

# Draft Decision Matrix for Landowner Incentives

---

## Objectives:

- Establish a breeding panther population north of Caloosahatchee River
- Avoid or minimize landowner concerns and resistance

ALTERNATIVES	PROS	CONS
(1) Programmatic Safe Harbor agreements	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Agreements may increase panther habitat N of river (at least temporarily).</li> <li>2. Provides assurances to landowner that their land uses will not be limited by ESA (down to baseline).</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Landowner can cancel at any time.</li> <li>2. Hard to measure baseline (esp. for panthers-large HR)</li> <li>3. Must show a net conservation benefit –will take many years for panther</li> <li>4. Removes FWS regulatory authority at end of agreement</li> <li>5. Publicizing, educating, signing up enough landowners would require major effort.</li> <li>6. Panther habitat coincides with habitat for other listed species, so Safe Harbor exclusively for panthers may not be feasible.</li> </ol>
(2) Section 10(j) Experimental Population	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Landowner can control depredating animals in some cases.</li> <li>2. No S7 consultation necessary (if non-essential, conference only)</li> <li>3. Still treated as “threatened” for non-S7 purposes</li> <li>4. Military has been supportive of NEP (e.g. Aplomado falcon) because it does not</li> </ol>	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Landowner may be concerned – can experimental status be changed to protected (listed) later?</li> <li>2. Must be geographically separate from main population (not really an issue for panther NEP).</li> <li>3. Panthers already present north of river would become part of experimental population</li> <li>4. If females cross river naturally, they will be part of experimental population</li> </ol>

## ALTERNATIVES

## PROS

## CONS

Section 10(j) (cont.)	<p>compromise military mission.</p> <p>5. Greater discretion in devising an active management program</p> <p>6. Provides social and biological laboratory to facilitate reintroduction elsewhere</p> <p>7. Does not preclude other conservation programs like Safe Harbors and PFW</p> <p>8. Although a lot of work up front, would not require the landowner-by-landowner contact that would be needed for Partners for Fish and Wildlife or Safe Harbor Agreements</p>	5. 10(j) requires FWS to translocate panthers into a new area to establish the experimental population.
3) Partners for Fish and Wildlife Agreements	<p>1. Voluntary habitat restoration would improve/increase panther habitat</p> <p>2. Does not eliminate FWS regulatory authority</p> <p>3. Easy to set up – no Federal Register Notice, etc.</p> <p>4. Technical or financial assistance provided to landowners</p> <p>5. Assists landowners with their current management objectives (i.e. Invasive species management)</p> <p>6. Section 7 outlines minimization measures, if there is take within these guidelines, then landowner is covered (i.e. regulatory relief without a full BO/BA)</p> <p>7. Interaction with landowners will strengthen partnerships</p>	<p>1. Most PFW projects would be too small to significantly benefit panthers (except in key locations or along corridors).</p> <p>2. No regulatory relief to landowner (but see No. 6 under pros).</p> <p>3. No long term conservation. This is not an easement program and agreement length is a minimum of 10 years (although there are mechanisms for landowners to pull out, especially if no funds provided by FWS)</p> <p>4. Increased workload -PFW agreements would require a lot of interaction with landowners</p>