenix (1%), Tucson (3%)

Percent

Phoenix (n=184)

Tucson (n=69)
Q37. Types of mammals for which respondent maintained plantings around home. (Asked of those who maintained plantings for mammals.)

- Squirrels: 21% (Phoenix) and 13% (Tucson)
- Javelinas: 38% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
- Coyotes: 8% (Phoenix) and 13% (Tucson)
- Bobcats: 25% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
- Deer: 13% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
- Mountain lions: 13% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
- Elk: 4% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
- Raccoons: 4% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
- Other: 13% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
- Don’t know: 4% (Phoenix) and 0% (Tucson)
Q15. In the past 2 years, how often did you participate in wildlife viewing around your home? (Asked of those who viewed wildlife.)

- Daily: 53%
- Weekly: 25%
- Monthly: 13%
- Every 6 months: 4%
- Once a year: 3%
- Don't know: 1%
Q15. In the past 2 years, how often did you participate in wildlife viewing around your home? (Asked of those who viewed wildlife.)
Q21. In the past 2 years, how often did you photograph wildlife around your home? (Asked of those who photographed wildlife.)

- Daily: 0
- Weekly: 8
- Monthly: 36
- Every 6 months: 33
- Once a year: 21
- Don't know: 2

Percent (n=290)
Q21. In the past 2 years, how often did you photograph wildlife around your home? (Asked of those who photographed wildlife.)

- **Phoenix (n=188)**
  - Daily: 1
  - Weekly: 9
  - Monthly: 32
  - Every 6 months: 36
  - Once a year: 25
  - Don't know: 1

- **Tucson (n=102)**
  - Daily: 0
  - Weekly: 7
  - Monthly: 28
  - Every 6 months: 39
  - Once a year: 20
  - Don't know: 2

The chart shows the data distribution with Phoenix data in black bars and Tucson data in white bars.
Q27. In the past 2 years, how often did you feed wildlife around your home? (Asked of those who fed wildlife.)

- **Daily**: 53 percent
- **Weekly**: 24 percent
- **Monthly**: 13 percent
- **Every 6 months**: 3 percent
- **Once a year**: 3 percent
- **Don't know**: 5 percent

Percent (n=295)
Q27. In the past 2 years, how often did you feed wildlife around your home? (Asked of those who fed wildlife.)

- **Daily**: Phoenix (n=215) - 53%, Tucson (n=80) - 22%
- **Weekly**: Phoenix - 13%, Tucson - 28%
- **Monthly**: Phoenix - 4%, Tucson - 11%
- **Every 6 months**: Phoenix - 2%, Tucson - 1%
- **Once a year**: Phoenix - 6%, Tucson - 5%
- **Don't know**: Phoenix - 3%, Tucson - 0%
Q33. In the past 2 years, how often did you maintain plantings around your home where the benefit to wildlife is the primary reason? (Asked of those who maintained plantings for wildlife.)

- Daily: 41
- Weekly: 26
- Monthly: 13
- Every 6 months: 5
- Once a year: 7
- Don't know: 7

Percent (n=253)
Q33. In the past 2 years, how often did you maintain plantings around your home where the benefit to wildlife is the primary reason? (Asked of those who maintained plantings for wildlife.)

![Bar chart showing the frequency of plant maintenance around homes for wildlife in Phoenix and Tucson. The chart indicates the percentage of respondents for each frequency category: Daily (42%, Phoenix; 39%, Tucson), Weekly (24%, Phoenix; 32%, Tucson), Monthly (15%, Phoenix; 10%, Tucson), Every 6 months (4%, Phoenix; 6%, Tucson), Once a year (8%, Phoenix; 6%, Tucson), and Don't know (7%, Phoenix; 7%, Tucson).]
ISSUES REGARDING COYOTES

KNOWLEDGE OF COYOTES

- Residents overall are about evenly divided in their professed knowledge of coyotes, with 45% saying that they know a great deal or moderate amount, and 54% saying that they know a little or nothing about coyotes, with little difference between Phoenix and Tucson residents.

Q52. Would you say you know a great deal, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing about coyotes?

![Bar chart showing the responses to Q52.]

- A great deal: 10
- A moderate amount: 35
- A little: 39
- Nothing: 15
- Can't say how much he/she knows: 1

Percent (n=1500)
Q52. Would you say you know a great deal, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing about coyotes?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q52.](chart.png)

- Phoenix (n=1097)
- Tucson (n=403)
ATTITUDES TOWARD COYOTES

The majority of respondents (58%) indicate that they have no coyotes around their home. Otherwise, respondents most commonly say that they enjoy seeing and having coyotes around their home (21%), more than all of the “nuisance” answers combined (18%).

- Phoenix residents are more likely than Tucson residents to not have coyotes around their home; Tucson residents are more likely to say they enjoy seeing and having coyotes around their home. The percentages are nearly the same between cities regarding the “nuisance” answers.

When asked directly about the nearest area to their home they would want to see coyotes, a majority of respondents (58%) said that they would want to see them in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas. Nonetheless, substantial percentages answered that they would like to see coyotes around their home (17%) or in nearby parks (14%).

- 8% do not want to see coyotes at all.
- Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to say that they want to see coyotes around their home.

The majority of respondents (68%) think the coyote population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (5%) or decreased (13%).

- Tucson residents are slightly more likely than are Phoenix residents to say the coyote population should remain the same, and they are less likely to say that the population should be decreased.
- Reasons that respondents give for increasing the coyote population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more coyotes.
- The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the coyote population are to improve pet and human safety and to reduce coyote-human conflicts.

While a majority of respondents think the coyote population in their area should remain the same in size, there is also a majority (58%) in support of controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) coyote populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas. (This graph is further discussed and shown in the section of the report titled, “Attitudes Toward Controlling the Coyote Population.”)
Q39. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about coyotes around your home or in your area?

- I do not have coyotes around my home or in my area (58%)
- I enjoy seeing and having coyotes around my home (21%)
- I enjoy seeing a few coyotes around my home, but worry about the problems they cause (12%)
- I generally regard coyotes as a nuisance (2%)
- I generally regard coyotes as dangerous (4%)
- I have no particular feeling about coyotes around my home (3%)
Q39. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about coyotes around your home or in your area?

- I do not have coyotes around my home or in my area
  - Phoenix: 64%
  - Tucson: 40%

- I enjoy seeing and having coyotes around my home
  - Phoenix: 33%
  - Tucson: 15%

- I enjoy seeing a few coyotes around my home but worry about the problems they cause
  - Phoenix: 15%
  - Tucson: 10%

- I generally regard coyotes as a nuisance
  - Phoenix: 4%
  - Tucson: 4%

- I generally regard coyotes as dangerous
  - Phoenix: 6%
  - Tucson: 2%

- I have no particular feeling about coyotes around my home
  - Phoenix: 2%
  - Tucson: 6%
Q160. What is the nearest area to your home that you would like to see coyotes? Would you prefer to see coyotes around your home; in nearby parks; in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas; or not at all?

- Around my home: 17%
- In nearby parks: 14%
- In areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas: 58%
- Not at all: 8%
- Don't know: 2%

(Percent based on n=1500)
Q160. What is the nearest area to your home that you would like to see coyotes? Would you prefer to see coyotes around your home; in nearby parks; in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas; or not at all?

- **Phoenix (n=1097)**
  - Around my home: 13%
  - In nearby parks: 16%
  - In areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas: 62%
  - Not at all: 8%
  - Don't know: 2%

- **Tucson (n=403)**
  - Around my home: 11%
  - In nearby parks: 11%
  - In areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas: 49%
  - Not at all: 7%
  - Don't know: 2%
Q98. In your opinion, should the coyote population in your area be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

- Increased: 5
- Remain the same: 68
- Decreased: 13
- Don't know: 13

Percent (n=1500)
Q98. In your opinion, should the coyote population in your area be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

- **Increased**: Phoenix (5), Tucson (6)
- **Remain the same**: Phoenix (14), Tucson (74)
- **Decreased**: Phoenix (14), Tucson (9)
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (10), Tucson (10)

![Bar chart showing attitudes towards coyote population increase, remain the same, decrease, and don't know in Phoenix and Tucson. Phoenix respondents are shown in darker bars, Tucson in lighter bars.](chart.png)
Q100. What are the most important reasons the coyote population should be increased?

- To improve chance of seeing a coyote: 30%
- Ecosystem needs more coyotes: 30%
- Animal rights / coyotes have right to live and breed: 20%
- Because coyotes are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations: 19%
- Other: 11%
- To control other nuisance animals: 9%
- To increase number of wildlife viewers: 7%
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers: 2%
- Don't know: 2%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=81)
Q100. What are the most important reasons the coyote population should be increased?

**Phoenix (n=55)**
- To improve chance of seeing a coyote: 38%
- Ecosystem needs more coyotes: 31%
- Animal rights / coyotes have right to live and breed: 24%
- Because coyotes are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations: 15%
- Other: 13%
- To control other nuisance animals: 12%
- To increase number of wildlife viewers: 11%
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers: 4%
- Don’t know: 4%

**Tucson (n=26)**
- To improve chance of seeing a coyote: 29%
- Ecosystem needs more coyotes: 31%
- Animal rights / coyotes have right to live and breed: 24%
- Because coyotes are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations: 12%
- Other: 8%
- To control other nuisance animals: 15%
- To increase number of wildlife viewers: 11%
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers: 4%
- Don’t know: 4%
Q103. What are the most important reasons the coyote population should be decreased?

To improve pet safety (36%)
To improve human safety (33%)
To reduce coyote-human conflicts (27%)
There are too many nuisance animal issues (18%)
To reduce vehicle collisions with coyotes (6%)
Don't know (5%)
To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by coyotes (4%)
Ecosystem needs fewer coyotes (4%)
To improve the overall health of the coyote population (3%)
To reduce agricultural losses from coyotes (3%)
To reduce the incidence of coyote starvation (1%)

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=195)
Q103. What are the most important reasons the coyote population should be decreased?

- To improve pet safety: 38% in Phoenix (n=157), 28% in Tucson (n=38)
- To improve human safety: 34% in Phoenix (n=157), 24% in Tucson (n=38)
- To reduce coyote-human conflicts: 27% in Phoenix (n=157), 24% in Tucson (n=38)
- There are too many nuisance animal issues: 19% in Phoenix (n=157), 16% in Tucson (n=38)
- Other: 8% in Phoenix (n=157), 8% in Tucson (n=38)
- To reduce vehicle collisions with coyotes: 11% in Phoenix (n=157), 5% in Tucson (n=38)
- Don't know: 8% in Phoenix (n=157), 8% in Tucson (n=38)
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by coyotes: 4% in Phoenix (n=157)
- Ecosystem needs fewer coyotes: 8% in Phoenix (n=157)
- To improve the overall health of the coyote population: 3% in Phoenix (n=157)
- To reduce agricultural losses from coyotes: 3% in Phoenix (n=157)
- To reduce the incidence of coyote starvation: 1% in Phoenix (n=157)
PROBLEMS WITH COYOTES

- A small percentage of respondents (5%) have had problems with coyotes in the past 2 years, with no difference between cities.
- The most common coyote problems were with pets (61% of those who had problems) and their presence in general (42%).

Q164. Have you had any problems with coyotes within the past 2 years?
Q164. Have you had any problems with coyotes within the past 2 years?

- Yes: 5%
- No: 95%

Phoenix (n=1097)
Tucson (n=403)
Q166. What kind of problems did the coyotes cause? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Pets: 61%
- Their presence in general: 42%
- Garbage: 9%
- Threat to humans: 6%
- Other: 6%
- Yards: 4%
- Vehicle collision: 4%
- Gardens: 1%
Q166. What kind of problems did the coyotes cause? (Asked of those who had problems.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Problem Description</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=58)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=21)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pets</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Threat to humans</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Garbage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Yards</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vehicle collision</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gardens</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTITUDES TOWARD CONTROLLING THE COYOTE POPULATION

Although a majority of respondents think the coyote population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (58%) support controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) coyote populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.

- Phoenix residents are more likely to support and less likely to oppose, relative to Tucson residents, controlling coyote populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
- Those who support controlling coyotes most commonly think the method that should be used is trapping and relocation.
- When asked directly about lethal methods, 41% support some type of lethal methods, with Tucson residents more likely to support them relative to Phoenix residents.
- When those who said they opposed lethal methods for controlling coyotes were asked about the use of lethal methods if other methods were not possible, 56% support lethal methods (but most of those only moderately supporting), with little difference between cities.
Q105. Do you support or oppose controlling coyote populations, that is, not allowing populations to naturally increase, in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Strongly support: 27
- Moderately support: 31
- Neither support nor oppose: 7
- Moderately oppose: 14
- Strongly oppose: 11
- Don't know: 11
Q105. Do you support or oppose controlling coyote populations, that is, not allowing populations to naturally increase, in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Strongly support: Phoenix (n=1097) - 29%, Tucson (n=403) - 21%
- Moderately support: Phoenix (n=1097) - 32%, Tucson (n=403) - 28%
- Neither support nor oppose: Phoenix (n=1097) - 7%, Tucson (n=403) - 7%
- Moderately oppose: Phoenix (n=1097) - 13%, Tucson (n=403) - 17%
- Strongly oppose: Phoenix (n=1097) - 9%, Tucson (n=403) - 15%
- Don't know: Phoenix (n=1097) - 11%, Tucson (n=403) - 13%
Q107. How do you think the coyotes should be controlled in cities, towns, and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)

- Trapping and relocation: 47%
- Don't know: 32%
- Other: 6%
- Recreational firearm hunting: 6%
- Biological birth control: 5%
- Professionals or sharpshooters: 3%
- Trapping and euthanasia: 3%
- Recreational archery hunting: 3%
- Recreational trapping: 2%
- Should not be decreased at all / natural factors: 2%
- Erecting fences: 2%
Q107. How do you think the coyotes should be controlled in cities, towns, and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Trapping and relocation
- Don't know
- Other
- Recreational firearm hunting
- Biological birth control
- Professionals or sharpshooters
- Trapping and euthanasia
- Recreational archery hunting
- Recreational trapping
- Should not be decreased at all / natural factors
- Erecting fences
- Poison
- Chemical repellents

Phoenix (n=663)
Tucson (n=199)
Q109. Do you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control coyotes in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Strongly support: 18
- Moderately support: 23
- Neither support nor oppose: 4
- Moderately oppose: 16
- Strongly oppose: 33
- Don't know: 6

Percent (n=862)
Q109. Do you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control coyotes in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Strongly support
- Moderately support
- Neither support nor oppose
- Moderately oppose
- Strongly oppose
- Don't know

Phoenix (n=663)

Tucson (n=199)
Q110. Would you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control coyotes in cities, towns, and suburban areas if other methods were not possible? (Of those who opposed lethal methods in the previous question.)

- Strongly support: 11
- Moderately support: 45
- Neither support nor oppose: 4
- Moderately oppose: 12
- Strongly oppose: 24
- Don't know: 5

Percent (n=420)
Q110. Would you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control coyotes in cities, towns, and suburban areas if other methods were not possible? (Of those who opposed lethal methods in the previous question.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=332)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=88)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT’S MANAGEMENT OF COYOTES

- Respondents give more positive than negative ratings to the AGFD’s management of coyotes in their area: 35% rate it excellent or good, while 11% rate it fair or poor (the majority answered, “Don’t know”).
  - Tucson residents are less likely than are Phoenix residents to give an excellent rating, but not in lieu of giving a negative rating; instead, Tucson residents are more likely to answer, “Don’t know.”
  - Reasons for excellent or good ratings are shown, as are reasons for poor ratings.

- Recall that previously the report indicated that the majority of respondents (68%) think the coyote population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (5%) or decreased (13%).
  - Also recall reasons that respondents give for increasing the coyote population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more coyotes.
  - The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the coyote population include to improve pet and human safety and to reduce coyote-human conflicts.
Q87. Would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Coyote Management Program in your county as excellent, good, fair, or poor?
Q87. Would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Coyote Management Program in your county as excellent, good, fair, or poor?
Q90. Why do you rate the Department's Coyote Management Program as excellent or good?

- There are not many coyote-human conflicts: 31%
- The Department does a good job addressing coyote-human conflicts / nuisance issues: 22%
- The coyote population is at the right size: 16%
- The Department does a good job with its resources: 15%
- Don't know: 13%
- The coyote population is healthy: 9%
- Other: 5%
- Good PR: 5%
- Don't see any coyotes: 4%
- There are plenty of coyotes to view / observe: 3%
- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively: 2%
- The Department uses scientific data to manage the coyote populations in cities / towns / suburban areas: 1%
- General impression: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=526)
Q90. Why do you rate the Department's Coyote Management Program as excellent or good?

- There are not many coyote-human conflicts
- The Department does a good job addressing coyote-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- The coyote population is at the right size
- The Department does a good job with its resources
- Don't know
- The coyote population is healthy
- Other
- Good PR
- Don't see any coyotes
- There are plenty of coyotes to view / observe
- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively
- The Department uses scientific data to manage the coyote populations in cities / towns / suburban areas
- General impression
- The Department does not allow undue political influence

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Phoenix (n=404)

Tucson (n=122)
Q96. Why do you rate the Department's Coyote Management Program as poor?

The Department does a poor job addressing coyote-human conflicts / nuisance issues (25%)

The coyote population is at the wrong size (23%)

There are many coyote-human conflicts / nuisance issues (23%)

Other (18%)

The coyote population is unhealthy (9%)

Disapproves of killing (9%)

Nobody helping here (7%)

There are too few coyotes to view / observe (5%)

The Department does a poor job with its resources (5%)

The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively (5%)

The Department allows undue political influence (5%)

Don't know (5%)

The Department does not use scientific data to manage coyote populations in cities / towns / suburban areas (2%)
Q96. Why do you rate the Department's Coyote Management Program as poor?

- The Department does a poor job addressing coyote-human conflicts / nuisance issues
  - Phoenix (n=30): 20%
  - Tucson (n=14): 36%

- The coyote population is at the wrong size
  - Phoenix (n=30): 17%
  - Tucson (n=14): 36%

- There are many coyote-human conflicts / nuisance issues
  - Phoenix (n=30): 17%
  - Tucson (n=14): 36%

- Other
  - Phoenix (n=30): 27%

- The coyote population is unhealthy
  - Phoenix (n=30): 3%
  - Tucson (n=14): 21%

- Disapproves of killing
  - Phoenix (n=30): 10%

- Nobody helping here
  - Phoenix (n=30): 7%

- There are too few coyotes to view / observe
  - Phoenix (n=30): 3%

- The Department does a poor job with its resources
  - Phoenix (n=30): 7%

- The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively
  - Phoenix (n=30): 7%

- The Department allows undue political influence
  - Phoenix (n=30): 3%

- Don't know
  - Phoenix (n=30): 7%

- The Department does not use scientific data to manage coyote populations in cities / towns / suburban areas
  - Phoenix (n=30): 3%
  - Tucson (n=14): 7%
ISSUES REGARDING MOUNTAIN LIONS

KNOWLEDGE OF MOUNTAIN LIONS

- A large majority of respondents (72%) profess to know a little or nothing about mountain lions; only 27% say they know a great deal or moderate amount.
- Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to say they know a great deal or moderate amount about mountain lions.

Q53. Would you say you know a great deal, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing about mountain lions?

- A great deal: 5
- A moderate amount: 22
- A little: 42
- Nothing: 30
- Can't say how much he/she knows: 1

Percent (n=1500)
Q53. Would you say you know a great deal, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing about mountain lions?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perception</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=1097)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=403)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't say how much he/she knows</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
ATTITUDES TOWARD MOUNTAIN LIONS

- The overwhelming majority of respondents (89%) indicate that they do not have mountain lions around their home or in their area, with Phoenix residents (92%) more likely than Tucson residents (82%) to give that answer. Because such a high percentage of respondents gave this answer, another graph shows only those who did not give the answer that they have no mountain lions around their home or in their area. Of those, there are about equal percentages who enjoy seeing and having mountain lions around their home (32%) and who regard mountain lions as dangerous (33%). Indeed, a majority of those respondents not answering that there are no mountain lions around their home (53%) gave one of the three “nuisance” answers.
  - Phoenix residents are more likely than Tucson residents to regard mountain lions as dangerous.

- Most commonly, respondents think the mountain lion population in Arizona is declining (33%), with another 15% saying mountain lions are endangered in Arizona and 1% saying they are extinct. About a fifth (19%) think the mountain lion population is stable and healthy.
  - While Tucson residents have the same likelihood as do Phoenix residents to say that mountain lions in Arizona are declining, endangered, or extinct, Tucson residents are more likely to say that the mountain lion population is stable and healthy (at the expense of the percentage answering, “Don’t know”).

- A majority of respondents (61%), with little difference between cities, feel confident that they know what to do to minimize the risk of danger from mountain lions. Just less than half (44%) feel that mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans, and about a fifth (21%) say that mountain lions are a threat to their safety. (Note that the question in this bullet regarding whether mountain lions are dangerous was asked differently than the attitude question reported previously in which a low percentage of respondents said that they regard mountain lions as dangerous. The previous question asked which statement would best describe their attitude toward mountain lions. The question reported in this bullet asked directly, “Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?” Those who agree in this question that mountain lions are dangerous may not necessarily say that “dangerous” best describes their attitude toward mountain lions.)
• In the individual questions, respondents are about equally divided regarding whether mountain lions are dangerous to humans (44% agree, 44% disagree), with little difference between cities.
• Disagreement (72%) far exceeds agreement (21%) that mountain lions are a threat to personal safety, with little difference between cities.
• Agreement (60%) is about double the disagreement (32%) that the respondent is confident he/she knows how to minimize personal risk from mountain lions.

➢ When asked directly about the nearest area to their home they would want to see mountain lions, a large majority of respondents (72%) said that they would want to see them in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas. Small percentages answered that they would like to see mountain lions around their home (5%) or in nearby parks (8%)
• A substantial percentage (13%) do not want to see mountain lions at all.
• Tucson residents are slightly more likely than are Phoenix residents to say that they want to see mountain lions around their home.

➢ The majority of respondents (65%) think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (9%) or decreased (8%), with little difference between cities.
• Common reasons that respondents give for increasing the mountain lion population include that the ecosystem needs more mountain lions and to improve the chances of seeing one.
• Most commonly, reasons that respondents give for decreasing the mountain lion population are to improve human safety, to reduce mountain lion-human conflicts, and to improve pet safety.

➢ While a majority of respondents think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same in size, there is also a majority (59%) in support of controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) mountain lion populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas. (This graph is further discussed and shown in the section of the report titled, “Attitudes Toward Controlling the Mountain Lion Population.”)
Q40. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about mountain lions around your home or in your area?

- I do not have mountain lions around my home or in my area (89%)
- I enjoy seeing and having mountain lions around my home (3%)
- I enjoy seeing a few mountain lions around my home, but worry about the problems they cause (2%)
- I generally regard mountain lions as a nuisance (0%)
- I generally regard mountain lions as dangerous (4%)
- I have no particular feeling about mountain lions around my home (1%)
- Don't know (1%)

Percent (n=1500)
Q40. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about mountain lions around your home or in your area?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statement</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=90)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=71)</th>
<th>Total (n=161)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy seeing and having mountain lions around my home</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I enjoy seeing a few mountain lions around my home, but worry about the problems they cause</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally regard mountain lions as a nuisance</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I generally regard mountain lions as dangerous</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I have no particular feeling about mountain lions around my home</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
Q55. Overall, what is the status of the mountain lion population in Arizona? Would you say it is stable and healthy, declining, endangered, or extinct?

- Stable and healthy: 19
- Declining: 33
- Endangered: 15
- Extinct: 1
- Don't know: 31

(Percent n=1500)
Q55. Overall, what is the status of the mountain lion population in Arizona? Would you say it is stable and healthy, declining, endangered, or extinct?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=1097)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=403)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable and healthy</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Declining</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Endangered</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extinct</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q58-60. Percent who strongly agree with the following statements.

- **Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans.**
  - 21%

- **Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety.**
  - 10%

- **Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions.**
  - 37%
Q58-60. Percent who strongly or moderately agree with the following statements.

- Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. 44%
- Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. 21%
- Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. 61%
Q58-60. Percent who strongly disagree with the following statements.

Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety.

Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions.

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans.
Q58-60. Percent who moderately or strongly disagree with the following statements.

- **Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety.**
  - Percent: 72%

- **Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans.**
  - Percent: 44%

- **Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions.**
  - Percent: 33%
Q58-60. Percent who strongly agree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans.

Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety.

Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions.
Q58-60. Percent who strongly or moderately agree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. 60

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. 44

Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. 20

Percent
Q58-60. Percent who strongly disagree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans.

Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety.

Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions.
Q58-60. Percent who moderately or strongly disagree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. 73%

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. 44%

Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. 33%
Q58-60. Percent who strongly agree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. 44%

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. 23%

Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. 8%
Q58-60. Percent who strongly or moderately agree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions.

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans.

Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety.
Q58-60. Percent who strongly disagree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. 19%
Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. 40%
Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. 18%
Q58-60. Percent who moderately or strongly disagree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

- Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. 44%
- Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. 68%
- Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. 32%
Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

- Strongly agree: 21
- Moderately agree: 23
- Neither agree nor disagree: 6
- Moderately disagree: 26
- Strongly disagree: 18
- Don't know: 6

Percent (n=585)
Q58. Mountain lions in Arizona are dangerous to humans. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

- Strongly agree: Phoenix (20), Tucson (23)
- Moderately agree: Phoenix (24), Tucson (18)
- Neither agree nor disagree: Phoenix (5), Tucson (9)
- Moderately disagree: Phoenix (26), Tucson (25)
- Strongly disagree: Phoenix (18), Tucson (19)
- Don't know: Phoenix (6), Tucson (5)
Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

- Strongly agree: 10
- Moderately agree: 11
- Neither agree nor disagree: 3
- Moderately disagree: 31
- Strongly disagree: 41
- Don't know: 4

Percent (n=573)
Q59. Mountain lions are a threat to my safety. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

- Strongly agree
- Moderately agree
- Neither agree nor disagree
- Moderately disagree
- Strongly disagree
- Don't know

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Phoenix (n=427)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=146)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly agree</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately agree</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither agree nor disagree</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately disagree</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly disagree</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

- Strongly agree: 37
- Moderately agree: 23
- Neither agree nor disagree: 1
- Moderately disagree: 14
- Strongly disagree: 18
- Don't know: 6

Percent (n=577)
Q60. I feel confident that I know what to do to minimize my risk of danger from mountain lions. Do you agree or disagree with this statement?

![Bar chart showing the distribution of agreement levels for Q60 among residents of Phoenix and Tucson.](chart)

- **Strongly agree**: Phoenix (n=433) - 35%, Tucson (n=144) - 24%
- **Moderately agree**: Phoenix (n=433) - 19%, Tucson (n=144) - 14%
- **Neither agree nor disagree**: Phoenix (n=433) - 1%, Tucson (n=144) - 1%
- **Moderately disagree**: Phoenix (n=433) - 14%, Tucson (n=144) - 14%
- **Strongly disagree**: Phoenix (n=433) - 18%, Tucson (n=144) - 18%
- **Don't know**: Phoenix (n=433) - 6%, Tucson (n=144) - 4%
Q161. What is the nearest area to your home that you would like to see mountain lions? Would you prefer to see mountain lions around your home; in nearby parks; in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas; or not at all?

- Around my home: 5%
- In nearby parks: 8%
- In areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas: 72%
- Not at all: 13%
- Don't know: 2%
Q161. What is the nearest area to your home that you would like to see mountain lions? Would you prefer to see mountain lions around your home; in nearby parks; in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas; or not at all?
Q122. In your opinion, should the mountain lion population in your area be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

- Increased: 9%
- Remain the same: 65%
- Decreased: 8%
- Don't know: 18%

Percent (n=1500)
Q122. In your opinion, should the mountain lion population in your area be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

- Increased: Phoenix (8%), Tucson (10%)
- Remain the same: Phoenix (64%), Tucson (67%)
- Decreased: Phoenix (8%), Tucson (8%)
- Don't know: Phoenix (20%), Tucson (14%)

![Bar chart showing responses to Q122]

Phoenix (n=1097) Tucson (n=403)
Q124. What are the most important reasons the mountain lion population should be increased?

- Ecosystem needs more mountain lions: 35%
- To improve chance of seeing a mountain lion: 34%
- Animal rights / mountain lions have right to live and breed: 28%
- Because mountain lions are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations: 15%
- Other: 13%
- To increase number of wildlife viewers: 9%
- Don't know: 3%
- To control other nuisance animals: 2%
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers: 1%
Q124. What are the most important reasons the mountain lion population should be increased?

- Ecosystem needs more mountain lions (Phoenix: 32%, Tucson: 43%)
- To improve chance of seeing a mountain lion (Phoenix: 34%, Tucson: 33%)
- Animal rights / mountain lions have right to live and breed (Phoenix: 27%, Tucson: 29%)
- Because mountain lions are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations (Phoenix: 18%, Tucson: 10%)
- Other (Phoenix: 10%, Tucson: 19%)
- To increase number of wildlife viewers (Phoenix: 11%, Tucson: 5%)
- Don't know (Phoenix: 3%, Tucson: 2%)
- To control other nuisance animals (Phoenix: 2%, Tucson: 0%)
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers (Phoenix: 1%, Tucson: 0%)

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q127. What are the most important reasons the mountain lion population should be decreased?

- To improve human safety: 56%
- To reduce mountain lion-human conflicts: 26%
- To improve pet safety: 20%
- There are too many nuisance animal issues: 9%
- Other: 7%
- Don't know: 5%
- To improve the overall health of the mountain lion population: 3%
- To reduce vehicle collisions with mountain lions: 2%
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by mountain lions: 2%
- To reduce agricultural losses from mountain lions: 2%
- Ecosystem needs fewer mountain lions: 2%
- To reduce the incidence of mountain lion starvation: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q127. What are the most important reasons the mountain lion population should be decreased?

- To improve human safety
- To reduce mountain lion-human conflicts
- To improve pet safety
- There are too many nuisance animal issues
- Other
- Don’t know
- To improve the overall health of the mountain lion population
- To reduce vehicle collisions with mountain lions
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by mountain lions
- To reduce agricultural losses from mountain lions
- Ecosystem needs fewer mountain lions
- To reduce the incidence of mountain lion starvation

Multiple Responses Allowed

Phoenix (n=88)

Tucson (n=34)
PROBLEMS WITH MOUNTAIN LIONS

- A very small percentage of respondents (less than 1%) have had problems with mountain lions in the past 2 years, with little difference between cities.
  - The most common mountain lion problem was threats to humans (4 of the 9 respondents who reported a problem—all 4 of them were Tucson residents).

Q168. Have you had any problems with mountain lions within the past 2 years?
Q168. Have you had any problems with mountain lions within the past 2 years?

Yes

No

Phoenix (n=1097)

Tucson (n=403)
Q170. What kind of problems did the mountain lions cause? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Threat to humans: 4
- Pets: 2
- Their presence in general: 2
- Other: 2
- Don't know: 1

Multiple Responses Allowed

Frequency (n=9)
Q170. What kind of problems did the mountain lions cause? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Threat to humans: 4 (Phoenix) - 4 (Tucson)
- Pets: 1 (Phoenix) - 1 (Tucson)
- Their presence in general: 1 (Phoenix) - 1 (Tucson)
- Other: 1 (Phoenix) - 1 (Tucson)
- Don't know: 0 (Phoenix) - 1 (Tucson)

Multiple Responses Allowed

Frequency
ATTITUDES TOWARD CONTROLLING THE MOUNTAIN LION POPULATION

Although a majority of respondents think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (59%) support controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) mountain lion populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.

- Phoenix residents are more likely to support and less likely to oppose, relative to Tucson residents, controlling mountain lion populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
- The majority of those who support controlling mountain lions (58%) think the method that should be used is trapping and relocation.
- When asked directly about lethal methods for controlling mountain lions, 46% support some type of lethal methods, with little difference between cities.
- When those who said they opposed lethal methods for controlling mountain lions were asked about the use of lethal methods if other methods were not possible, 55% support lethal methods (but most of those only moderately supporting), with little difference between cities.
Q129. Do you support or oppose controlling mountain lion populations, that is, not allowing populations to naturally increase, in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Strongly support: 28
- Moderately support: 31
- Neither support nor oppose: 5
- Moderately oppose: 13
- Strongly oppose: 13
- Don't know: 11

Percent (n=1500)
Q129. Do you support or oppose controlling mountain lion populations, that is, not allowing populations to naturally increase, in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Response</th>
<th>Phoenix (n=1097)</th>
<th>Tucson (n=403)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neither support nor oppose</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q131. How do you think the mountain lions should be controlled in cities, towns, and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)

- Trapping and relocation: 58%
- Don't know: 24%
- Other: 7%
- Recreational firearm hunting: 6%
- Biological birth control: 4%
- Professionals or sharpshooters: 3%
- Trapping and euthanasia: 3%
- Recreational archery hunting: 3%
- Recreational trapping: 1%
- Should not be decreased at all / natural factors: 1%
- Erecting fences: 1%

Percent (n=878)
Q131. How do you think the mountain lions should be controlled in cities, towns, and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)
Q133. Do you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control mountain lions in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Strongly support: 18
- Moderately support: 28
- Neither support nor oppose: 4
- Moderately oppose: 14
- Strongly oppose: 32
- Don't know: 4

Percent (n=878)
Q133. Do you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control mountain lions in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q133]

- **Strongly support**: Phoenix (n=668) - 18%, Tucson (n=210) - 27%
- **Moderately support**: Phoenix - 32%, Tucson - 32%
- **Neither support nor oppose**: Phoenix - 4%, Tucson - 4%
- **Moderately oppose**: Phoenix - 14%, Tucson - 13%
- **Strongly oppose**: Phoenix - 32%, Tucson - 30%
- **Don't know**: Phoenix - 4%, Tucson - 3%
Q134. Would you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control mountain lions in cities, towns, and suburban areas if other methods were not possible? (Of those who opposed lethal methods in the previous question.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Support/Moderate Support</th>
<th>Oppose</th>
<th>Neither Support/Nor Oppose</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Strongly support</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately support</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Moderately oppose</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Strongly oppose</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent (n=402)
Q134. Would you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control mountain lions in cities, towns, and suburban areas if other methods were not possible? (Of those who opposed lethal methods in the previous question.)
ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT’S MANAGEMENT OF MOUNTAIN LIONS

Respondents were asked if they agree or disagree with five statements about the AGFD’s management of mountain lions that reflect positively on the AGFD’s management (e.g., “The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions”). Each statement had a large majority in agreement (from 65% to 72%).

- The most striking difference between the two cities is that Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to agree that the AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion. This may be a function of a greater prevalence of lions in the Tucson area—perhaps more information is publicized there because there are more lions there.
- Another difference between cities is that Tucson residents are more likely than Phoenix residents to strongly disagree that the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion in human-mountain lion conflicts.
- No statement had more than 10% in disagreement overall, but Tucson residents disagreed at a greater rate than did Phoenix residents, with as much as 19% of Tucson residents in disagreement (with the statement, “In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion,” although the other statements had from 9% to 13% in disagreement).
- Those who disagree that the AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans most commonly say that the AGFD sides with humans too often.

Respondents gave more positive than negative ratings to the AGFD’s management of mountain lions in their area: 38% rate it excellent or good, while 9% rate it fair or poor (the majority answered, “Don’t know”).

- Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to give a rating of fair or poor.
- Reasons for excellent or good ratings are shown, as are reasons for poor ratings.
Recall that previously the report indicated that the majority of respondents (65%) think the mountain lion population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (9%) or decreased (8%).

- Also recall reasons that respondents give for increasing the mountain lion population include that the ecosystem needs more mountain lions and to improve the chances of seeing one.

- The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the mountain lion population are to improve human safety, to reduce mountain lion-human conflicts, and to improve pet safety.
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly agree with the following statements.

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion.

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions.

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion.

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior.

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly or moderately agree with the following statements.

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion.

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions.

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion.

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior.

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly disagree with the following statements.

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion.

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion.

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions.

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior.
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who moderately or strongly disagree with the following statements.

- **Q67.** In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion. 10%
- **Q66.** The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion. 10%
- **Q62.** The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans. 8%
- **Q61.** The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions. 7%
- **Q68.** The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior. 4%
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly agree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

- **Q67.** In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion. - 45%

- **Q61.** The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions. - 40%

- **Q68.** The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior. - 36%

- **Q66.** The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion. - 34%

- **Q62.** The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans. - 31%
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly or moderately agree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion. 72%

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions. 69%

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior. 68%

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion. 67%

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans. 64%
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly disagree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion.

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions.

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion.

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior.
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who moderately or strongly disagree with the following statements. (Phoenix residents.)

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion. 8

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans. 7

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion. 6

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions. 5

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior. 3
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly agree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

- Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions. (46%)
- Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion. (45%)
- Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion. (42%)
- Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior. (38%)
- Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans. (35%)
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly or moderately agree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion.

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions.

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion.

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior.
Attitudes Toward Urban Wildlife Among Residents of Phoenix and Tucson

Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who strongly disagree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion.

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion.

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions.

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior.
Q61, 62, 66, 67, 68. Percent who moderately or strongly disagree with the following statements. (Tucson residents.)

Q67. In conflicts between humans and mountain lions, the AGFD carefully considers all possibilities before deciding to kill a mountain lion.

Q66. The AGFD makes sufficient information available to the public to help reduce the chances of having a negative encounter with a mountain lion.

Q61. The AGFD takes the appropriate actions to protect me from danger from mountain lions.

Q62. The AGFD effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.

Q68. The AGFD has staff biologists who are knowledgeable about mountain lion populations and mountain lion behavior.
Q64. Why do you disagree that the Arizona Game and Fish Department effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans.

- AGFD sides with humans too often: 44%
- Mountain lion population is too low: 15%
- Don't know: 15%
- There are too many conflicts between mountain lions and humans: 12%
- Should leave them alone: 12%
- Other: 7%
- Mountain lion population is unhealthy: 2%
- Humans are not safe: 2%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=41)
Q64. Why do you disagree that the Arizona Game and Fish Department effectively balances the needs of mountain lions with the safety of humans?

AGFD sides with humans too often
Mountain lion population is too low
Don't know
There are too many conflicts between mountain lions and humans
Should leave them alone
Other
Mountain lion population is unhealthy
Humans are not safe

Phoenix (n=25)
Tucson (n=16)
Q111. Would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Mountain Lion Management Program in your county as excellent, good, fair, or poor?
Q111. Would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Mountain Lion Management Program in your county as excellent, good, fair, or poor?

![Bar chart showing responses to Q111 for Phoenix and Tucson]

- Excellent: Phoenix (n=1097) and Tucson (n=403)
- Good: Phoenix (n=1097) and Tucson (n=403)
- Fair: Phoenix (n=1097) and Tucson (n=403)
- Poor: Phoenix (n=1097) and Tucson (n=403)
- Don't know: Phoenix (n=1097) and Tucson (n=403)
Q114. Why do you rate the Department's Mountain Lion Management Program as excellent or good?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Percent (n=569)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There are not many mountain lion-human conflicts</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department does a good job addressing mountain lion-human conflicts / nuisance issues</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mountain lion population is at the right size</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department does a good job with its resources</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good press in media</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>None around</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The mountain lion population is healthy</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good job</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are plenty of mountain lions to view / observe</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department uses scientific data to manage the mountain lion populations in cities/towns/suburban areas</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No information</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q114. Why do you rate the Department’s Mountain Lion Management Program as excellent or good?

- There are not many mountain lion-human conflicts
- The Department does a good job addressing mountain lion-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- The mountain lion population is at the right size
- The Department does a good job with its resources
- Don't know
- Good press in media
- None around
- The mountain lion population is healthy
- Other
- Good job
- There are plenty of mountain lions to view / observe
- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively
- The Department uses scientific data to manage the mountain lion populations in cities/towns/suburban areas
- No information
- The Department does not allow undue political influence

Multiple Responses Allowed

Phoenix (n=401)

Tucson (n=168)
Q120. Why do you rate the Department’s Mountain Lion Management Program as poor?

- The Department does a poor job addressing mountain lion-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- There are too few mountain lions to view / observe
- The mountain lion population is at the wrong size
- The mountain lion population is unhealthy
- The Department does a poor job with its resources
- The Department allows undue political influence
- There are many mountain lion-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively
- Don't know
- The Department does not use scientific data to manage mountain lion populations in cities / towns / suburban areas

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=38)
Q120. Why do you rate the Department’s Mountain Lion Management Program as poor?

- The Department does a poor job addressing mountain lion-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- There are too few mountain lions to view / observe
- The mountain lion population is at the wrong size
- The mountain lion population is unhealthy
- The Department does a poor job with its resources
- The Department allows undue political influence
- There are many mountain lion-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively
- The Department does not use scientific data to manage mountain lion populations in cities / towns / suburban areas
- Other

multiple responses allowed

Phoenix (n=14)
Tucson (n=24)
ISSUES REGARDING JAVELINAS

KNOWLEDGE OF JAVELINAS

- A large majority of respondents (68%) profess to know a little or nothing about javelinas, while 30% say they know a great deal or moderate amount.
  - Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to say they know a great deal or moderate amount about javelinas.

Q54. Would you say you know a great deal, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing about javelinas?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Knowledge Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A great deal</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A moderate amount</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A little</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nothing</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Can't say how much he/she knows</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q54. Would you say you know a great deal, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing about javelinas?

- A great deal: Phoenix (6), Tucson (10)
- A moderate amount: Phoenix (20), Tucson (34)
- A little: Phoenix (40), Tucson (36)
- Nothing: Phoenix (33), Tucson (19)
- Can't say how much he/she knows: Phoenix (1), Tucson (1)
ATTITUDES TOWARD JAVELINAS

- The overwhelming majority of respondents (80%) do not have javelinas around their home or in their area. Otherwise, a greater percentage said they enjoy seeing and having javelinas around their home (11%) than gave any of the “nuisance” answers combined (8%).
  - The differences regarding attitudes toward javelinas between Phoenix and Tucson are mostly a function of the presence of javelinas. Because a greater percentage of Phoenix residents than Tucson residents said that they do not have javelinas around, Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to give any other answer. Therefore, a greater percentage of Tucson residents than Phoenix residents said they enjoy seeing and having javelinas around, but also a greater percentage of Tucson residents gave a “nuisance” answer. Nonetheless, Tucson residents are more likely to say they enjoy seeing and having javelinas around than they are to give any of the “nuisance” answers.

- When asked directly about the nearest area to their home they would want to see javelinas, a majority of respondents (62%) said that they would want to see them in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas. Nonetheless, substantial percentages answered that they would like to see javelinas around their home (13%) or in nearby parks (10%).
  - A substantial percentage (12%) do not want to see javelinas at all.
  - Tucson residents are much more likely than are Phoenix residents to say that they want to see javelinas around their home.

- The majority of respondents (66%) think the javelina population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (7%) or decreased (9%).
  - Tucson residents are slightly more likely than are Phoenix residents to say the javelina population should remain the same.
  - Common reasons that respondents give for increasing the javelina population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more javelinas.
  - The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the javelina population are to improve human safety, that there are simply too many nuisance issues, and to reduce javelina-human conflicts.
While a majority of respondents think the javelina population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (53%) also are in support of controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) javelina populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas. (This graph is further discussed and shown in the section of the report titled, “Attitudes Toward Controlling the Javelina Population.”)
Q41. Which of the following best describes your feelings about javelinas around your home or in your area?

- I do not have javelinas around my home or in my area (80%)
- I enjoy seeing and having javelinas around my home (11%)
- I enjoy seeing a few javelinas around my home, but worry about the problems they cause (4%)
- I generally regard javelinas as a nuisance (2%)
- I generally regard javelinas as dangerous (2%)
- I have no particular feeling about javelinas around my home (1%)
Q41. Which of the following best describes your feelings about javelinas around your home or in your area?

- I do not have javelinas around my home or in my area: 87%
- I enjoy seeing and having javelinas around my home: 6%
- I enjoy seeing a few javelinas around my home but worry about the problems they cause: 3%
- I generally regard javelinas as a nuisance: 4%
- I generally regard javelinas as dangerous: 1%
- I have no particular feeling about javelinas around my home: 1%

**Phoenix** (n=1097)

*Phoenix (n=1097)*

**Tucson** (n=403)

*Tucson (n=403)*
Q162. What is the nearest area to your home that you would like to see javelinas? Would you prefer to see javelinas around your home; in nearby parks; in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas; or not at all?

- Around my home: 13%
- In nearby parks: 10%
- In areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas: 62%
- Not at all: 12%
- Don't know: 2%
Q162. What is the nearest area to your home that you would like to see javelinas? Would you prefer to see javelinas around your home; in nearby parks; in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas; or not at all?

- **Around my home**: 26% (Phoenix: 9%, Tucson: 11%)
- **In nearby parks**: 7% (Phoenix: 7%, Tucson: 11%)
- **In areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas**: 65% (Phoenix: 65%, Tucson: 56%)
- **Not at all**: 13% (Phoenix: 13%, Tucson: 9%)
- **Don't know**: 3% (Phoenix: 3%, Tucson: 2%)
Q146. In your opinion, should the javelina population in your area be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Option</th>
<th>Percent (n=1500)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increased</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Remain the same</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q146. In your opinion, should the javelina population in your area be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

- **Increased**: 6% (Phoenix) 8% (Tucson)
- **Remain the same**: 65% (Phoenix) 71% (Tucson)
- **Decreased**: 9% (Phoenix) 8% (Tucson)
- **Don't know**: 20% (Phoenix) 13% (Tucson)
Q148. What are the most important reasons the javelina population should be increased?

- To improve chance of seeing a javelina: 45%
- Ecosystem needs more javelinas: 27%
- Animal rights / javelinas have right to live and breed: 18%
- Because javelinas are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations: 17%
- Other: 16%
- To increase number of wildlife viewers: 12%
- Don't know: 4%
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers: 1%

(Multiple Responses Allowed)
Q148. What are the most important reasons the javelina population should be increased?

- To improve chance of seeing a javelina: Phoenix (48%), Tucson (27%)
- Ecosystem needs more javelinas: Phoenix (27%), Tucson (27%)
- Animal rights / javelinas have right to live and breed: Phoenix (18%), Tucson (18%)
- Because javelinas are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations: Phoenix (16%), Tucson (18%)
- Other: Phoenix (15%), Tucson (18%)
- To increase number of wildlife viewers: Phoenix (13%), Tucson (9%)
- Don't know: Phoenix (1%), Tucson (9%)
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers: Phoenix (1%), Tucson (0%)

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q151. What are the most important reasons the javelina population should be decreased?

- To improve human safety: 37%
- There are too many nuisance animal issues: 31%
- To reduce javelina-human conflicts: 24%
- To improve pet safety: 14%
- Other: 11%
- Don't know: 4%
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by javelinas: 4%
- Ecosystem needs fewer javelinas: 4%
- To reduce agricultural losses from javelinas: 2%
- To reduce vehicle collisions with javelinas: 1%
- To improve the overall health of the javelina population: 1%
- To reduce the incidence of javelina starvation: 1%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent (n=134)
Q151. What are the most important reasons the javelina population should be decreased?

- To improve human safety: Phoenix (n=102) - 28%, Tucson (n=32) - 34%
- There are too many nuisance animal issues: Phoenix (n=102) - 29%, Tucson (n=32) - 34%
- To reduce javelina-human conflicts: Phoenix (n=102) - 21%, Tucson (n=32) - 34%
- To improve pet safety: Phoenix (n=102) - 13%, Tucson (n=32) - 19%
- Other: Phoenix (n=102) - 11%, Tucson (n=32) - 13%
- Don't know: Phoenix (n=102) - 6%, Tucson (n=32) - 0%
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by javelinas: Phoenix (n=102) - 3%, Tucson (n=32) - 6%
- Ecosystem needs fewer javelinas: Phoenix (n=102) - 3%, Tucson (n=32) - 6%
- To reduce agricultural losses from javelinas: Phoenix (n=102) - 1%, Tucson (n=32) - 6%
- To reduce vehicle collisions with javelinas: Phoenix (n=102) - 2%, Tucson (n=32) - 0%
- To improve the overall health of the javelina population: Phoenix (n=102) - 2%, Tucson (n=32) - 0%
- To reduce the incidence of javelina starvation: Phoenix (n=102) - 0%, Tucson (n=32) - 3%

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent
PROBLEMS WITH JAVELINAS

- A small percentage of respondents (4%) have had problems with javelinas in the past 2 years, with Tucson residents more likely than Phoenix residents to have reported problems.
- The most common javelina problems were with gardens (39% of those who had problems), their presence in general (33%), garbage (26%), and yards (26%).

Q172. Have you had any problems with javelinas within the past 2 years?

![Bar chart showing the percentage of respondents who have had problems with javelinas within the past 2 years. 96% have not had any problems, and 4% have had problems.](chart.png)
Q172. Have you had any problems with javelinas within the past 2 years?

- **Yes**: 2 (Phoenix: 2, Tucson: 7)
- **No**: 98 (Phoenix: 98, Tucson: 93)

**Legend**:
- ■ Phoenix (n=1097)
- □ Tucson (n=403)
Q174. What kind of problems did the javelinas cause? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Gardens: 39%
- Their presence in general: 33%
- Garbage: 26%
- Yards: 26%
- Threat to humans: 17%
- Pets: 15%
- Other: 9%
- Vehicle collision: 2%
- Structural damage to home: 2%
- Don't know: 2%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q174. What kind of problems did the javelinas cause? (Asked of those who had problems.)

- Gardens: Phoenix (n=24) - 40%, Tucson (n=30) - 38%
- Their presence in general: Phoenix - 37%, Tucson - 37%
- Garbage: Phoenix - 13%, Tucson - 13%
- Yards: Phoenix - 13%, Tucson - 13%
- Threat to humans: Phoenix - 17%, Tucson - 17%
- Pets: Phoenix - 21%, Tucson - 10%
- Other: Phoenix - 13%, Tucson - 7%
- Vehicle collision: Phoenix - 0%, Tucson - 3%
- Structural damage to home: Phoenix - 0%, Tucson - 3%
- Don't know: Phoenix - 4%, Tucson - 0%
ATTITUDES TOWARD CONTROLLING THE JAVELINA POPULATION

- Although a majority of respondents think the javelina population in their area should remain the same in size, a majority (53%) support controlling (i.e., not allowing an increase in) javelina populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
  - Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to oppose controlling javelina populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas.
  - The majority of those who support controlling javelinas (53%) think the method that should be used is trapping and relocation.
  - When asked directly about lethal methods to control javelinas, 50% support lethal methods, with little difference between cities.
  - When those who said they opposed lethal methods for controlling javelinas were asked about the use of lethal methods if other methods were not possible, 55% support lethal methods (but most of those only moderately supporting), with little difference between cities.
Q153. Do you support or oppose controlling javelina populations, that is, not allowing populations to naturally increase, in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- Strongly support: 24
- Moderately support: 29
- Neither support nor oppose: 6
- Moderately oppose: 15
- Strongly oppose: 13
- Don't know: 14

Percent (n=1500)
Q153. Do you support or oppose controlling javelina populations, that is, not allowing populations to naturally increase, in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

![Bar chart showing attitudes toward urban wildlife among residents of Phoenix and Tucson.]

- **Strongly support**: Phoenix (25%), Tucson (29%)
- **Moderately support**: Phoenix (19%), Tucson (29%)
- **Neither support nor oppose**: Phoenix (13%), Tucson (18%)
- **Moderately oppose**: Phoenix (11%), Tucson (18%)
- **Strongly oppose**: Phoenix (9%), Tucson (15%)

Legend:
- Phoenix (n=1097)
- Tucson (n=403)
Q155. How do you think the javelinas should be controlled in cities, towns, and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)

Percent (n=785)

- Trapping and relocation: 53%
- Don't know: 26%
- Recreational firearm hunting: 9%
- Other: 6%
- Biological birth control: 5%
- Recreational archery hunting: 4%
- Professionals or sharpshooters: 3%
- Trapping and euthanasia: 3%
- Should not be decreased at all / natural factors: 1%
- Recreational trapping: 1%
- Erecting fences: 1%
Q155. How do you think the javelinas should be controlled in cities, towns, and suburban areas? (Asked of those who support controlling.)

- Trapping and relocation: Phoenix 54%, Tucson 48%
- Don't know: Phoenix 25%, Tucson 28%
- Recreational firearm hunting: Phoenix 8%, Tucson 10%
- Other: Phoenix 6%, Tucson 4%
- Biological birth control: Phoenix 5%, Tucson 8%
- Recreational archery hunting: Phoenix 4%, Tucson 5%
- Professionals or sharpshooters: Phoenix 3%, Tucson 4%
- Trapping and euthanasia: Phoenix 2%, Tucson 4%
- Should not be decreased at all / natural factors: Phoenix 1%, Tucson 0%
- Recreational trapping: Phoenix 1%, Tucson 1%
- Erecting fences: Phoenix 0%, Tucson 2%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q157. Do you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control javelinas in urban and suburban environments?

- Strongly support: 21%
- Moderately support: 29%
- Neither support nor oppose: 3%
- Moderately oppose: 13%
- Strongly oppose: 29%
- Don't know: 5%

(Percent total n=785)
Q157. Do you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control javelinas in urban and suburban environments?

- Strongly support: Phoenix 23%, Tucson 30%
- Moderately support: Phoenix 21%, Tucson 28%
- Neither support nor oppose: Phoenix 3%, Tucson 3%
- Moderately oppose: Phoenix 13%, Tucson 13%
- Strongly oppose: Phoenix 29%, Tucson 28%
- Don't know: Phoenix 6%, Tucson 2%

Percentages are based on sample sizes of 594 for Phoenix and 191 for Tucson.
Q158. Would you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control javelinas in cities, towns, and suburban areas if other methods were not possible? (Of those who opposed lethal methods in the previous question.)

- Strongly support: 11
- Moderately support: 44
- Neither support nor oppose: 2
- Moderately oppose: 15
- Strongly oppose: 25
- Don't know: 3

Percent (n=327)
Q158. Would you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control javelinas in cities, towns, and suburban areas if other methods were not possible? (Of those who opposed lethal methods in the previous question.)

- **Strongly support**: Phoenix 11, Tucson 9
- **Moderately support**: Phoenix 43, Tucson 44
- **Neither support nor oppose**: Phoenix 3, Tucson 1
- **Moderately oppose**: Phoenix 14, Tucson 19
- **Strongly oppose**: Phoenix 26, Tucson 22
- **Don't know**: Phoenix 2, Tucson 5
ATTITUDES TOWARD THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT’S MANAGEMENT OF JAVELINAS

- Respondents give more positive than negative ratings to the AGFD’s management of javelinas in their area: 32% rate it excellent or good, while 7% rate it fair or poor (the majority answered, “Don’t know”).
  - Tucson residents are more likely than are Phoenix residents to give a fair or poor rating.
  - Reasons for excellent or good ratings are shown, as are reasons for poor ratings.

- Previously, the report indicated that the majority of respondents (66%) think the javelina population in their area should remain the same rather than be increased (7%) or decreased (9%).
  - Recall that common reasons that respondents give for increasing the javelina population include to improve the chances of seeing one and that the ecosystem needs more javelinas.
  - The most common reasons that respondents give for decreasing the javelina population are to improve human safety, that there are simply too many nuisance issues, and to reduce javelina-human conflicts.
Q135. Would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Javelina Management Program in your county as excellent, good, fair, or poor?

- Excellent: 11
- Good: 21
- Fair: 5
- Poor: 2
- Don't know: 61
Q135. Would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department's Javelina Management Program in your county as excellent, good, fair, or poor?
Q138. Why do you rate the Department's Javelina Management Program as excellent or good?

- There are not many javelina-human conflicts: 32%
- The javelina population is at the right size: 22%
- The Department does a good job addressing javelina-human conflicts / nuisance issues: 19%
- The Department does a good job with its resources: 12%
- Don't know: 11%
- The javelina population is healthy: 10%
- Don't see them/doesn't seem to be a problem: 8%
- There are plenty of javelinas to view / observe: 7%
- Other: 4%
- Media coverage: 2%
- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively: 1%
- Good job/professionalism: 1%
- The Department uses scientific data to manage the mountain lion populations in cities / towns / suburban areas: 1%
Q138. Why do you rate the Department's Javelina Management Program as excellent or good?

- There are not many javelina-human conflicts: Phoenix (34%), Tucson (18%)
- The javelina population is at the right size: Phoenix (20%), Tucson (25%)
- The Department does a good job addressing javelina-human conflicts / nuisance issues: Phoenix (19%), Tucson (18%)
- The Department does a good job with its resources: Phoenix (14%), Tucson (11%)
- Don't know: Phoenix (11%), Tucson (11%)
- The javelina population is healthy: Phoenix (18%), Tucson (7%)
- Don't see them/doesn't seem to be a problem: Phoenix (8%), Tucson (7%)
- There are plenty of javelinas to view / observe: Phoenix (7%), Tucson (4%)
- Other: Phoenix (4%), Tucson (1%)
- Media coverage: Phoenix (3%), Tucson (1%)
- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively: Phoenix (2%), Tucson (1%)
- Good job/professionalism: Phoenix (1%), Tucson (1%)
- The Department uses scientific data to manage the mountain lion populations in cities / towns / suburban areas: Phoenix (1%), Tucson (1%)

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q144. Why do you rate the Department's Javelina Management Program as poor?

- There are many javelina-human conflicts / nuisance issues: 36%
- The javelina population is at the wrong size: 29%
- The Department does a poor job addressing javelina-human conflicts / nuisance issues: 18%
- Don't know: 14%
- There are too few javelinas to view / observe: 11%
- The javelina population is unhealthy: 7%
- The Department does a poor job with its resources: 7%
- The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively: 7%
- The Department allows undue political influence: 7%
- The Department does not use scientific data to manage javelina populations in cities / towns / suburban areas: 4%

Multiple Responses Allowed
Q144. Why do you rate the Department's Javelina Management Program as poor?

- There are many javelina-human conflicts / nuisance issues: Phoenix (n=16) - 67% (13 responses), Tucson (n=12) - 44% (7 responses)
- The javelina population is at the wrong size: Phoenix - 42% (13 responses), Tucson - 19% (3 responses)
- The Department does a poor job addressing javelina-human conflicts / nuisance issues: Phoenix - 25% (8 responses), Tucson - 13% (3 responses)
- Don't know: Phoenix - 17% (5 responses), Tucson - 13% (2 responses)
- There are too few javelinas to view / observe: Phoenix - 13% (3 responses), Tucson - 8% (2 responses)
- The javelina population is unhealthy: Phoenix - 13% (3 responses), Tucson - 0% (0 responses)
- The Department does a poor job with its resources: Phoenix - 13% (3 responses), Tucson - 0% (0 responses)
- The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively: Phoenix - 13% (3 responses), Tucson - 0% (0 responses)
- The Department allows undue political influence: Phoenix - 13% (3 responses), Tucson - 0% (0 responses)
- The Department does not use scientific data to manage javelina populations in cities / towns / suburban areas: Phoenix - 0% (0 responses), Tucson - 0% (0 responses)
DEMOGRAPHIC DATA

- Phoenix residents in the sample overwhelmingly live within the city limits (87%); while only about two-thirds of the Tucson sample lives within the city limits (62%).
  - Most commonly, residents from either city live in detached, single-family houses. Most respondents in the sample owned their place of residence.

- The graph of the length of residence in each city shows a somewhat transient population, particularly Phoenix.

- Educational attainment is shown: 21% went no further than high school, with or without earning a diploma; 74% attended some college, with or without earning a degree; 47% earned an Associate’s degree or higher; and 38% earned a Bachelor’s degree or higher. There was little difference between cities.

- Respondents’ occupations are shown.

- Household incomes follow a bell curve, with the peak in the $40,000 to $59,999 category, with little difference between cities.

- Most respondents consider themselves white or Caucasian (80%). Additionally, a tenth (10%) of the sample indicated that they are of Hispanic descent, with slightly more in Tucson saying that they are of Hispanic descent (but the difference is not outside of the margin of error). (Note that, consistent with the U.S. Census Bureau, the survey did not make “white/Caucasian” mutually exclusive of “Hispanic,” which is why there is a separate question for Hispanic descent.)

- The ages of respondents are fairly evenly distributed among age categories, although slightly skewed to the older age groups.

- The sample was 45% male.
Q260. Do you live within the city limits or outside of the city limits?

- **Within city limits**: Phoenix (n=1097) - 87%, Tucson (n=403) - 62%
- **Outside of city limits**: Phoenix - 10%, Tucson - 33%
- **Don't know**: Phoenix - 1%, Tucson - 1%
- **Refused**: Phoenix - 2%, Tucson - 3%
Q261. Which of the following best describes your residence?

- Detached single-family house: 77% in Phoenix, 72% in Tucson
- Garden-style apartment: 7% in Phoenix, 8% in Tucson
- Rowhouse or townhouse: 5% in Phoenix, 6% in Tucson
- Trailer or mobile home: 3% in Phoenix, 7% in Tucson
- Duplex: 2% in Phoenix, 2% in Tucson
- High-rise building: 1% in Phoenix, 1% in Tucson
- Other: 1% in Phoenix, 1% in Tucson
- Don’t know: 1% in Phoenix, 1% in Tucson
- Refused: 3% in Phoenix, 3% in Tucson
Q263. Do you rent or own your current place of residence?

- Rent: 14
- Own: 81
- Occupy without cash rent: 1
- Don't know: 1
- Refused: 3

Percent (n=1500)
Q263. Do you rent or own your current place of residence?

- Rent: Phoenix (n=1097) - 13, Tucson (n=403) - 15
- Own: Phoenix (n=1097) - 82, Tucson (n=403) - 79
- Occupy without cash rent: Phoenix (n=1097) - 1, Tucson (n=403) - 1
- Don't know: Phoenix (n=1097) - 1, Tucson (n=403) - 1
- Refused: Phoenix (n=1097) - 3, Tucson (n=403) - 3
Q264. How many consecutive years have you lived in your community?

- Over 25 years: 20
- 21-25 years: 7
- 16-20 years: 10
- 11-15 years: 14
- 6-10 years: 17
- 5 years or less: 28
- Refused: 2
- Don't know: 1

Percent (n=1500)
Q264. How many consecutive years have you lived in your community?

- Over 25 years: Phoenix (28), Tucson (27)
- 21-25 years: Phoenix (7), Tucson (6)
- 16-20 years: Phoenix (10), Tucson (9)
- 11-15 years: Phoenix (14), Tucson (13)
- 6-10 years: Phoenix (18), Tucson (15)
- 5 years or less: Phoenix (31), Tucson (22)
- Refused: Phoenix (2), Tucson (2)
- Don't know: Phoenix (1), Tucson (1)
Q267. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Not a high school graduate: 3%
- High school graduate or equivalent: 18%
- Some college or trade school, no degree: 27%
- Associate degree or trade school degree: 9%
- Bachelor's degree: 23%
- Master's degree: 12%
- Professional or doctorate degree (e.g., M.D. or Ph.D.): 3%
- Don't know: 1%
- Refused: 4%
Q267. What is the highest level of education you have completed?

- Not a high school graduate: Phoenix (n=1097) = 3, Tucson (n=403) = 4
- High school graduate or equivalent: Phoenix (n=1097) = 18, Tucson (n=403) = 21
- Some college or trade school, no degree: Phoenix (n=1097) = 27, Tucson (n=403) = 24
- Associate’s degree or trade school degree: Phoenix (n=1097) = 9, Tucson (n=403) = 10
- Bachelor’s degree: Phoenix (n=1097) = 24, Tucson (n=403) = 20
- Master’s degree: Phoenix (n=1097) = 13, Tucson (n=403) = 12
- Professional or doctorate degree (e.g., M.D. or Ph.D.): Phoenix (n=1097) = 2, Tucson (n=403) = 4
- Don’t know: Phoenix (n=1097) = 1, Tucson (n=403) = 1
- Refused: Phoenix (n=1097) = 3, Tucson (n=403) = 4
Q268/270. What is your current occupation?

- Retired: 24%
- Medical / wellness: 7%
- Homemaker: 7%
- Business owner / self-employed: 7%
- Education: 6%
- Refused: 5%
- Retail / wholesale sales: 5%
- Construction / carpentry / plumbing / electrical / skilled craftsman: 4%
- Finance / insurance / real estate: 4%
- Other: 4%
- Office / consulting / data analysis: 4%
- Government services (police, fire, trash, postal worker, etc.): 4%
- Computer / technical / electronics: 3%
- Disabled: 3%
- Unemployed: 3%
- Manufacturing / factory / industry: 2%
- Restaurant / hotel / tourism / entertainment: 2%
- Full-time student: 2%
- Mechanical / machine servicing (e.g., automobile mechanic): 2%
- Transportation/ shipping: 1%
- Don't know / cant be categorized: 1%
- Agriculture / farming: 1%

Percent (n=1500)
Q268/270. What is your current occupation?

- Retired
- Medical / wellness
- Homemaker
- Business owner / self-employed
- Education
- Refused
- Retail / wholesale sales
- Construction / carpentry / plumbing / electrical / skilled craftsman
- Finance / insurance / real estate
- Other
- Office / consulting / data analysis
- Government services (police, fire, trash, postal worker, etc.)
- Computer / technical / electronics
- Disabled
- Unemployed
- Manufacturing / factory / industry
- Restaurant / hotel / tourism / entertainment
- Full-time student
- Mechanical / machine servicing (e.g., automobile mechanic)
- Transportation/ shipping
- Don't know/ can't be categorized
- Agriculture / farming

Percent

Phoenix (n=1097)
Tucson (n=403)
Q272. Which of these categories best describes your total household income before taxes last year?

- Under $20,000: 7
- $20,000-$39,999: 13
- $40,000-$59,999: 14
- $60,000-$79,999: 12
- $80,000-$99,999: 7
- $100,000-$119,999: 5
- $120,000 or more: 7
- Don't know: 6
- Refused: 29
Q272. Which of these categories best describes your total household income before taxes last year?

- Under $20,000
- $20,000-$39,999
- $40,000-$59,999
- $60,000-$79,999
- $80,000-$99,999
- $100,000-$119,999
- $120,000 or more
- Don't know
- Refused

Phoenix (n=1097) | Tucson (n=403)
---|---
Under $20,000 | 6 | 7
$20,000-$39,999 | 12 | 17
$40,000-$59,999 | 14 | 15
$60,000-$79,999 | 12 | 12
$80,000-$99,999 | 8 | 5
$100,000-$119,999 | 6 | 2
$120,000 or more | 7 | 7
Don't know | 5 | 6
Refused | 30 | 29
Q274. What is your race or ethnic background?

- White or Caucasian: 80%
- Black or African-American: 2%
- Native American or Alaska native: 1%
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 1%
- Other: 8%
- Don't know: 1%
- Refused: 6%
Q274. What is your race or ethnic background?

- White or Caucasian: 81% in Phoenix, 77% in Tucson
- Black or African-American: 2% in both Phoenix and Tucson
- Native American or Alaska native: 1% in Phoenix, 2% in Tucson
- Asian or Pacific Islander: 1% in Phoenix, 0% in Tucson
- Other: 7% in Phoenix, 11% in Tucson
- Don't know: 1% in Phoenix, 2% in Tucson
- Refused: 7% in Phoenix, 6% in Tucson
Q273. Are you of Hispanic descent?

- Hispanic origin: 10%
- Non-Hispanic origin: 85%
- Don't know: 1%
- Refused: 5%

(Percent n=1500)
Q273. Are you of Hispanic descent?

- Hispanic origin: 8 (Phoenix) vs. 13 (Tucson)
- Non-Hispanic origin: 86 (Phoenix) vs. 81 (Tucson)
- Don't know: 1 (Phoenix) vs. 1 (Tucson)
- Refused: 5 (Phoenix) vs. 5 (Tucson)
Q276. May I ask your age?

- 65 years old or older: 20%
- 55-64 years old: 19%
- 45-54 years old: 20%
- 35-44 years old: 15%
- 25-34 years old: 13%
- 18-24 years old: 5%
- Don't know: 1%
- Refused: 7%

(Percent based on n=1500)
Q276. May I ask your age?

- 65 years old or older: Phoenix (24), Tucson (20)
- 55-64 years old: Phoenix (20), Tucson (19)
- 45-54 years old: Phoenix (19), Tucson (16)
- 35-44 years old: Phoenix (16), Tucson (15)
- 25-34 years old: Phoenix (10), Tucson (14)
- 18-24 years old: Phoenix (4), Tucson (5)
- Don't know: Phoenix (1), Tucson (1)
- Refused: Phoenix (7), Tucson (7)
Q278. Respondent's gender (not asked, but observed by interviewer).

![Graph showing gender distribution with 45% male and 55% female]
Q278. Respondent's gender (not asked, but observed by interviewer).

- Phoenix (n=1097)
- Tucson (n=403)
SELECTED COMPARISONS OF COYOTE, MOUNTAIN LION, AND JAVELINA QUESTIONS

KNOWLEDGE OF COYOTES, MOUNTAIN LIONS, AND JAVELINAS

- Knowledge levels are greater regarding coyotes than regarding mountain lions and javelinas.

Q52-54. Would you say you know a great deal, a moderate amount, a little, or nothing about (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)?

- A great deal
  - Coyotes: 10
  - Mountain Lions: 5
  - Javelinas: 7

- A moderate amount
  - Coyotes: 35
  - Mountain Lions: 22
  - Javelinas: 23

- A little
  - Coyotes: 39
  - Mountain Lions: 42
  - Javelinas: 39

- Nothing
  - Coyotes: 15
  - Mountain Lions: 30
  - Javelinas: 29

- Can't say how much he/she knows
  - Coyotes: 1
  - Mountain Lions: 1
  - Javelinas: 1
Attitudes Toward Urban Wildlife Among Residents of Phoenix and Tucson

ATTITUDES TOWARD COYOTES, MOUNTAIN LIONS, AND JAVELINAS AROUND HOME

- Of the three species in the survey, coyotes are the most prevalent (according to whether respondents say they have them around their homes); mountain lions are the least prevalent. Among those who did not answer, “I don’t have (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home or in my area,” mountain lions, not surprisingly, are considered the most dangerous.

- In a related question, respondents were asked how near to their home they would want to see coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas. People appear most comfortable having coyotes around their home; they are least comfortable with mountain lions.
Q39-41. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around your home or in your area?

- I do not have (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home or in my area
- I enjoy seeing and having (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home
- I enjoy seeing a few (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home, but worry about the problems they cause
- I generally regard (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) as a nuisance
- I generally regard (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) as dangerous
- I have no particular feeling about (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home
- Don't know

The chart shows the percentage of responses for each statement for coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas.
Q39-41. Which of the following statements best describes your feelings about coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas around your home or in your area? (Of those who did not say that they have none around their home or in their area.)

- I enjoy seeing and having (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home
- I enjoy seeing a few (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home, but worry about the problems they cause
- I generally regard (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) as a nuisance
- I generally regard (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) as dangerous
- I have no particular feeling about (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around my home
- Don't know

Percent (n=634)
Q160-162. What is the nearest area to your home that you would like to see (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)? Would you prefer to see (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) around your home; in nearby parks; in areas outside of cities, towns, and suburban areas; or not at all?
PROBLEMS WITH COYOTES, MOUNTAIN LIONS, AND JAVELINAS

- The ranking of the three types of animals in the survey for causing problems are coyotes (the most problems), javelinas, and mountain lions (the fewest problems).
  - Coyotes overwhelmingly cause more problems with pets than do mountain lions or javelinas. Javelinas cause the most problems to gardens, yards, and garbage. Mountain lions create the greatest perceived threats to humans.
Q164, 168, 172. Have you had any problems with (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) within the past 2 years?
Q166, 170, 174. What kind of problems did the (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) cause?

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Pets
- Their presence in general
- Garbage
- Threat to humans
- Other
- Yards
- Vehicle collision
- Gardens
- Don’t know
- Structural damage to home

Percent

Coyotes
Mountain Lions
Javelinas
ATTITUDES TOWARD INCREASING OR DECREASING POPULATIONS OF COYOTE, MOUNTAIN LION, AND JAVELINA

- Results regarding whether populations of coyotes, mountain lions, and javelinas should be increased, decreased, or kept the same are not much different among the three types of animals.
  - Reasons for increasing and decreasing the populations of the three animals are shown. Reasons to increase are about the same among the three types of animals, but reasons to decrease show some marked differences. People more often want to decrease coyote populations for pet safety than they do for the mountain lion or javelina populations. Human safety as a reason for decreasing the population was most often given regarding mountain lions.
Q98, 122, 146. In your opinion, should the (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) population in your area be increased, remain the same, or be decreased?

- Increased
  - Coyotes: 5
  - Mountain Lions: 9
  - Javelinas: 7

- Remain the same
  - Coyotes: 68
  - Mountain Lions: 65
  - Javelinas: 66

- Decreased
  - Coyotes: 13
  - Mountain Lions: 8
  - Javelinas: 9

- Don't know
  - Coyotes: 13
  - Mountain Lions: 18
  - Javelinas: 18
Q100, 124, 148. What are the most important reasons the (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) population should be increased?

- Ecosystem needs more (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)
- To improve chance of seeing a (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)
- Animal rights / (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) have right to live and breed
- Because (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations
- Other
- To control other nuisance animals
- To increase number of wildlife viewers
- Don't know
- To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers

Multiple Responses Allowed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Coyotes</th>
<th>Mountain Lions</th>
<th>Javelinas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ecosystem needs more (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve chance of seeing a (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal rights / (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) have right to live and breed</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Because (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) are pleasing to see / aesthetic considerations</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To control other nuisance animals</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase number of wildlife viewers</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don't know</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To increase money brought into community by wildlife viewers</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent
Q103, 127, 151. What are the most important reasons the (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) population should be decreased?

Part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Coyotes</th>
<th>Mountain Lions</th>
<th>Javelinas</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>To improve pet safety</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To improve human safety</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many nuisance animal issues</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>To reduce vehicle collisions with (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Q103, 127, 151. What are the most important reasons the (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) population should be decreased?

Part 2

- Don't know
- Ecosystem needs fewer (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)
- To improve / protect habitat that is damaged by (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)
- To improve the overall health of the (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population
- To reduce agricultural losses from (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)
- To reduce the incidence of (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) starvation

Percent

- Coyotes
- Mountain Lions
- Javelinas
There is little difference across species regarding support or opposition to controlling populations in cities, towns, and suburban areas. However, differences emerge regarding how to control them: people are more likely to want to trap and relocate mountain lions than javelinas and especially coyotes. Regarding lethal methods, when respondents were asked about them directly, there are no marked differences across species.
Q105, 129, 153. Do you support or oppose controlling (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) populations, that is, not allowing populations to naturally increase, in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

![Bar chart showing support levels for controlling populations across different species.]

- **Strongly support**:
  - Coyotes: 27%
  - Mountain Lions: 28%
  - Javelinas: 24%

- **Moderately support**:
  - Coyotes: 31%
  - Mountain Lions: 31%
  - Javelinas: 29%

- **Neither support nor oppose**:
  - Coyotes: 7%
  - Mountain Lions: 5%
  - Javelinas: 6%

- **Moderately oppose**:
  - Coyotes: 14%
  - Mountain Lions: 13%
  - Javelinas: 15%

- **Strongly oppose**:
  - Coyotes: 11%
  - Mountain Lions: 13%
  - Javelinas: 13%
Q107, 131, 155. How do you think the (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) should be controlled in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

[Bar chart showing percentages of residents' responses for each method of control for each species.]

- Trapping and relocation: 47% (Coyotes), 53% (Mountain Lions), 58% (Javelinas)
- Don't know: 24% (Coyotes), 26% (Mountain Lions), 26% (Javelinas)
- Other: 6% (Coyotes), 7% (Mountain Lions), 6% (Javelinas)
- Recreational firearm hunting: 6% (Coyotes), 6% (Mountain Lions), 9% (Javelinas)
- Biological birth control: 5% (Coyotes), 5% (Mountain Lions), 4% (Javelinas)
- Recreational archery hunting: 3% (Coyotes), 3% (Mountain Lions), 4% (Javelinas)
- Professionals or sharpshooters: 3% (Coyotes), 3% (Mountain Lions), 3% (Javelinas)
- Trapping and euthanasia: 3% (Coyotes), 3% (Mountain Lions), 3% (Javelinas)
- Erecting fences: 2% (Coyotes), 1% (Mountain Lions), 1% (Javelinas)
- Recreational trapping: 2% (Coyotes), 1% (Mountain Lions), 1% (Javelinas)
- Should not be decreased at all / natural factors: 2% (Coyotes), 1% (Mountain Lions), 1% (Javelinas)
Q109, 133, 157. Do you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) in cities, towns, and suburban areas?

- **Strongly support**
  - Coyotes: 18
  - Mountain Lions: 18
  - Javelinas: 21

- **Moderately support**
  - Coyotes: 23
  - Mountain Lions: 28
  - Javelinas: 29

- **Neither support nor oppose**
  - Coyotes: 4
  - Mountain Lions: 4
  - Javelinas: 3

- **Moderately oppose**
  - Coyotes: 16
  - Mountain Lions: 14
  - Javelinas: 13

- **Strongly oppose**
  - Coyotes: 33
  - Mountain Lions: 32
  - Javelinas: 29

- **Don't know**
  - Coyotes: 6
  - Mountain Lions: 4
  - Javelinas: 5
Q110, 134, 158. Would you support or oppose the use of lethal methods to control (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) in cities, towns, and suburban areas if other methods, such as biological birth control or trapping and relocation, were not possible?
RATING OF THE ARIZONA GAME AND FISH DEPARTMENT’S MANAGEMENT PROGRAMS FOR COYOTE, MOUNTAIN LION, AND JAVELINA

- There is little difference across species regarding opinions on the AGFD’s management of the species, except in reasons for giving poor ratings of the AGFD’s management programs. Respondents are much more likely to say the AGFD does a poor job addressing mountain lion-human conflicts than they are to say that about coyote-human or javelina-human conflicts. Additionally, respondents are more likely to say the javelina and coyote populations are at the wrong size than to say that the mountain lion population is at the wrong size. Finally, respondents are more likely to say there are many javelina-human and coyote-human conflicts than they are to say that there are many mountain lion-human conflicts.
Q87, 111, 135. Would you rate the Arizona Game and Fish Department’s (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) Management Program in your county as excellent, good, fair, or poor?

- Excellent:
  - Coyotes: 11
  - Mountain Lions: 14
  - Javelinas: 11

- Good:
  - Coyotes: 24
  - Mountain Lions: 24
  - Javelinas: 21

- Fair:
  - Coyotes: 8
  - Mountain Lions: 6
  - Javelinas: 5

- Poor:
  - Coyotes: 3
  - Mountain Lions: 3
  - Javelinas: 2

- Don’t know:
  - Coyotes: 54
  - Mountain Lions: 54
  - Javelinas: 61
Q90, 114, 138. Why do you rate the Department’s (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) Management Program as excellent or good?

Part 1

- There are not many (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts
- The Department does a good job addressing (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts / nuisance issues
- The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is at the right size
- The Department does a good job with its resources
- Don't know
- The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is healthy
- Good PR

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Coyotes
Mountain Lions
Javelinas
Q90, 114, 138. Why do you rate the Department’s (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) Management Program as excellent or good?

Part 2

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Don’t see any (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas)
  - Coyotes: 4
  - Mountain Lions: 6
  - Javelinas: 8

- There are plenty of (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) to view / observe
  - Coyotes: 2
  - Mountain Lions: 7
  - Javelinas: 1

- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively
  - Coyotes: 2
  - Mountain Lions: 1
  - Javelinas: 1

- General impression
  - Coyotes: 1
  - Mountain Lions: 2
  - Javelinas: 1

- The Department uses scientific data to manage the (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) populations in cities / towns / suburban areas
  - Coyotes: 2
  - Mountain Lions: 1
  - Javelinas: 1
Q93, 117, 141. Why do you rate the Department’s (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) Management Program as fair?

Part 1

Multiple Responses Allowed

- Don't know
  - Coyotes: 18
  - Mountain Lions: 22
  - Javelinas: 22

- Other
  - Coyotes: 17
  - Mountain Lions: 17
  - Javelinas: 21

- There are not too many (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts
  - Coyotes: 12
  - Mountain Lions: 11
  - Javelinas: 9

- The Department does a fair job addressing (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts / nuisance issues
  - Coyotes: 20
  - Mountain Lions: 9
  - Javelinas: 10

- The Department does a fair job with its resources
  - Coyotes: 12
  - Mountain Lions: 10
  - Javelinas: 10

- There are too many (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts
  - Coyotes: 10
  - Mountain Lions: 10
  - Javelinas: 10

- The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is not at the right size
  - Coyotes: 10
  - Mountain Lions: 9
  - Javelinas: 9

- The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is at the right size
  - Coyotes: 6
  - Mountain Lions: 4
  - Javelinas: 11
Q93, 117, 141. Why do you rate the Department’s (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) Management Program as fair?

Part 2

- There are plenty of (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) to view / observe
- The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is not healthy
- There are not plenty of (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) to view / observe
- The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is healthy
- The Department allows too much undue political influence
- The Department uses its budget wisely and/or effectively
- The Department does not use its budget wisely and/or effectively

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Coyotes
Mountain Lions
Javelinas
Q96, 120, 144. Why do you rate the Department’s (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) Management Program as poor?
Part 1

The Department does a poor job addressing (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts / nuisance issues

The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is at the wrong size

There are many (coyote/mountain lion/javelina)-human conflicts / nuisance issues

Other

The (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) population is unhealthy

Multiple Responses Allowed

Percent

Coyotes
Mountain Lions
Javelinas
Q96, 120, 144. Why do you rate the Department’s (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) Management Program as poor?

Part 2

There are too few (coyotes/mountain lions/javelinas) to view / observe

The Department allows undue political influence

The Department does a poor job with its resources

Don’t know

The Department uses its budget unwisely and/or ineffectively

The Department does not use scientific data to manage (coyote/mountain lion/javelina) populations in cities / towns / suburban areas

Multiple Responses Allowed
ADDITIONAL COMMENTS

Q277. That’s the end of the survey. Thanks for your time and cooperation. If you have any additional comments, I can record them here. (Additional comments.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Comment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I live in the heart of the city and have no knowledge or opinion on wildlife issues.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see some programs and lectures about how to properly deal with wildlife, as we are removing them out of their environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stand up for wildlife with everything you have. Fight this fight, defeat Bush, and win for the wildlife.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AGFD does an excellent job. I wish that the AGFD had a stronger voice in regard to zoning regulations to lessen habitat loss from development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anything to help out the poor animals will be a good thing.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I love to see the animals around.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like the Department or humane society to come get them when trapped.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Arizona is badly funded, and any agency with more responsibility will not get more money. Some questions are flawed.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The biggest problems are winter residents—they come and feed the animals, and then they wonder why the animals don’t leave them alone. We need to work on educating those idiots.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get information on wildlife to new people in the area.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>One cannot look at these questions and get an accurate feel. The questions are slanted and leading; your data will be worthless.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I really don’t know anything about Game and Fish.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>They captured a mountain lion and say they cannot rehabilitate any lion. They need to find someone who can rehab lions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AGFD is the finest wildlife organization in the country.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I don’t think there is enough information given on the feeding of animals especially in the canyon.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feed the poor bears.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I see bobcats around my home occasionally. Is that a regular occurrence? Should it be added to the survey?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fish and Game should be more aware to properly handle the wildlife population and be effective doing so; there should be less political influence.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Game and Fish comes up with too many charges for hunters, such as surveys and tags. In particular, why the bird stamp and why does it have to be done separately? Getting the bird stamp is only available on holiday weekends, why?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Get rid of the javelinas.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AGFD should keep up the good work. They are excellent.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I quit putting in for elk draws in Arizona because we never got drawn; I’m an avid big game hunter.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Help get rid of pigeons.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The hunting draw for deer and elk is skewed towards out-of-state people with money.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I appreciate the effort that the Department goes through to help the wildlife in the face of all the development.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I feel education is the best resource in order to deal with development in desert areas.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Government agencies should return to protecting animals and be reminded of what their function and initial cause was meant to be: they were created to protect wildlife and should continue to do so.

I have major concerns about the number of permits that are issued for building/developing; homes are destroying forest/habitat. Stop issuing so many permits; stop building new homes in Maricopa County and in the White Tank Mountains. I am very angry.

Pigeons are pooping everywhere and have stinky nests; their poop is dissolving paint.

I want to know the state/AGFD definition of nuisance animals. I also want to know why they’re considered nuisance animals. I had problems with the wording of Questions 211 and 193.

Humans are dangerous to the animals. It all boils down to the fact that we have moved into the wildlife’s habitat. This survey is irrelevant.

I would like to see the development slow down, as they are ruining the habitat of the animals and may be killing them.

I’d like to see more restriction on bear and javelina hunting.

If you don’t bother animals, they won’t bother you. Problems are due to building in animals’ natural habitat; people are the major problem. Condense cities and have boundaries.

Pigeons seem to be a problem.

Importance in participation is on all levels—homeowners, business, AGFD—in how to deal with the food chain and not interrupt the balance of the ecosystem.

Increase the deer population.

Internet format might be better for administering this survey. [Analyst note: Internet surveys have many more bias problems than do telephone surveys.]

Public education on wildlife should be improved. [Respondent talked at length about the mountain lions in Sabino Canyon and referred to Chuk’son Earth First!’s role in attempting to stop that hunt, although he did not remember the organization’s name.]

Tell the AGFD to keep doing what they’re doing.

Less animal management and encourage recreational hunting.

They need to get more information out about the pigmy owl, and maybe a survey concerning this would be a good idea.

Overdevelopment and over-population are the problem, not the wildlife.

People should be more aware and knowledgeable about wildlife so that they can cohabitate together with the wildlife, live peacefully. We’re intruding on their land—it was their land first.

People should be more involved in learning more about wildlife.

Pigeons are a very bad problem; need to do something about them.

Thank you for calling. I am happy to be more aware and curious about things now.

Public safety needs to be taken care of, but we need to keep as many animals around as possible.

I really appreciate everything the AGFD has done for us.

Wildlife is great.

I appreciate the job of the AGFD in so many ways. They need to work with the public to withstand the onslaught of specialty groups that do not know what they are talking about and that are trying to take over professionalism of the AGFD.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Relocate wildlife to minute-men encampments. Have education efforts in both official languages. I do not know much about the AGFD.</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Scorpions and poisonous snakes need to be controlled in cities and residential areas.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I wish I knew more about Arizona Game and Fish. You should put yourselves out there. PBS shows were really good.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stress the importance of trapping and relocating wildlife; do not kill them, as we are moving into their territory.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I strongly support coyote and mountain lion control in cities, and I know it’s hard to keep emotions out, but emotions must be left out.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This was fun and interesting; it’s something that applies to me. Sabino Canyon caused bad publicity for the AGFD. Catch-and-release could work much better.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prosecute those individuals who abuse animals.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Teach kids about wildlife.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I very much want the coyotes in the wash on 84th Street to be removed.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I think that the most important issue is to stop encroaching upon these animals’ natural habitat because this is the cause for these residential problems.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The AGFD needs to educate people of migratory patterns of animals and where they live so people know where to build and what they are confronting.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The city’s expansion is taking away the hunting of the citizens; there are no more areas in which to hunt.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The protection of our wildlife should be greater; we didn’t used to have a deer season every single year, and I think we should go back to that more often. We don’t need to have one every year.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want more in-state hunting tags issued before selling them to out-of-staters. Also, I want more cooperation between AGFD and local hunting/trapping clubs to control populations.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>This survey is most rewarding. I hope a difference will be made.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Although I hunt, I have an appreciation of animals—for instance, I wouldn’t kill anything I don’t plan on eating. Control only if nuisance and it is necessary. I don’t even kill snakes!</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I want to know about snakes.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wildlife stewardship program for all Arizona would be good—40-80 hours of training, with continuing education and recertification.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would like to see a little more consideration for wildlife habitat.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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