

TR-194

**Tradeoffs in Brush Management for Water Yield and
Habitat Management in Texas:**

Twin Buttes Drainage Area and Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone

FINAL REPORT

To:

Texas Agricultural Experiment Station

By:

**Christopher R. Narayanan
Urs P. Kreuter
J. Richard Conner**

August 14, 2002

Introduction

With the current population boom, the number of Texas residents will almost double by 2030. With the expected increase in demand for water, the scarcity of water is an urgent issue and research is being conducted to find ways to improve water yield. Rangelands provide the major catchments for both surface reservoirs and aquifers. Brush control as a means of increasing water yields was first studied in the 1970s (Bach and Conner 2000) and a number of studies have reviewed the feasibility of removing brush as a means to increase water yields (Wilcox 2002). For example, a study on the North Concho River watershed (Upper Colorado River Authority, 1998) indicated that removing brush could result in a significant increase in water yield and, in response to this report, the Legislature for the State of Texas appropriated funds to study the feasibility of this practice on eight additional watersheds (Bednarz et al., 2000). The Texas Agricultural Experiment Station sponsored additional studies for two of these eight watersheds (Twin Buttes and Edwards Aquifer) to determine the tradeoff between brush management for increased water yield and wildlife habitat improvement. These two watershed areas are the subjects of this report.

Since a significant portion of Texas lands are privately owned, it is important to account for landowners' willingness to participate in any brush management program, especially when such programs are intended to produce off-site benefits. Landowner participation is generally dependent upon expected economic benefits received (Bach and Conner 2000).

In our study, 300 questionnaires were each sent to randomly selected landowners from both the Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone and the Twin Buttes (Middle and South Concho River) Drainage Area. Names and addresses of rural landowners with tracts of 50 or more acres were compiled with the help of local county appraisal districts. In the questionnaire, survey participants were asked several questions to measure their willingness to participate in different scenarios, as well as the amount of compensation required. This report examines the results of the survey. Of the 300 questionnaires sent to the Edwards Aquifer area, 131 were returned and usable, 50 were returned but unusable, and 119 were never returned. In the Twin Buttes area, 141 questionnaires were returned and usable, 38 were returned but were unusable, and 121 were not returned.

This report examines each watershed separately. All survey questions are considered. Results include mean, median, and quartile data, and frequency distributions.

Survey Responses from Edwards Aquifer and Twin Buttes Area Landowners

Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone

Landholdings of respondents ranged between 50 and 13,000 acres, with mean acreage being 867.15 acres, and median (second quartile) of 225 acres. First and third quartiles were 100 and 950 acres, respectively (Table 1).

Landowners were first asked to describe their property and land management. When asked about their role on the property, most respondents (83.2%) stated that they make most of the management decisions and 6.1% stated that they were one of the key decision makers (Table 2). Property organization included 63.8% sole proprietorship, followed by family partnership at 23.6% (Table 3). Primary activity on the property was very nearly split evenly among combined farm/ranch and wildlife operation (26.7%), wildlife operation (21.7%), livestock production (20.0%), and a residence or weekend hideaway (20.0%) (Table 4). Sources of income were observed to be highest for livestock sales (36.02%) followed by hunting fees (26.89%) (Table 5).

Landowners were next asked a series of questions regarding the importance of rangeland components, land management objectives, and brush management options on their lands. Survey participants were instructed to use a Likert scale in answering the questions, 1 to 7, with 1 indicating very unimportant, 4 as neutral, and 7 indicating very important.

Landowners were first asked about the importance of the presence of certain rangeland components on their land. Of the respondents, 86% rated the presence of grasslands as important or very important, while 57.9% rated woodlands and brush as important or very important. Surface water was rated by 88% of the respondents to be important or very important, while 93.3% of the respondents stated that the presence of wildlife to be important or very important (Tables 6-9).

Next, landowners were asked about how important certain land management objectives were on their land. Results showed that 65.5% of landowners felt that improving forage supply was either important or very important, compared with improving wildlife habitat which was rated important or very important for 89.1% of the respondents. Similarly, 85.4% of landowners stated that controlling brush invasion was important or very important. Protecting and improving riparian areas and increasing streamflow were important or very important for 77.8% and 80% of the respondents, respectively (Tables 10-14).

Finally, landowners were asked to rate the importance of various brush management objectives. Increasing water yield and stream flow (87.5%), improving riparian areas for wildlife (79.5%), protecting live oak in brush control areas (79.2%), and controlling light levels of juniper (79.2%) were deemed as important or very important by a large majority of respondents. By contrast, controlling light levels of mesquite (37.7%) and the potentially negative effects of less brush cover on the value of hunting lands (35.6%) were deemed important or very important by relatively few respondents (Tables 15-20).

When asked if they used any water conservation practices on their land, 72.1% of the respondents stated that they did (Table 21). Water conservation practices used included: ponds (55.2%), terraces (31.2%), shaped waterways or drainages (36.8%), exclude grazing from riparian areas (16.0%), flash graze riparian areas (11.3%), brush control (60.8%), and reseeding and/or replanting to protect drainage areas (42.4%) (Tables 22-28).

Reported percentages of land cover were observed to be trimodal with highs for open grassland (23.5%), predominantly juniper (29.23%), and mixed live oak and juniper (26.75%) (Table 29).

Landowners were asked to estimate the amount of certain brush cover that occurred with areas of their land on slopes greater than 15% gradient. No live oak on these slopes was reported 36.4% of respondents, while 5% and 20% live oak cover on such land were reported by 13.6% of the respondents (Table 30). Mesquite and a mixed cover of mesquite and live oak on these slopes were very low with 98.9% of respondents reporting no mesquite occurred in these areas (Table 31) and 95% of respondents reporting no mixed live oak and mesquite occurred in these areas (Table 32). By contrast, only 22.2% of respondents reported no juniper on land with more than 15% slope, compared to 16.7% reporting 50% of juniper cover occurred in these areas (Table 33). Finally, 29.6% of respondents stated that mixed live oak and juniper did not occur in these areas, while 11.3% stated 20% of the mixed cover occurred in these areas (Table 34).

Land owners were then asked to estimate the amount of brush that occurred within 75 yards of streams and/or rivers, on their land. Of the respondents, 31.9% stated that no live oak occurred in these areas, while 15.3% stated that 10% of the live oak cover occurred within 75 yards of streams/rivers (Table 35). Levels of mesquite and a mix of live oak and mesquite in these areas were low as 93.4% of respondents reported no mesquite (Table 36) while 95.0% of respondents reported no mixed live oak and mesquite in these areas (Table 37). By comparison, 34.8% had no juniper in these areas, followed by 13.0% who stated that 20% of the juniper on their land occurred in these areas. In addition, 11.6% of respondents each stated that 5% and 10% of juniper on their land occurred in these areas (Table 38). Finally, 39.7% of respondents stated that no mixed live oak and juniper occurred within these areas,

followed by 13.7% who stated that 10% of the mixed cover occurred in riparian areas on their land (Table 39).

Lastly, landowners were asked to estimate the amount of brush cover in all “other” areas of their land. Live oak was fairly common in other areas as 20.3% of respondents stated that no live oak cover occurred in these areas, while the remaining 79.7% of responses reported less than 9% in terms of percentage of cover (Table 40). On the other hand, 89.0% of respondents reported no mesquite occurred in other areas (Table 41) and 93.7% of respondents stated that no mixed live oak and mesquite occurred in these other areas (Table 42). Juniper was more common with only 18.9% of respondents reporting no juniper, followed by 10.8% who stated that it occurred on 10% of these areas (Table 43). Finally, 23.6% of respondents stated that no mixed live oak and juniper occurred in these other areas, followed by 11.1% who stated that the mixed cover was on 50% of their property in these areas (Table 44).

Landowners were asked a series of questions regarding how they felt about the amount of brush cover on their property. Landowners were asked to use a 1 to 7 Likert scale, with 1 indicating much too little, 4 just right, and 7 much too much. A higher number associated with the response reflects too much cover, while a lower number indicates not enough of that type of brush (Table 45). Results showed that landowners felt that there was a high occurrence of juniper (6.47) and a mix of live oak and juniper (5.34). On the other hand, they felt that the amount of mesquite (3.81), mixed live oak and mesquite (3.75) and live oak (3.30) were low.

Open cover was defined in the survey as land with less than 10% canopy cover, moderate was between 10 and 30%, and heavy cover was defined as greater than 30%. On average, 22.47% of the land was reported to be open cover, 21.77% moderate cover, and 45.04% heavy cover (Table 46).

Respondents indicated, on average, that they would include 49.15% of their moderate cover and 52.73% of their heavy cover in a brush management program (Table 47). Only 21.8% of the respondents stated they would enroll all of their acres of moderate brush in a program, while 21.8% stated they would not enroll any acres of moderate brush in this type of program. Finally, 24.6% of the respondents stated they would enroll all of the heavy brush in a program, while 19.3% stated they would not enroll any acres of heavy brush.

Landowners were then asked if the willingness to include moderate and heavy cover areas would change if constraints on brush removal were placed within 75 yards of riparian areas. About 80.0% of respondents stated that their willingness to include moderate or heavy cover areas would not change (Table 48-49). Landowners were also asked how their willingness to enroll would change if 40% of the land remained in moderate or heavy cover after the brush control was completed. A slightly lower percentage (approximately 71%) of respondents stated that their willingness would not change in moderate and heavy cover areas (Table 50-51).

In addition, landowners were asked how other constraints and requirements would affect their interest in such a program. These included: 75 yard buffer along both sides of streams and rivers in which brush removal may be restricted, protection of bottomland hardwoods, selective removal of mesquite and/or juniper in riparian areas, replanting/reseeding of native plants to stabilize stream banks and/or improve wildlife habitat, fencing to control movement of cattle in riparian areas, restricted flash grazing of livestock in riparian areas, and no grazing of livestock in riparian areas (Tables 52 to 58). The majority of respondents stated that their level of interest would not change for most of these constraints and requirements: 75 yard buffer (72.6%), bottomland hardwoods (93.2%), selective brush management (86.0%) and replanting/reseeding (95.8%). However about 33% of the respondents stated that fencing and restricted flash grazing would decrease their interest and over 50% indicated a lower interest if grazing in riparian areas was restricted with 21.8% reporting that this constraint would prevent their participation.

When asked how important compensation would be for certain actions or restrictions, landowners were asked to use a 1 to 7 scale, with 1 indicating very unimportant, 4 as neutral, and 7 indicating very important. These actions/restrictions included fencing, new water sources, grazing deferment, prescribed burns and reseeding/replanting of native plants. Higher numbers (>4) associated with the response reflect more compensation is needed to participate, while lower numbers (<4) indicate less compensation is needed to participate (Table 59). Results showed that compensation was most important for new water sources (5.93) and least important for grazing deferment (4.56), but the mean responses were in a narrow range that indicated neutral to slightly important.

Similarly, landowners were asked to indicate their levels of interests in various contract types, using a scale of 1 to 7, with 1 indicating not at all interested, 4 as neutral, and 7 indicating very interested. A higher number associated with the response reflects greater interest, while a lower number indicates less interest (Table 60). Interest was highest for contracts tied to other state funded programs (4.33) and lowest for long term (50 year) conservation easements (2.38), but the mean responses for all contract types placed interest in the not interested to slightly above neutral interest range.

Landowners were then asked if they had participated in any federal or state funded programs such as EQIP, and to specify each one. Of the respondents, 85.2% stated they did not participate in any programs (Table 61). Of those that responded in the affirmative, 75% stated they currently participate in EQIP and 16.7% had participated in the past (Table 62), 60.0% stated that they had participated in CRP and 20.0% stated they currently participate (Table 63), and 50.0% had participated in another program while 25.0% are currently participating in such a program (Table 64).

Response choices for minimum amount of cost-share levels required ranged from 50 to 100% (by increments of 10%), along with a choice of no interest in such a program. On average, 34.5% of the landowners indicated that they would require a minimum of 50%, while 26.1% indicated that at least 80% was desirable, and 16.8% stated that they were not interested in participating in such a program (Table 65).

Demographic data is summarized in the tables that follow this report (Tables 67-74). This includes birth year of respondents and the years of farming and/or ranching experience since age 18. These answers were expressed as actual values (Table 66). Mean birth year was 1941, while respondents had an average of 21 years of farming and/or ranching experience since age 18.

The most selected length of property ownership category was more than one generation (33.1%), followed by 3 to 10 years (25.0%), and most landowners (88.5%) stated that they would own their property indefinitely. When asked if they currently live on their farm or ranch, 54.0% of respondents stated that they did not, of which 51.5% stated that they live more than 100 miles away, and 43.8% reported living in a very large city, while 27.4% reported living in a rural area

Levels of investments in fixed improvements amounted to 30.3% in the \$1000-\$9999 range, followed by 23.8% for the \$10,000-\$24,999 range. Most landowners (74.2%) stated that less than 10% of their household income is derived from the property. Finally, household income was highest (32.2%) for the \$100,001-\$500,000 range, followed by \$50,001-\$75,000 for 20.7% of the respondents.

Twin Buttes Recharge Area

Of the 141 usable responses, landholdings ranged between 62 and 95,000 acres with mean acreage being 4516.56 acres. The median (second quartile) was 1600 acres and the first and third quartiles were 600 and 3900 acres, respectively (Table 75).

When asked about their role on the property, most respondents (78.1%) stated that they make most of the management decisions, while 13.1% stated that they were one of the key decision makers (Table 76). Property organization was primarily sole proprietorship (52.9%), followed by family partnership (23.2%) (Table 77). For primary activity on the property, 43.4% of respondents stated combined farm/ranch

and wildlife operation, 31.6% reported livestock production and 10.3% mixed crop and livestock (Table 78). Sources of income were highest for livestock sales (41.3%) followed by hunting fees (20.23%) and mineral sales and leases (14.49%) (Table 79).

In this watershed, 92.1% of landowners rated the presence of grasslands as important or very important, while 42.1% rated woodlands and brush, 70.1% rated surface water, and 87.0% rated the presence of wildlife on their property as important or very important (Tables 80-83).

When asked about how important certain land management objectives were on their land, 86.3%, 82.8%, and 89.1% of respondents rated improving forage supply, improving wildlife habitat, and controlling brush invasion as important or very important, respectively. By contrast, protecting and improving riparian areas and increasing streamflow were important or very important for 71.1% and 74.4% of the respondents, respectively (Tables 84-88).

Finally, landowners were asked to rate the importance of various brush management options. Options such as increasing water yield and stream flow (74.8%), improving riparian areas for wildlife (68.6%), protecting live oak in brush control areas (70.2%), controlling light levels of mesquite (81.3%) and controlling light levels of juniper (74.0%), were deemed as important or very important by a majority of respondents. However, the fact that less brush cover may reduce the value of hunting lands (40.8%) was of concern to relatively few respondents (Tables 89-94).

When asked if they used any water conservation practices on their land, 71.0% of the respondents stated that they did (Table 95), including: ponds (53.3%), terraces (36.6%), shaped waterways or drainages (43.5%), exclude grazing from riparian areas (17.4%), flash graze riparian areas (12.2%), brush control (83.7%), and reseeding and/or replanting to protect drainage areas (33.7%) (Tables 96-102).

Percentages of land cover were observed to be highest for predominantly mesquite (27.95%), followed by mixed mesquite and juniper (20.61%) and open grassland (18.5%) (Table 103).

Landowners were first asked to estimate the amount of brush cover that occurred on different parts of their land. On slopes greater than 15% gradient, 73.6% of respondents reported no live oak, and 7.7% reported that 10% of their live oak cover was in these areas (Table 104). Conversely, only 35.2% of the respondents reported no mesquite, 15.9% reported 10% of the mesquite cover, and 10.2% reported 20% was in these areas (Table 105). Similarly, 80.3% of respondents stated that no mixed live oak and mesquite occurred in these areas (Table 106). By contrast, 33.8% of respondents reported no juniper in these areas, while 12.5% that stated that 50% of juniper cover and 10.0% responded that 10% of the juniper on their land occurred in these areas (Table 107). But most (74.4%) of respondents reported no mixed live oak

and juniper occurred in these areas, while 10.7% reported that 10% of the mixed cover occurred in these areas (Table 108).

When asked to estimate the amount of brush that occurred within 75 yards of streams and/or rivers on their land, 86.4% of respondents stated that no live oak occurred in these areas (Table 109), while mesquite was more common with only 52.9% of respondents reporting no mesquite and 8.2% reporting 10% of the mesquite occurred in these areas (Table 110). Of the respondents, 80.3% reported no mixed live oak and mesquite (Table 111). Juniper cover was more frequent as 66.7% of respondents reported no juniper in these areas, and 9.0% of respondents reported 5% of the juniper on their land occurred in these areas (Table 112). Finally, 83.8% of respondents stated that no mixed live oak and juniper occurred within these areas (Table 113).

For other areas of their land with less than 15% slope or more than 75 meters from streams and/or rivers, 69.7% of respondents reported no live oak cover occurred (Table 114), while 18.6% of respondents reported 100% of the mesquite cover, compared to 15.1% who stated that no mesquite occurred in these areas (Table 115). Mixed live oak and mesquite was also uncommon with 65.8% of respondents reporting none in the residual land (Table 116), compared with juniper cover which was reported by 30.8% of respondents as none in these areas, followed by 11.5% who reported as having 50% of the juniper on their property in these residual areas (Table 117). Finally, 66.7% of respondents reported no mixed live oak and juniper, while 9.3% reported 90% of this mixed cover occurred in this residual area of their property (Table 118).

Landowners were asked a series of questions regarding how they felt about the amount of certain brush covers on their property (Table 119). Using a 1 to 7 Likert scale, results showed that landowners felt that there was a high occurrence of mesquite (6.31) and juniper (5.92). On the other hand, they felt that the amount of live oak (2.50), mixed live oak and juniper (3.92) were low.

In terms of overall cover, responses provided a mean of 22.8% open cover (<10%), 33.96% moderate cover (10-30%), and 43.41% heavy cover (>30%) (Table 120).

Respondents, on average, indicated that they would include 58.97% of their moderate cover and 63.69% of their heavy cover in a brush management program (Table 121) while 29.3% of the respondents stated they would enroll all of their acres of moderate brush in a program and 32.5% of the respondents stated they would enroll all of the heavy brush in a program. Conversely, 11.2% stated they would not enroll any acres of moderate brush into this type of program, and 6.8% stated they would not enroll any acres of heavy brush.

In moderate areas, 71.0% of respondents stated that their willingness to enroll would not change if brush removal within 75 yards of riparian areas was restricted (Table 122), compared to 68.6% in heavy areas (Table 123). Similarly, 62.4% of respondents stated that their willingness would not change if the brush control program required 40% moderate and/or heavy brush after clearing (Table 124), compared with 60.4% of respondents for heavy cover (Table 125).

The majority of respondents also stated that their level of interest would not change for most other constraints and requirements, including: a 75 yard buffer (84.9%), protection of bottomland hardwoods (92.9%), selective brush management (89.9%) and replanting/reseeding (88.8%). However only 57.5% and 62.2% respectively stated that fencing and restricted flash grazing would not affect their interest. Finally, only 44.5% of landowners stated that their interest would not change if no grazing in riparian areas was permitted, and 27.3% reported that this would prevent their participation (Tables 126-132).

Survey participants were asked to indicate the importance of compensation for certain actions or restrictions (fencing, new water sources, grazing deferment, prescribed burns and reseeding/replanting of native plants) using a 1-7 scale (Table 133). Respondents indicated compensation to be most important for fencing (5.83) and least important for prescribed burning (5.02). However, the mean responses were in a narrow range that indicated compensation to be slightly important to important.

Similarly, landowners were asked about their levels of interests in various contract types (Table 134). Interest was highest for contracts tied to other state funded programs (4.90) and lowest for long term (50 year) conservation easements (2.85), but the mean responses for all contract types placed interest in the not interested to slightly above neutral interest range.

When asked if they had participated in any federal or state funded programs, 73.1% of respondents stated that they did not participate in any such programs (Table 135). Of those that responded that they had or are participating, 72.4% stated they currently participate in EQIP and 27.6% had participated in the past (Table 136), 38.5% stated that they had participated in CRP and 61.5% stated they currently participate (Table 137), and 66.7% had participated in another program while 33.3% are currently participating in such a program (Table 138).

In determining the minimum cost share for participating, 32.6% of the landowners indicated that they would require a minimum of 80%, while 27.4% indicated that at least 70% was desirable. Of those that responded to the question, 8.1% stated that they were not interested in participating in such a program (Table 139).

Demographic data is summarized in the tables that follow this report. Mean birth year was 1942, while most landowners had approximately 29 years of farming and/or ranching experience since age 18 (Table 140). Other statistics are reported in (Tables 141-148). The category of length of property ownership most frequently selected was more than one generation (50.7%), followed by 11 to 25 years and 3 to 10 years, both at 15.7%. Most landowners (88.0%) stated that they would own their property indefinitely. When asked if they currently live on their land, 67.9% of respondents stated that they did not. Of these, 53.3% stated that they live 11 to 50 miles away, and 48.4% reported living in a large city by, while 31.2% reported living in a rural area.

Levels of investments in fixed improvements amounted to 29.8% in the \$1000-\$9999 range, followed by \$10,000-\$24,999 for 22.9% of landowners. Landowners most frequently reported (47.4%) less than 10% of their household income is derived from the property, while the most frequently selected household income category was the \$100,001-\$500,000 range (28.1%), followed by the \$50,001-\$75,000 range (25.8%).

Conclusions and Implications

Upon reviewing the data, responses from both watershed areas were generally similar with some noteworthy differences. First, property acreage was, on average, considerably larger in the Twin Buttes area compared to the Edwards Aquifer area. In addition, primary activities in the Twin Buttes generally included more livestock and crop production combined with hunting, while Edwards Aquifer properties were primarily used for wildlife operations. As such, forage production was more important to landowners in the Twin Buttes, while riparian areas and other wildlife habitats were more important to landowners in the Edwards Aquifer.

Dominant land cover also differed between the 2 areas with more mesquite and less open grasslands present in the Twin Buttes and more open grasslands and juniper in the Edwards Aquifer. In addition, compensation requirements for certain restoration practices differed between the 2 areas. Compensation in the Edwards Aquifer was reported as more important for new water sources and less for grazing deferment, while compensation in the Twin Buttes was reported more important for fencing least important for prescribed burning.

Finally, while the majority of landowners in both areas tended to live away from the property, owners in the Edwards Aquifer tended to live more than 100 miles away, while owners in the Twin Buttes lived 11 to 50 miles away from their properties.

In conclusion, landowners in both watershed areas seemed to be willing to participate in a cost-share brush management program. The key differences rested upon the various constraints and/or requirements imposed by such a program.

References

Bach, J.P. and J.R. Conner. "Economic Analysis of Brush Control Practices for Increased Water Yield: the North Concho River Example." In: Ric Jensen (editor) Proceedings of the 25th Water for Texas Conference, pp. 209-217, Austin, December 2, 1998.

Bednarz, S. T., T. Dybala, R. S. Muttiah, W. Rosenthal, and W. A. Dugas. 2000. Brush/water yield feasibility studies. Chapter 1 *In*: Brush control for water yield, a final report to the Texas State Soil and Water Conservation Board. Texas A&M Univ. College Station, Tex.

Upper Colorado River Authority. 1998. North concho river watershed: brush control planning, assessment, & feasibility study.

Edwards Aquifer Recharge Zone Data

Table 1.

EA Acreage

EA Acreage		
N	Valid	129
	Missing	2
Mean		867.15
Median		225.00
Percentiles	25	100.00
	50	225.00
	75	950.00

Table 2.

Role at Property

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Make Most Management Decisions	109	83.2	83.8	83.8
	One of Key Decision Makers	8	6.1	6.2	90.0
	Spouse of Key Decision Maker	4	3.1	3.1	93.1
	Hired Manager	2	1.5	1.5	94.6
	Other	7	5.3	5.4	100.0
	Total	130	99.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	1	.8		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 3.**Property Organization**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Sole Proprietorship	81	61.8	63.8	63.8
	Family Partnership	30	22.9	23.6	87.4
	Family Corporation	2	1.5	1.6	89.0
	Non-family Corporation	2	1.5	1.6	90.6
	Other	12	9.2	9.4	100.0
	Total	127	96.9	100.0	
Missing	Multiple Responses Checked	1	.8		
	No Response	3	2.3		
	Total	4	3.1		
Total	131	100.0			

Table 4.**Primary Activity**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Livestock Production	24	18.3	20.0	20.0
	Wildlife Operation	26	19.8	21.7	41.7
	Mixed Crop and Livestock Production	7	5.3	5.8	47.5
	Farm/Ranch and Wildlife Operation	32	24.4	26.7	74.2
	Tourist Operation	3	2.3	2.5	76.7
	Residence/Weekend Hideaway	24	18.3	20.0	96.7
	Long Term Investment	4	3.1	3.3	100.0
	Total	120	91.6	100.0	
Missing	Multiple Responses Checked	11	8.4		
	Total	131	100.0		

Table 5.**Sources of Income**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Income from Crops	98	0	50	2.55	8.74
Income from Livestock	101	0	100	36.02	41.09
Income from Wildlife	98	0	100	5.18	17.88
Hunting Fees	98	0	100	26.89	33.96
Income from Other Recreation	97	0	100	7.02	22.25
Government Program Payments	97	0	22	.95	3.60
Mineral Sales and Leases	97	0	100	2.94	14.16
Other	97	0	100	17.74	35.97
Valid N (listwise)	97				

Table 6.**Grassland Importance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.5	1.7	1.7
	Neutral	3	2.3	2.5	4.1
	Slightly Important	12	9.2	9.9	14.0
	Important	21	16.0	17.4	31.4
	Very Important	83	63.4	68.6	100.0
	Total	121	92.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	9	6.9		
	Total	10	7.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 7.**Woodland/Brush Importance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	6	4.6	5.3	5.3
	Unimportant	7	5.3	6.1	11.4
	Slightly Unimportant	2	1.5	1.8	13.2
	Neutral	7	5.3	6.1	19.3
	Slightly Important	26	19.8	22.8	42.1
	Important	26	19.8	22.8	64.9
	Very Important	40	30.5	35.1	100.0
	Total	114	87.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	16	12.2		
	Total	17	13.0		
Total	131	100.0			

Table 8.**Surface Water Importance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	3	2.3	2.6	2.6
	Slightly Unimportant	1	.8	.9	3.4
	Neutral	4	3.1	3.4	6.9
	Slightly Important	6	4.6	5.2	12.1
	Important	6	4.6	5.2	17.2
	Very Important	96	73.3	82.8	100.0
	Total	116	88.5	100.0	
Missing	No Response	15	11.5		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 9.**Importance of Wildlife**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.5	1.7	1.7
	Neutral	1	.8	.8	2.5
	Slightly Important	5	3.8	4.2	6.7
	Important	19	14.5	15.8	22.5
	Very Important	93	71.0	77.5	100.0
	Total	120	91.6	100.0	
Missing	No Response	11	8.4		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 10.**Improve Forage Supply**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	14	10.7	12.1	12.1
	Unimportant	3	2.3	2.6	14.7
	Slightly Unimportant	2	1.5	1.7	16.4
	Neutral	13	9.9	11.2	27.6
	Slightly Important	8	6.1	6.9	34.5
	Important	21	16.0	18.1	52.6
	Very Important	55	42.0	47.4	100.0
	Total	116	88.5	100.0	
Missing	No Response	15	11.5		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 11.**Improve Wildlife Habitat**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.5	1.7	1.7
	Neutral	2	1.5	1.7	3.4
	Slightly Important	9	6.9	7.6	10.9
	Important	20	15.3	16.8	27.7
	Very Important	86	65.6	72.3	100.0
	Total	119	90.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	12	9.2		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 12.**Control Brush Invasion**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	3	2.3	2.6	2.6
	Unimportant	1	.8	.9	3.4
	Neutral	3	2.3	2.6	6.0
	Slightly Important	10	7.6	8.5	14.5
	Important	15	11.5	12.8	27.4
	Very Important	85	64.9	72.6	100.0
	Total	117	89.3	100.0	
Missing	No Response	14	10.7		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 13.**Protect/Improve Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.5	1.8	1.8
	Unimportant	1	.8	.9	2.7
	Neutral	13	9.9	11.5	14.2
	Slightly Important	9	6.9	8.0	22.1
	Important	18	13.7	15.9	38.1
	Very Important	70	53.4	61.9	100.0
	Total	113	86.3	100.0	
Missing	No Response	18	13.7		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 14.**Increase Streamflow**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	4	3.1	3.5	3.5
	Slightly Unimportant	1	.8	.9	4.3
	Neutral	11	8.4	9.6	13.9
	Slightly Important	7	5.3	6.1	20.0
	Important	10	7.6	8.7	28.7
	Very Important	82	62.6	71.3	100.0
	Total	115	87.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	16	12.2		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 15.

		Increase Water Yield			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.5	1.7	1.7
	Unimportant	1	.8	.8	2.5
	Neutral	7	5.3	5.8	8.3
	Slightly Important	5	3.8	4.2	12.5
	Important	18	13.7	15.0	27.5
	Very Important	87	66.4	72.5	100.0
	Total	120	91.6	100.0	
Missing	No Response	11	8.4		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 16.

		Improve Riparian Areas for Wildlife			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.5	1.7	1.7
	Unimportant	1	.8	.9	2.6
	Neutral	8	6.1	6.8	9.4
	Slightly Important	13	9.9	11.1	20.5
	Important	26	19.8	22.2	42.7
	Very Important	67	51.1	57.3	100.0
	Total	117	89.3	100.0	
Missing	No Response	14	10.7		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 17.**Protect Live Oak**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	3	2.3	2.5	2.5
	Unimportant	1	.8	.8	3.3
	Slightly Unimportant	1	.8	.8	4.2
	Neutral	4	3.1	3.3	7.5
	Slightly Important	16	12.2	13.3	20.8
	Important	21	16.0	17.5	38.3
	Very Important	74	56.5	61.7	100.0
	Total	120	91.6	100.0	
Missing	No Response	11	8.4		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 18.**Control Light Mesquite**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	14	10.7	12.3	12.3
	Unimportant	7	5.3	6.1	18.4
	Neutral	30	22.9	26.3	44.7
	Slightly Important	20	15.3	17.5	62.3
	Important	16	12.2	14.0	76.3
	Very Important	27	20.6	23.7	100.0
	Total	114	87.0	100.0	
Missing	No Response	17	13.0		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 19.**Control Light Juniper**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	4	3.1	3.3	3.3
	Unimportant	1	.8	.8	4.1
	Neutral	6	4.6	5.0	9.1
	Slightly Important	14	10.7	11.6	20.7
	Important	11	8.4	9.1	29.8
	Very Important	85	64.9	70.2	100.0
	Total	121	92.4	100.0	
Missing	No Response	10	7.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 20.**Less Brush May Reduce Hunting Value**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	24	18.3	20.3	20.3
	Unimportant	2	1.5	1.7	22.0
	Slightly Unimportant	3	2.3	2.5	24.6
	Neutral	31	23.7	26.3	50.8
	Slightly Important	16	12.2	13.6	64.4
	Important	15	11.5	12.7	77.1
	Very Important	27	20.6	22.9	100.0
Total		118	90.1	100.0	
Missing	No Response	13	9.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 21.**Water Conservation Practices**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	31	23.7	27.9	27.9
	Yes	80	61.1	72.1	100.0
	Total	111	84.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	20	15.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 22.**Ponds**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	56	42.7	44.8	44.8
	Use	69	52.7	55.2	100.0
	Total	125	95.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	5	3.8		
	Total	6	4.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 23.**Terraces**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	85	64.9	68.0	68.0
	Use	39	29.8	31.2	99.2
	14	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	125	95.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	5	3.8		
	Total	6	4.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 24.**Shaped Waterways (Drainages)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	79	60.3	63.2	63.2
	Use	46	35.1	36.8	100.0
	Total	125	95.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	5	3.8		
	Total	6	4.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 25.**Exclude Grazing from Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	105	80.2	84.0	84.0
	Use	20	15.3	16.0	100.0
	Total	125	95.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	5	3.8		
	Total	6	4.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 26.**Flash Graze Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	110	84.0	88.7	88.7
	Use	14	10.7	11.3	100.0
	Total	124	94.7	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	1.5		
	No Response	5	3.8		
	Total	7	5.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 27.**Brush Control**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	49	37.4	39.2	39.2
	Use	76	58.0	60.8	100.0
	Total	125	95.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	5	3.8		
	Total	6	4.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 28.**Reseeding/Replanting to Protect Drainage Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	72	55.0	57.6	57.6
	Use	53	40.5	42.4	100.0
	Total	125	95.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	5	3.8		
	Total	6	4.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 29.**Land Cover**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Open Grassland	120	0	90	23.50	18.77
Predominantly Live Oak	119	0	40	9.16	10.42
Predominantly Mesquite	118	0	50	1.22	6.12
Predominantly Juniper	118	0	90	29.23	26.87
Mixed Live Oak and Mesquite	117	0	30	.53	3.09
Mixed Live Oak and Juniper	119	0	95	26.75	27.59
Mixed Mesquite and Juniper	117	0	35	1.21	5.24
Other Brush Species	117	0	40	4.99	7.52
Other Land Cover	117	0	80	4.44	12.52
Valid N (listwise)	117				

Table 30.**Live Oak Greater than 15% Slope**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	24	18.3	36.4	36.4
	1	1	.8	1.5	37.9
	2	1	.8	1.5	39.4
	5	9	6.9	13.6	53.0
	10	5	3.8	7.6	60.6
	15	3	2.3	4.5	65.2
	20	9	6.9	13.6	78.8
	25	4	3.1	6.1	84.8
	35	1	.8	1.5	86.4
	40	2	1.5	3.0	89.4
	50	3	2.3	4.5	93.9
	60	1	.8	1.5	95.5
	70	1	.8	1.5	97.0
	80	1	.8	1.5	98.5
	100	1	.8	1.5	100.0
		Total	66	50.4	100.0
Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
	No Response	61	46.6		
	Total	65	49.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 31.**Mesquite Greater than 15% Slope**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	89	67.9	98.9	98.9
	15	1	.8	1.1	100.0
	Total	90	68.7	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3		
	No Response	38	29.0		
	Total	41	31.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 32.

Mixed Live Oak/Mesquite Greater than 15% Slope

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	58.0	95.0	95.0
	15	2	1.5	2.5	97.5
	20	1	.8	1.3	98.8
	33	1	.8	1.3	100.0
	Total	80	61.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3		
	No Response	48	36.6		
	Total	51	38.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 33.

Juniper Greater than 15% Slope

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	16	12.2	22.2	22.2
	5	1	.8	1.4	23.6
	10	5	3.8	6.9	30.6
	15	1	.8	1.4	31.9
	20	3	2.3	4.2	36.1
	25	1	.8	1.4	37.5
	30	3	2.3	4.2	41.7
	33	1	.8	1.4	43.1
	35	2	1.5	2.8	45.8
	40	6	4.6	8.3	54.2
	43	1	.8	1.4	55.6
	50	12	9.2	16.7	72.2
	60	4	3.1	5.6	77.8
	65	2	1.5	2.8	80.6
	70	2	1.5	2.8	83.3
	75	1	.8	1.4	84.7
	80	5	3.8	6.9	91.7
	85	1	.8	1.4	93.1
	90	2	1.5	2.8	95.8
	100	3	2.3	4.2	100.0
	Total	72	55.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
	No Response	55	42.0		
	Total	59	45.0		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 34.

Mixed Live Oak/Juniper Greater than 15% Slope

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	0	21	16.0	29.6	29.6	
	5	4	3.1	5.6	35.2	
	10	5	3.8	7.0	42.3	
	15	1	.8	1.4	43.7	
	20	8	6.1	11.3	54.9	
	25	3	2.3	4.2	59.2	
	30	6	4.6	8.5	67.6	
	33	1	.8	1.4	69.0	
	35	1	.8	1.4	70.4	
	40	2	1.5	2.8	73.2	
	43	1	.8	1.4	74.6	
	50	6	4.6	8.5	83.1	
	60	2	1.5	2.8	85.9	
	70	2	1.5	2.8	88.7	
	75	1	.8	1.4	90.1	
	80	2	1.5	2.8	93.0	
	85	1	.8	1.4	94.4	
	100	4	3.1	5.6	100.0	
		Total	71	54.2	100.0	
	Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
No Response		56	42.7			
Total		60	45.8			
Total		131	100.0			

Table 35.

Live Oak Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	23	17.6	31.9	31.9
	5	4	3.1	5.6	37.5
	10	11	8.4	15.3	52.8
	15	3	2.3	4.2	56.9
	20	7	5.3	9.7	66.7
	25	5	3.8	6.9	73.6
	30	4	3.1	5.6	79.2
	35	2	1.5	2.8	81.9
	40	3	2.3	4.2	86.1
	45	1	.8	1.4	87.5
	50	2	1.5	2.8	90.3
	55	1	.8	1.4	91.7
	75	2	1.5	2.8	94.4
	90	1	.8	1.4	95.8
	95	1	.8	1.4	97.2
	99	1	.8	1.4	98.6
	100	1	.8	1.4	100.0
	Total	72	55.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
	No Response	55	42.0		
	Total	59	45.0		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 36.

Mesquite Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	85	64.9	93.4	93.4
	5	1	.8	1.1	94.5
	20	3	2.3	3.3	97.8
	50	1	.8	1.1	98.9
	99	1	.8	1.1	100.0
		Total	91	69.5	100.0
Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3		
	No Response	37	28.2		
	Total	40	30.5		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 37.**Mixed Live Oak/Mesquite Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	58.0	95.0	95.0
	15	1	.8	1.3	96.3
	20	1	.8	1.3	97.5
	33	1	.8	1.3	98.8
	99	1	.8	1.3	100.0
	Total	80	61.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3		
	No Response	48	36.6		
	Total	51	38.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 38.**Juniper Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	24	18.3	34.8	34.8
	5	8	6.1	11.6	46.4
	10	8	6.1	11.6	58.0
	15	3	2.3	4.3	62.3
	20	9	6.9	13.0	75.4
	25	2	1.5	2.9	78.3
	30	5	3.8	7.2	85.5
	33	1	.8	1.4	87.0
	40	3	2.3	4.3	91.3
	43	1	.8	1.4	92.8
	50	3	2.3	4.3	97.1
	80	1	.8	1.4	98.6
	90	1	.8	1.4	100.0
	Total	69	52.7	100.0	
	Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1	
No Response		58	44.3		
Total		62	47.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 39.

Mixed Live Oak/Juniper Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	0	29	22.1	39.7	39.7	
	5	3	2.3	4.1	43.8	
	10	10	7.6	13.7	57.5	
	15	1	.8	1.4	58.9	
	20	7	5.3	9.6	68.5	
	25	5	3.8	6.8	75.3	
	30	3	2.3	4.1	79.5	
	33	1	.8	1.4	80.8	
	35	1	.8	1.4	82.2	
	40	4	3.1	5.5	87.7	
	43	1	.8	1.4	89.0	
	50	4	3.1	5.5	94.5	
	60	1	.8	1.4	95.9	
	70	1	.8	1.4	97.3	
	80	2	1.5	2.7	100.0	
	Total		73	55.7	100.0	
	Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
No Response		54	41.2			
Total		58	44.3			
Total		131	100.0			

Table 40.

Live Oak in Other Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	15	11.5	20.3	20.3
	4	1	.8	1.4	21.6
	5	1	.8	1.4	23.0
	10	6	4.6	8.1	31.1
	15	1	.8	1.4	32.4
	20	2	1.5	2.7	35.1
	23	1	.8	1.4	36.5
	25	2	1.5	2.7	39.2
	30	4	3.1	5.4	44.6
	35	2	1.5	2.7	47.3
	40	3	2.3	4.1	51.4
	45	2	1.5	2.7	54.1
	50	2	1.5	2.7	56.8
	55	1	.8	1.4	58.1
	60	5	3.8	6.8	64.9
	65	1	.8	1.4	66.2
	70	1	.8	1.4	67.6
	75	6	4.6	8.1	75.7
	80	6	4.6	8.1	83.8
	85	6	4.6	8.1	91.9
90	1	.8	1.4	93.2	
95	1	.8	1.4	94.6	
100	4	3.1	5.4	100.0	
	Total	74	56.5	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
	No Response	53	40.5		
	Total	57	43.5		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 41.**Mesquite in Other Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	81	61.8	89.0	89.0
	10	1	.8	1.1	90.1
	50	1	.8	1.1	91.2
	65	1	.8	1.1	92.3
	80	2	1.5	2.2	94.5
	95	1	.8	1.1	95.6
	100	4	3.1	4.4	100.0
	Total	91	69.5	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3		
	No Response	37	28.2		
	Total	40	30.5		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 42.**Mixed Live Oak/Mesquite in Other Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	74	56.5	93.7	93.7
	33	1	.8	1.3	94.9
	70	1	.8	1.3	96.2
	80	1	.8	1.3	97.5
	85	1	.8	1.3	98.7
	100	1	.8	1.3	100.0
	Total	79	60.3	100.0	
	Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3	
No Response		49	37.4		
Total		52	39.7		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 43.

Juniper in Other Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	14	10.7	18.9	18.9
	10	8	6.1	10.8	29.7
	14	1	.8	1.4	31.1
	15	7	5.3	9.5	40.5
	20	6	4.6	8.1	48.6
	25	3	2.3	4.1	52.7
	30	1	.8	1.4	54.1
	33	1	.8	1.4	55.4
	35	4	3.1	5.4	60.8
	40	5	3.8	6.8	67.6
	45	3	2.3	4.1	71.6
	50	7	5.3	9.5	81.1
	60	2	1.5	2.7	83.8
	75	2	1.5	2.7	86.5
	80	2	1.5	2.7	89.2
	85	1	.8	1.4	90.5
	90	2	1.5	2.7	93.2
	95	2	1.5	2.7	95.9
	100	3	2.3	4.1	100.0
		Total	74	56.5	100.0
Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
	No Response	53	40.5		
	Total	57	43.5		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 44.

Mixed Live Oak/Juniper in Other Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	17	13.0	23.6	23.6
	5	1	.8	1.4	25.0
	10	6	4.6	8.3	33.3
	14	1	.8	1.4	34.7
	15	1	.8	1.4	36.1
	20	2	1.5	2.8	38.9
	25	2	1.5	2.8	41.7
	30	4	3.1	5.6	47.2
	33	1	.8	1.4	48.6
	35	1	.8	1.4	50.0
	40	5	3.8	6.9	56.9
	45	2	1.5	2.8	59.7
	50	8	6.1	11.1	70.8
	55	1	.8	1.4	72.2
	60	2	1.5	2.8	75.0
	65	1	.8	1.4	76.4
	70	3	2.3	4.2	80.6
	75	1	.8	1.4	81.9
	80	4	3.1	5.6	87.5
	85	2	1.5	2.8	90.3
	90	3	2.3	4.2	94.4
	95	1	.8	1.4	95.8
	100	3	2.3	4.2	100.0
	Total	72	55.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	4	3.1		
	No Response	55	42.0		
	Total	59	45.0		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 45.**Amount of Brush Cover Present**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How Much Live Oak	114	1	7	3.30	1.32
How Much Mesquite	97	1	7	3.81	1.20
How Much Mixed Live Oak/MEsquite	84	1	6	3.75	.93
How Much Juniper	121	1	7	6.47	1.10
How Much Mixed Live Oak/Juniper	102	1	7	5.34	1.34
How Much Other Brush Species	109	2	20	4.88	1.90
Valid N (listwise)	74				

Table 46.**Percent of Land Cover**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Percentage of Open Cover	126	0	100	22.47	18.55
Percentage of Moderate Cover	126	0	100	31.77	21.63
Percentage of Heavy Cover	126	0	100	45.04	25.87
Valid N (listwise)	126				

Table 47.**Cover to Include**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How Much Moderate Cover to Include	110	0	100	49.15	37.94
How Much Heavy Cover to Include	114	0	100	52.73	36.95
Valid N (listwise)	103				

Table 48.**Willingness to Include Moderate Cover if Constrained Within 75 Yards**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	10	7.6	11.2	11.2
	Decrease	6	4.6	6.7	18.0
	No Change	73	55.7	82.0	100.0
	Total	89	67.9	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	23	17.6		
	No Response	19	14.5		
	Total	42	32.1		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 49.**Willingness to Include Heavy Cover if Constrained Within 75 Yards**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	9	6.9	10.2	10.2
	Decrease	9	6.9	10.2	20.5
	No Change	70	53.4	79.5	100.0
	Total	88	67.2	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	23	17.6		
	No Response	20	15.3		
	Total	43	32.8		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 50.**Willingness to Include Moderate Cover if 40% of Brush Left**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	11	8.4	11.6	11.6
	Decrease	16	12.2	16.8	28.4
	No Change	68	51.9	71.6	100.0
	Total	95	72.5	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	20	15.3		
	No Response	16	12.2		
	Total	36	27.5		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 51.**Willingness to Include Heavy Cover if 40% of Brush Left**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	13	9.9	14.1	14.1
	Decrease	14	10.7	15.2	29.3
	No Change	65	49.6	70.7	100.0
	Total	92	70.2	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	22	16.8		
	No Response	17	13.0		
	Total	39	29.8		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 52.**Affect of Interest with 75 Yard Buffer Zone**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.8	.9	.9
	Won't Affect	85	64.9	72.6	73.5
	Reduce Interest	22	16.8	18.8	92.3
	Prevent Participation	9	6.9	7.7	100.0
	Total	117	89.3	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	1.5		
	No Response	12	9.2		
	Total	14	10.7		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 53.**Affect of Interest with Protection of Bottomland Hardwoods**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.8	.8	.8
	Won't Affect	110	84.0	93.2	94.1
	Reduce Interest	3	2.3	2.5	96.6
	Prevent Participation	4	3.1	3.4	100.0
	Total	118	90.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	1.5		
	No Response	11	8.4		
	Total	13	9.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 54.**Affect of Interest with Selective Brush Management**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.8	.8	.8
	Won't Affect	104	79.4	86.0	86.8
	Reduce Interest	13	9.9	10.7	97.5
	Prevent Participation	3	2.3	2.5	100.0
	Total	121	92.4	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	1.5		
	No Response	8	6.1		
	Total	10	7.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 55.**Affect of Interest with Replanting/Reseeding Native Plants**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.8	.8	.8
	Won't Affect	115	87.8	95.8	96.7
	Reduce Interest	1	.8	.8	97.5
	Prevent Participation	3	2.3	2.5	100.0
	Total	120	91.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	1.5		
	No Response	9	6.9		
	Total	11	8.4		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 56.**Affect of Interest with Fencing to Control Cattle in Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.8	.8	.8
	Won't Affect	80	61.1	66.7	67.5
	Reduce Interest	24	18.3	20.0	87.5
	Prevent Participation	15	11.5	12.5	100.0
	Total	120	91.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	1.5		
	No Response	9	6.9		
	Total	11	8.4		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 57.**Affect of Interest with Restricted Flash Grazing**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.8	.8	.8
	Won't Affect	78	59.5	66.1	66.9
	Reduce Interest	26	19.8	22.0	89.0
	Prevent Participation	13	9.9	11.0	100.0
	Total	118	90.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3		
	No Response	10	7.6		
	Total	13	9.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 58.**Affect of Interest with No Livestock Grazing in Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.8	.8	.8
	Won't Affect	58	44.3	48.7	49.6
	Reduce Interest	34	26.0	28.6	78.2
	Prevent Participation	26	19.8	21.8	100.0
	Total	119	90.8	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	3	2.3		
	No Response	9	6.9		
	Total	12	9.2		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 59.**Compensation For Various Activities**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Compensation for Fencing	122	1	7	5.58	1.77
Compensation for New Water Sources	123	1	7	5.93	1.53
Compensation for Grazing Deferment	123	1	7	4.56	1.91
Compensation for Prescribed Burns	124	1	7	5.10	1.73
Compensation for Replanting/Reseeding of Native Plants	123	1	7	5.49	1.81
Valid N (listwise)	122				

Table 60.**Interest in Different Contract Types**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
EQUIP-type Contracts	92	1	7	3.97	1.78
Contracts that Transfer to New Owners	105	1	7	3.84	2.26
Contracts Tied to Other State Funded Programs	104	1	9	4.33	2.02
Contracts in Which Smaller Properties are Charged More	105	1	7	3.23	2.04
Contracts that Include Several Landowners	107	1	7	3.69	2.13
CRP-type Contracts	97	1	7	3.52	1.79
10 Year Conservation Easement	107	1	7	3.67	2.05
50 Year Conservation Easement	104	1	7	2.38	1.55
Other	25	1	7	3.52	1.96
Valid N (listwise)	20				

Table 61.**Participation in EQUIP or Similar Programs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	104	79.4	85.2	85.2
	Yes	18	13.7	14.8	100.0
	Total	122	93.1	100.0	
Missing	No Response	9	6.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 62.**EQUIP Participation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have Participated	2	1.5	16.7	16.7
	Currently Participated	9	6.9	75.0	91.7
	9	1	.8	8.3	100.0
	Total	12	9.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	119	90.8		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 63.**CRP Participation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have Participated	3	2.3	60.0	60.0
	Currently Participated	1	.8	20.0	80.0
	9	1	.8	20.0	100.0
	Total	5	3.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	126	96.2		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 64.**Other Participation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have Participated	2	1.5	50.0	50.0
	Currently Participated	1	.8	25.0	75.0
	9	1	.8	25.0	100.0
	Total	4	3.1	100.0	
Missing	No Response	127	96.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 65.

Minimum Level of Cost Share Required

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	50%	41	31.3	34.5	34.5
	60%	5	3.8	4.2	38.7
	70%	10	7.6	8.4	47.1
	80%	31	23.7	26.1	73.1
	90%	4	3.1	3.4	76.5
	100%	8	6.1	6.7	83.2
	Not Interested	20	15.3	16.8	100.0
	Total	119	90.8	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	2	1.5		
	No Response	10	7.6		
	Total	12	9.2		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 66.

Demographic Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Birth Year	122	1910	1973	1941.30	12.37
Years Farming/Ranching Experience Since Age 18	119	0	74	20.90	17.19
Valid N (listwise)	117				

Table 67.

Length of Property Ownership

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 3 Years	12	9.2	9.7	9.7
	3-10 Years	31	23.7	25.0	34.7
	11-25 Years	18	13.7	14.5	49.2
	More than 25 Years	21	16.0	16.9	66.1
	More than One Generation	41	31.3	33.1	99.2
	Manage But Don't Own	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	124	94.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	7	5.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 68.**Length of Future Ownership**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-3 Years	4	3.1	3.3	3.3
	3-10 Years	8	6.1	6.6	9.8
	Indefinitely	108	82.4	88.5	98.4
	Don't Own	2	1.5	1.6	100.0
	Total	122	93.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.8		
	No Response	8	6.1		
	Total	9	6.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 69.**Currently Live on Property**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	57	43.5	46.0	46.0
	No	67	51.1	54.0	100.0
	Total	124	94.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	7	5.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 70.**Distance from Ranch/Farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 10 Miles	8	6.1	11.8	11.8
	11-50 Miles	13	9.9	19.1	30.9
	51-100 Miles	12	9.2	17.6	48.5
	More than 100 Miles	35	26.7	51.5	100.0
	Total	68	51.9	100.0	
Missing	No Response	63	48.1		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 71.

		Type of Community			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Country	20	15.3	27.4	27.4
	Small Town	4	3.1	5.5	32.9
	Small City	9	6.9	12.3	45.2
	Medium-Sized City	4	3.1	5.5	50.7
	Large City	4	3.1	5.5	56.2
	Very Large City	32	24.4	43.8	100.0
	Total	73	55.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	58	44.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 72.

		Investments in Fixed Improvements			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under \$1000	10	7.6	8.2	8.2
	\$1000-9999	37	28.2	30.3	38.5
	\$10,000-24,999	29	22.1	23.8	62.3
	\$25,000-49,999	15	11.5	12.3	74.6
	\$50,000-99,999	14	10.7	11.5	86.1
	Over \$100,000	17	13.0	13.9	100.0
	Total	122	93.1	100.0	
Missing	99	9	6.9		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 73.

		Proportion of Household Income from Property			
		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under 10%	95	72.5	74.2	74.2
	11-25%	12	9.2	9.4	83.6
	26-50%	9	6.9	7.0	90.6
	51-75%	4	3.1	3.1	93.8
	Over 75%	8	6.1	6.3	100.0
	Total	128	97.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	3	2.3		
Total		131	100.0		

Table 74.**Household Income**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$25,000	11	8.4	9.1	9.1
	\$25,001-50,000	17	13.0	14.0	23.1
	\$50,001-75,000	25	19.1	20.7	43.8
	\$75,001-100,000	18	13.7	14.9	58.7
	\$100,001-500,000	39	29.8	32.2	90.9
	Greater Than \$500,000	10	7.6	8.3	99.2
	45	1	.8	.8	100.0
	Total	121	92.4	100.0	
Missing	No Response	10	7.6		
Total		131	100.0		

Twin Buttes Drainage Area Data

Table 75.

Twin Buttes Acreage

TB Acreage

N	Valid	141
	Missing	0
Mean		4516.56
Median		1600.00
Percentiles	25	600.00
	50	1600.00
	75	3900.00

Table 76.

Role at Property

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.7	.7	.7
	Make Most Management Decisions	107	75.9	78.1	78.8
	One of Key Decision Makers	18	12.8	13.1	92.0
	Spouse of Key Decision Maker	1	.7	.7	92.7
	Other	10	7.1	7.3	100.0
	Total	137	97.2	100.0	
Missing	Multiple Responses Checked	1	.7		
	No Response	3	2.1		
	Total	4	2.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 77.**Property Organization**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.7	.7	.7
	Sole Proprietorship	73	51.8	52.9	53.6
	Family Partnership	32	22.7	23.2	76.8
	Non-family Partnership	6	4.3	4.3	81.2
	Family Corporation	10	7.1	7.2	88.4
	Non-family Corporation	2	1.4	1.4	89.9
	Other	14	9.9	10.1	100.0
	Total	138	97.9	100.0	
Missing	Multiple Responses Checked	3	2.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 78.**Primary Activity**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Crop Production	4	2.8	2.9	2.9
	Livestock Production	43	30.5	31.6	34.6
	Wildlife Operation	8	5.7	5.9	40.4
	Mixed Crop and Livestock Production	14	9.9	10.3	50.7
	Farm/Ranch and Wildlife Operation	59	41.8	43.4	94.1
	Residence/Weekend Hideaway	7	5.0	5.1	99.3
	Long Term Investment	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	136	96.5	100.0	
Missing	Multiple Responses Checked	5	3.5		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 79.**Sources of Income**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Income from Crops	138	0	100	7.35
Income from Livestock	137	0	100	41.30
Income from Wildlife	138	0	100	2.43
Hunting Fees	137	0	100	20.23
Income from Other Recreation	138	0	50	.69
Government Program Payments	138	0	50	3.48
Mineral Sales and Leases	138	0	100	14.49
Other	137	0	100	8.74
Valid N (listwise)	137			

Table 80.**Grassland Importance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.4	1.6	1.6
	Neutral	2	1.4	1.6	3.1
	Slightly Important	6	4.3	4.7	7.9
	Important	7	5.0	5.5	13.4
	Very Important	110	78.0	86.6	100.0
	Total	127	90.1	100.0	
Missing	No Response	14	9.9		
	Total	141	100.0		

Table 81.**Woodland/Brush Importance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	9	6.4	7.4	7.4
	Unimportant	3	2.1	2.5	9.9
	Slightly Unimportant	6	4.3	5.0	14.9
	Neutral	11	7.8	9.1	24.0
	Slightly Important	41	29.1	33.9	57.9
	Important	19	13.5	15.7	73.6
	Very Important	32	22.7	26.4	100.0
	Total	121	85.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	20	14.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 82.**Surface Water Importance**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	1	.7	.9	.9
	Slightly Unimportant	4	2.8	3.4	4.3
	Neutral	14	9.9	12.0	16.2
	Slightly Important	16	11.3	13.7	29.9
	Important	11	7.8	9.4	39.3
	Very Important	71	50.4	60.7	100.0
	Total	117	83.0	100.0	
Missing	No Response	24	17.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 83.**Importance of Wildlife**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.4	1.5	1.5
	Slightly Unimportant	1	.7	.8	2.3
	Neutral	4	2.8	3.1	5.3
	Slightly Important	10	7.1	7.6	13.0
	Important	25	17.7	19.1	32.1
	Very Important	89	63.1	67.9	100.0
	Total	131	92.9	100.0	
Missing	No Response	10	7.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 84.**Improve Forage Supply**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	3	2.1	2.4	2.4
	Slightly Unimportant	1	.7	.8	3.2
	Neutral	5	3.5	4.0	7.3
	Slightly Important	8	5.7	6.5	13.7
	Important	16	11.3	12.9	26.6
	Very Important	91	64.5	73.4	100.0
	Total	124	87.9	100.0	
Missing	No Response	17	12.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 85.**Improve Wildlife Habitat**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	1	.7	.8	.8
	Slightly Unimportant	1	.7	.8	1.6
	Neutral	6	4.3	4.7	6.3
	Slightly Important	14	9.9	10.9	17.2
	Important	41	29.1	32.0	49.2
	Very Important	65	46.1	50.8	100.0
	Total	128	90.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	13	9.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 86.**Control Brush Invasion**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.4	1.6	1.6
	Unimportant	1	.7	.8	2.3
	Neutral	5	3.5	3.9	6.3
	Slightly Important	6	4.3	4.7	10.9
	Important	11	7.8	8.6	19.5
	Very Important	103	73.0	80.5	100.0
	Total	128	90.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	13	9.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 87.**Protect/Improve Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	3	2.1	2.5	2.5
	Unimportant	1	.7	.8	3.4
	Neutral	16	11.3	13.6	16.9
	Slightly Important	14	9.9	11.9	28.8
	Important	22	15.6	18.6	47.5
	Very Important	62	44.0	52.5	100.0
	Total	118	83.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	23	16.3		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 88.**Increase Streamflow**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	5	3.5	4.1	4.1
	Unimportant	1	.7	.8	5.0
	Slightly Unimportant	2	1.4	1.7	6.6
	Neutral	17	12.1	14.0	20.7
	Slightly Important	6	4.3	5.0	25.6
	Important	11	7.8	9.1	34.7
	Very Important	79	56.0	65.3	100.0
Total		121	85.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	20	14.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 89.**Increase Water Yield**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	3	2.1	2.4	2.4
	Unimportant	1	.7	.8	3.3
	Slightly Unimportant	2	1.4	1.6	4.9
	Neutral	12	8.5	9.8	14.6
	Slightly Important	13	9.2	10.6	25.2
	Important	14	9.9	11.4	36.6
	Very Important	78	55.3	63.4	100.0
	Total	123	87.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	18	12.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 90.**Improve Riparian Areas for Wildlife**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	3	2.1	2.5	2.5
	Unimportant	2	1.4	1.7	4.1
	Slightly Unimportant	2	1.4	1.7	5.8
	Neutral	13	9.2	10.7	16.5
	Slightly Important	18	12.8	14.9	31.4
	Important	30	21.3	24.8	56.2
	Very Important	53	37.6	43.8	100.0
	Total	121	85.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	20	14.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 91.**Protect Live Oak**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	6	4.3	5.3	5.3
	Neutral	18	12.8	15.8	21.1
	Slightly Important	10	7.1	8.8	29.8
	Important	15	10.6	13.2	43.0
	Very Important	65	46.1	57.0	100.0
	Total	114	80.9	100.0	
Missing	No Response	27	19.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 92.**Control Light Mesquite**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	7	5.0	5.5	5.5
	Neutral	7	5.0	5.5	10.9
	Slightly Important	10	7.1	7.8	18.8
	Important	23	16.3	18.0	36.7
	Very Important	81	57.4	63.3	100.0
	Total	128	90.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	13	9.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 93.**Control Light Juniper**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	6	4.3	5.0	5.0
	Unimportant	1	.7	.8	5.9
	Slightly Unimportant	1	.7	.8	6.7
	Neutral	11	7.8	9.2	16.0
	Slightly Important	12	8.5	10.1	26.1
	Important	19	13.5	16.0	42.0
	Very Important	69	48.9	58.0	100.0
	Total	119	84.4	100.0	
Missing	No Response	22	15.6		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 94.**Less Brush May Reduce Hunting Value**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Very Unimportant	2	1.4	1.7	1.7
	Unimportant	2	1.4	1.7	3.3
	Slightly Unimportant	9	6.4	7.5	10.8
	Neutral	29	20.6	24.2	35.0
	Slightly Important	29	20.6	24.2	59.2
	Important	22	15.6	18.3	77.5
	Very Important	27	19.1	22.5	100.0
	Total	120	85.1	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	20	14.2		
	Total	21	14.9		
Total	141	100.0			

Table 95.**Water Conservation Practices**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	38	27.0	29.0	29.0
	Yes	93	66.0	71.0	100.0
	Total	131	92.9	100.0	
Missing	No Response	10	7.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 96.**Ponds**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	43	30.5	46.7	46.7
	Use	49	34.8	53.3	100.0
	Total	92	65.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	49	34.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 97.**Terraces**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	59	41.8	63.4	63.4
	Use	34	24.1	36.6	100.0
	Total	93	66.0	100.0	
Missing	No Response	48	34.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 98.**Shaped Waterways (Drainages)**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Don't Use	52	36.9	56.5	56.5
	Use	40	28.4	43.5	100.0
	Total	92	65.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	49	34.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 99.**Exclude Grazing from Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.7	1.1	1.1
	Don't Use	75	53.2	81.5	82.6
	Use	16	11.3	17.4	100.0
	Total	92	65.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	49	34.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 100.**Flash Graze Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.7	1.1	1.1
	Don't Use	78	55.3	86.7	87.8
	Use	11	7.8	12.2	100.0
	Total	90	63.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	51	36.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 101.**Brush Control**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.7	1.1	1.1
	Don't Use	14	9.9	15.2	16.3
	Use	77	54.6	83.7	100.0
	Total	92	65.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	49	34.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 102.**Reseeding/Replanting to Protect Drainage Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	1	.7	1.1	1.1
	Don't Use	60	42.6	65.2	66.3
	Use	31	22.0	33.7	100.0
	Total	92	65.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	49	34.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 103.**Land Cover**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Open Grassland	127	0	90	18.50	20.45
Predominantly Live Oak	127	0	95	3.26	9.94
Predominantly Mesquite	128	0	100	27.95	30.08
Predominantly Juniper	127	0	75	14.17	21.08
Mixed Live Oak and Mesquite	127	0	40	2.32	6.28
Mixed Live Oak and Juniper	127	0	55	4.69	11.07
Mixed Mesquite and Juniper	127	0	100	20.61	28.17
Other Brush Species	127	0	50	4.57	10.43
Other Land Cover	127	0	63	4.34	11.02
Valid N (listwise)	127				

Table 104.**Live Oak Greater than 15% Slope**

	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid 0	67	47.5	73.6	73.6
1	1	.7	1.1	74.7
5	3	2.1	3.3	78.0
10	7	5.0	7.7	85.7
15	3	2.1	3.3	89.0
20	2	1.4	2.2	91.2
30	1	.7	1.1	92.3
40	1	.7	1.1	93.4
50	4	2.8	4.4	97.8
90	1	.7	1.1	98.9
99	1	.7	1.1	100.0
Total	91	64.5	100.0	
Missing No Response	50	35.5		
Total	141	100.0		

Table 105.

Mesquite Greater than 15% Slope

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	31	22.0	35.2	35.2
	1	1	.7	1.1	36.4
	2	2	1.4	2.3	38.6
	4	1	.7	1.1	39.8
	5	8	5.7	9.1	48.9
	10	14	9.9	15.9	64.8
	15	3	2.1	3.4	68.2
	20	9	6.4	10.2	78.4
	25	2	1.4	2.3	80.7
	30	3	2.1	3.4	84.1
	40	1	.7	1.1	85.2
	50	5	3.5	5.7	90.9
	75	2	1.4	2.3	93.2
	80	2	1.4	2.3	95.5
	100	4	2.8	4.5	100.0
	Total		88	62.4	100.0
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	52	36.9		
	Total	53	37.6		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 106.

Mixed Live Oak/Mesquite Greater than 15% Slope

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent	
Valid	0	61	43.3	80.3	80.3	
	1	1	.7	1.3	81.6	
	5	1	.7	1.3	82.9	
	8	1	.7	1.3	84.2	
	10	6	4.3	7.9	92.1	
	30	1	.7	1.3	93.4	
	38	1	.7	1.3	94.7	
	40	2	1.4	2.6	97.4	
	50	1	.7	1.3	98.7	
	75	1	.7	1.3	100.0	
	Total		76	53.9	100.0	
	Missing	No Response	65	46.1		
Total		141	100.0			

Table 107.

Juniper Greater than 15% Slope

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	27	19.1	33.8	33.8
	1	1	.7	1.3	35.0
	2	1	.7	1.3	36.3
	3	1	.7	1.3	37.5
	5	3	2.1	3.8	41.3
	10	8	5.7	10.0	51.3
	15	4	2.8	5.0	56.3
	20	3	2.1	3.8	60.0
	25	1	.7	1.3	61.3
	30	2	1.4	2.5	63.8
	33	2	1.4	2.5	66.3
	40	5	3.5	6.3	72.5
	45	1	.7	1.3	73.8
	50	10	7.1	12.5	86.3
	60	4	2.8	5.0	91.3
	70	1	.7	1.3	92.5
	75	1	.7	1.3	93.8
	80	2	1.4	2.5	96.3
	85	1	.7	1.3	97.5
	100	2	1.4	2.5	100.0
	Total	80	56.7	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	60	42.6		
	Total	61	43.3		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 108.**Mixed Live Oak/Juniper Greater than 15% Slope**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	56	39.7	74.7	74.7
	7	1	.7	1.3	76.0
	10	8	5.7	10.7	86.7
	15	1	.7	1.3	88.0
	20	2	1.4	2.7	90.7
	30	1	.7	1.3	92.0
	38	1	.7	1.3	93.3
	40	2	1.4	2.7	96.0
	45	1	.7	1.3	97.3
	50	2	1.4	2.7	100.0
	Total	75	53.2	100.0	
	Missing	Don't Know	1	.7	
No Response		65	46.1		
Total		66	46.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 109.**Live Oak Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	76	53.9	86.4	86.4
	10	2	1.4	2.3	88.6
	20	3	2.1	3.4	92.0
	30	2	1.4	2.3	94.3
	50	1	.7	1.1	95.5
	75	1	.7	1.1	96.6
	80	1	.7	1.1	97.7
	85	1	.7	1.1	98.9
	90	1	.7	1.1	100.0
	Total	88	62.4	100.0	
Missing	No Response	53	37.6		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 110.

Mesquite Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	45	31.9	52.9	52.9
	1	1	.7	1.2	54.1
	2	1	.7	1.2	55.3
	5	3	2.1	3.5	58.8
	8	1	.7	1.2	60.0
	10	7	5.0	8.2	68.2
	15	1	.7	1.2	69.4
	20	5	3.5	5.9	75.3
	25	5	3.5	5.9	81.2
	30	3	2.1	3.5	84.7
	33	1	.7	1.2	85.9
	40	3	2.1	3.5	89.4
	50	2	1.4	2.4	91.8
	60	3	2.1	3.5	95.3
	70	1	.7	1.2	96.5
	75	1	.7	1.2	97.6
	100	2	1.4	2.4	100.0
	Total	85	60.3	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	55	39.0		
	Total	56	39.7		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 111.

Mixed Live Oak/Mesquite Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	61	43.3	80.3	80.3
	4	1	.7	1.3	81.6
	5	1	.7	1.3	82.9
	10	1	.7	1.3	84.2
	12	1	.7	1.3	85.5
	15	1	.7	1.3	86.8
	20	1	.7	1.3	88.2
	30	3	2.1	3.9	92.1
	40	1	.7	1.3	93.4
	45	1	.7	1.3	94.7
	70	1	.7	1.3	96.1
	75	1	.7	1.3	97.4
	85	1	.7	1.3	98.7
	90	1	.7	1.3	100.0
	Total	76	53.9	100.0	
Missing	No Response	65	46.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 112.

Juniper Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	52	36.9	66.7	66.7
	1	1	.7	1.3	67.9
	5	7	5.0	9.0	76.9
	6	1	.7	1.3	78.2
	8	1	.7	1.3	79.5
	10	5	3.5	6.4	85.9
	15	3	2.1	3.8	89.7
	20	1	.7	1.3	91.0
	25	1	.7	1.3	92.3
	30	1	.7	1.3	93.6
	33	2	1.4	2.6	96.2
	35	1	.7	1.3	97.4
	40	1	.7	1.3	98.7
	60	1	.7	1.3	100.0
	Total	78	55.3	100.0	
	Missing	Don't Know	1	.7	
No Response		62	44.0		
Total		63	44.7		
Total	141	100.0			

Table 113.

Mixed Live Oak/Juniper Within 75 Yards of Streams/Rivers

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	62	44.0	83.8	83.8
	4	1	.7	1.4	85.1
	7	1	.7	1.4	86.5
	10	5	3.5	6.8	93.2
	20	2	1.4	2.7	95.9
	30	1	.7	1.4	97.3
	40	1	.7	1.4	98.6
	75	1	.7	1.4	100.0
	Total	74	52.5	100.0	
	Missing	Don't Know	1	.7	
No Response		66	46.8		
Total		67	47.5		
Total	141	100.0			

Table 114.

Live Oak in Other Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	62	44.0	69.7	69.7
	10	1	.7	1.1	70.8
	15	1	.7	1.1	71.9
	20	2	1.4	2.2	74.2
	40	3	2.1	3.4	77.5
	50	4	2.8	4.5	82.0
	70	2	1.4	2.2	84.3
	75	2	1.4	2.2	86.5
	80	1	.7	1.1	87.6
	85	1	.7	1.1	88.8
	90	6	4.3	6.7	95.5
	99	1	.7	1.1	96.6
	100	3	2.1	3.4	100.0
	Total	89	63.1	100.0	
Missing	No Response	52	36.9		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 115.

Mesquite in Other Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	13	9.2	15.1	15.1
	15	1	.7	1.2	16.3
	20	2	1.4	2.3	18.6
	25	1	.7	1.2	19.8
	30	2	1.4	2.3	22.1
	35	1	.7	1.2	23.3
	40	2	1.4	2.3	25.6
	47	1	.7	1.2	26.7
	50	8	5.7	9.3	36.0
	55	2	1.4	2.3	38.4
	60	3	2.1	3.5	41.9
	65	1	.7	1.2	43.0
	70	4	2.8	4.7	47.7
	75	3	2.1	3.5	51.2
	80	9	6.4	10.5	61.6
	85	2	1.4	2.3	64.0
	90	11	7.8	12.8	76.7
	96	1	.7	1.2	77.9
	98	3	2.1	3.5	81.4
	100	16	11.3	18.6	100.0
	Total	86	61.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	54	38.3		
	Total	55	39.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 116.

Mixed Live Oak/Mesquite in Other Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	50	35.5	65.8	65.8
	10	1	.7	1.3	67.1
	15	1	.7	1.3	68.4
	20	1	.7	1.3	69.7
	25	2	1.4	2.6	72.4
	30	1	.7	1.3	73.7
	40	1	.7	1.3	75.0
	45	1	.7	1.3	76.3
	50	1	.7	1.3	77.6
	60	2	1.4	2.6	80.3
	62	1	.7	1.3	81.6
	70	2	1.4	2.6	84.2
	80	1	.7	1.3	85.5
	85	1	.7	1.3	86.8
	90	5	3.5	6.6	93.4
	95	1	.7	1.3	94.7
	100	4	2.8	5.3	100.0
	Total	76	53.9	100.0	
Missing	No Response	65	46.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 117.

Juniper in Other Areas

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	24	17.0	30.8	30.8
	10	1	.7	1.3	32.1
	14	1	.7	1.3	33.3
	15	2	1.4	2.6	35.9
	20	2	1.4	2.6	38.5
	25	1	.7	1.3	39.7
	30	1	.7	1.3	41.0
	33	1	.7	1.3	42.3
	34	1	.7	1.3	43.6
	40	6	4.3	7.7	51.3
	45	1	.7	1.3	52.6
	50	9	6.4	11.5	64.1
	55	1	.7	1.3	65.4
	60	1	.7	1.3	66.7
	70	3	2.1	3.8	70.5
	75	5	3.5	6.4	76.9
	80	4	2.8	5.1	82.1
	85	3	2.1	3.8	85.9
	90	5	3.5	6.4	92.3
	92	1	.7	1.3	93.6
96	1	.7	1.3	94.9	
98	1	.7	1.3	96.2	
99	1	.7	1.3	97.4	
100	2	1.4	2.6	100.0	
	Total	78	55.3	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	62	44.0		
	Total	63	44.7		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 118.**Mixed Live Oak/Juniper in Other Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	0	50	35.5	66.7	66.7
	10	1	.7	1.3	68.0
	20	2	1.4	2.7	70.7
	30	1	.7	1.3	72.0
	45	1	.7	1.3	73.3
	50	2	1.4	2.7	76.0
	60	1	.7	1.3	77.3
	62	1	.7	1.3	78.7
	70	1	.7	1.3	80.0
	80	3	2.1	4.0	84.0
	86	2	1.4	2.7	86.7
	90	7	5.0	9.3	96.0
	100	3	2.1	4.0	100.0
	Total	75	53.2	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	65	46.1		
	Total	66	46.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 119.**Amount of Brush Cover Present**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
How Much Live Oak	107	1	7	2.50	1.41
How Much Mesquite	129	1	7	6.31	1.24
How Much Mixed Live Oak/Mesquite	79	1	7	3.71	1.52
How Much Juniper	115	1	7	5.92	1.61
How Much Mixed Live Oak/Juniper	78	1	7	3.92	1.72
How Much Other Brush Species	95	1	7	4.65	1.66
Valid N (listwise)	64				

Table 120.**Percent of Land Cover**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Percentage of Open Cover	135	0	100	22.98
Percentage of Moderate Cover	135	0	100	33.96
Percentage of Heavy Cover	136	0	100	43.41
Valid N (listwise)	135			

Table 121.**Cover to Include**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
How Much Moderate Cover to Include	116	0	100	58.97
How Much Heavy Cover to Include	117	0	100	63.69
Valid N (listwise)	102			

Table 122.**Willingness to Include Moderate Cover if Constrained Within 75 Yards**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	15	10.6	16.1	16.1
	Decrease	12	8.5	12.9	29.0
	No Change	66	46.8	71.0	100.0
	Total	93	66.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	25	17.7		
	No Response	23	16.3		
	Total	48	34.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 123.**Willingness to Include Heavy Cover if Constrained Within 75 Yards**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	16	11.3	18.6	18.6
	Decrease	11	7.8	12.8	31.4
	No Change	59	41.8	68.6	100.0
	Total	86	61.0	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	28	19.9		
	No Response	27	19.1		
	Total	55	39.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 124.**Willingness to Include Moderate Cover if 40% of Brush Left**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	14	9.9	13.9	13.9
	Decrease	23	16.3	22.8	36.6
	No Change	63	44.7	62.4	99.0
	999	1	.7	1.0	100.0
	Total	101	71.6	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	26	18.4		
	No Response	14	9.9		
	Total	40	28.4		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 125.**Willingness to Include Heavy Cover if 40% of Brush Left**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Increase	15	10.6	16.5	16.5
	Decrease	21	14.9	23.1	39.6
	No Change	55	39.0	60.4	100.0
	Total	91	64.5	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	26	18.4		
	No Response	24	17.0		
	Total	50	35.5		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 126.**Affect of Interest with 75 Yard Buffer Zone**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Won't Affect	107	75.9	84.9	84.9
	Reduce Interest	16	11.3	12.7	97.6
	Prevent Participation	3	2.1	2.4	100.0
	Total	126	89.4	100.0	
Missing	No Response	15	10.6		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 127.**Affect of Interest with Protection of Bottomland Hardwoods**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Won't Affect	117	83.0	92.9	92.9
	Reduce Interest	7	5.0	5.6	98.4
	Prevent Participation	2	1.4	1.6	100.0
	Total	126	89.4	100.0	
Missing	No Response	15	10.6		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 128.**Affect of Interest with Selective Brush Management**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Won't Affect	116	82.3	89.9	89.9
	Reduce Interest	9	6.4	7.0	96.9
	Prevent Participation	4	2.8	3.1	100.0
	Total	129	91.5	100.0	
Missing	No Response	12	8.5		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 129.**Affect of Interest with Replanting/Reseeding Native Plants**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Won't Affect	111	78.7	88.8	88.8
	Reduce Interest	7	5.0	5.6	94.4
	Prevent Participation	7	5.0	5.6	100.0
	Total	125	88.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	16	11.3		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 130.**Affect of Interest with Fencing to Control Cattle in Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Won't Affect	73	51.8	57.5	57.5
	Reduce Interest	30	21.3	23.6	81.1
	Prevent Participation	24	17.0	18.9	100.0
	Total	127	90.1	100.0	
Missing	No Response	14	9.9		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 131.**Affect of Interest with Restricted Flash Grazing**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Won't Affect	79	56.0	62.2	62.2
	Reduce Interest	33	23.4	26.0	88.2
	Prevent Participation	15	10.6	11.8	100.0
	Total	127	90.1	100.0	
Missing	No Response	14	9.9		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 132.**Affect of Interest with No Livestock Grazing in Riparian Areas**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Won't Affect	57	40.4	44.5	44.5
	Reduce Interest	36	25.5	28.1	72.7
	Prevent Participation	35	24.8	27.3	100.0
	Total	128	90.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	13	9.2		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 133.**Compensation for Various Activities**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean
Compensation for Fencing	129	1	7	5.83
Compensation for New Water Sources	129	1	7	5.81
Compensation for Grazing Deferment	128	1	7	5.22
Compensation for Prescribed Burns	130	1	7	5.02
Compensation for Replanting/Reseeding of Native Plants	128	1	7	5.56
Valid N (listwise)	125			

Table 134.**Interest in Different Contract Types**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
EQUIP-type Contracts	117	1	7	4.54	1.95
Contracts that Transfer to New Owners	125	1	7	4.34	2.08
Contracts Tied to Other State Funded Programs	124	1	7	4.90	1.92
Contracts in Which Smaller Properties are Charged More	124	1	7	3.40	2.02
Contracts that Include Several Landowners	124	1	7	3.69	2.13
CRP-type Contracts	118	0	7	4.02	1.99
10 Year Conservation Easement	124	0	7	3.98	2.22
50 Year Conservation Easement	119	0	7	2.85	2.14
Other	26	1	7	3.88	2.23
Valid N (listwise)	26				

Table 135.**Participation in EQUIP or Similar Programs**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	No	95	67.4	73.1	73.1
	Yes	35	24.8	26.9	100.0
	Total	130	92.2	100.0	
Missing	Don't Know	1	.7		
	No Response	10	7.1		
	Total	11	7.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 136.**EQUIP Participation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have Participated	8	5.7	27.6	27.6
	Currently Participated	21	14.9	72.4	100.0
	Total	29	20.6	100.0	
Missing	No Response	112	79.4		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 137.**CRP Participation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have Participated	5	3.5	38.5	38.5
	Currently Participated	8	5.7	61.5	100.0
	Total	13	9.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	128	90.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 138.**Other Participation**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Have Participated	4	2.8	66.7	66.7
	Currently Participated	2	1.4	33.3	100.0
	Total	6	4.3	100.0	
Missing	No Response	135	95.7		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 139.**Minimum Level of Cost Share Required**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	50%	25	17.7	18.5	18.5
	60%	12	8.5	8.9	27.4
	70%	37	26.2	27.4	54.8
	80%	44	31.2	32.6	87.4
	90%	5	3.5	3.7	91.1
	100%	1	.7	.7	91.9
	Not Interested	11	7.8	8.1	100.0
	Total	135	95.7	100.0	
Missing	No Response	6	4.3		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 140.**Demographic Statistics**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Birth Year	132	1910	1975	1941.97	13.43
Years Farming/Ranching Experience Since Age 18	125	0	74	29.09	18.96
Valid N (listwise)	125				

Table 141.**Length of Property Ownership**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 3 Years	4	2.8	3.0	3.0
	3-10 Years	19	13.5	14.2	17.2
	11-25 Years	21	14.9	15.7	32.8
	More than 25 Years	21	14.9	15.7	48.5
	More than One Generation	68	48.2	50.7	99.3
	Manage But Don't Own	1	.7	.7	100.0
	Total	134	95.0	100.0	
Missing	Multiple Responses Checked	1	.7		
	No Response	6	4.3		
	Total	7	5.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 142.**Length of Future Ownership**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	1-3 Years	1	.7	.8	.8
	3-10 Years	12	8.5	9.0	9.8
	Indefinitely	117	83.0	88.0	97.7
	Don't Own	3	2.1	2.3	100.0
	Total	133	94.3	100.0	
Missing	No Response	8	5.7		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 143.**Currently Live on Property**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Yes	43	30.5	32.1	32.1
	No	91	64.5	67.9	100.0
	Total	134	95.0	100.0	
Missing	No Response	7	5.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 144.**Distance from Ranch/Farm**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than 10 Miles	17	12.1	18.5	18.5
	11-50 Miles	49	34.8	53.3	71.7
	51-100 Miles	11	7.8	12.0	83.7
	More than 100 Miles	15	10.6	16.3	100.0
	Total	92	65.2	100.0	
Missing	No Response	49	34.8		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 145.**Type of Community**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Country	29	20.6	31.2	31.2
	Small Town	8	5.7	8.6	39.8
	Small City	2	1.4	2.2	41.9
	Medium-Sized City	1	.7	1.1	43.0
	Large City	45	31.9	48.4	91.4
	Very Large City	8	5.7	8.6	100.0
	Total	93	66.0	100.0	
Missing	No Response	48	34.0		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 146.**Investments in Fixed Improvements**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under \$1000	11	7.8	8.4	8.4
	\$1000-9999	39	27.7	29.8	38.2
	\$10,000-24,999	30	21.3	22.9	61.1
	\$25,000-49,999	24	17.0	18.3	79.4
	\$50,000-99,999	14	9.9	10.7	90.1
	Over \$100,000	13	9.2	9.9	100.0
	Total	131	92.9	100.0	
Missing	99	10	7.1		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 147.**Proportion of Household Income from Property**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Under 10%	63	44.7	47.4	47.4
	11-25%	18	12.8	13.5	60.9
	26-50%	16	11.3	12.0	72.9
	51-75%	19	13.5	14.3	87.2
	Over 75%	17	12.1	12.8	100.0
	Total	133	94.3	100.0	
Missing	No Response	8	5.7		
Total		141	100.0		

Table 148.**Household Income**

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Less than \$25,000	7	5.0	5.5	5.5
	\$25,001-50,000	20	14.2	15.6	21.1
	\$50,001-75,000	33	23.4	25.8	46.9
	\$75,001-100,000	21	14.9	16.4	63.3
	\$100,001-500,000	36	25.5	28.1	91.4
	Greater Than \$500,000	11	7.8	8.6	100.0
	Total	128	90.8	100.0	
Missing	No Response	13	9.2		
Total		141	100.0		