

From: [Brad Keitt](#)
To: [Gerry McChesney \(Gerry_McChesney@fws.gov\)](mailto:Gerry_McChesney@fws.gov)
Cc: [Dan Grout](#); [Richard Griffiths](#)
Subject: RE: mouse project budget
Date: 07/25/2012 05:11 PM
Importance: High

Gerry,

Thanks for taking on the thankless task of trying to provide information to NPFC. I was under the impression we had already sent the information to NPFC to consider additional funding. Is this in response to a request by them for additional information?

When we revised the budget we were being very cautious about keeping cost estimates low to fit as best as possible the available funding. If I recall correctly, toxicological monitoring was taken out since it is not necessarily a required aspect of an eradication project. That said, it often gets added on by USDA or EPA as a contingency and so there is a decent chance that would be the case in the Farallones. If you think we can afford it I would add \$25,000 in there for toxicology monitoring.

I also agree that the \$100,000 estimate for mitigation is low. Seeing as how we expect a trial of hazing this year to be close to \$100,000 I would guess that that would be a minimum amount for implementing a hazing trial. \$125,000 would be even safer. But it is hard to budget it before the trial and before the partners, led by USFWS, makes a decision on what mitigation will look like. For raptor mitigation- I think \$50,000 is reasonable, assuming FWS is letting a contract and managing this part of the project. But if IC does that we would need to manage the contract etc., putting it closer to \$70,000.

I cannot think of any other specific project aspect that is not currently included in the project budget. I can report on USFWS recent experience on Wake, there ended up being a lot of unexpected costs associated with the implementation that were not included in their own internal budgeting process. It always seems like more people want to be on island, observe or participate than planned and that means more trips to and from the island, more this and more that. I would recommend USFWS build some contingency into your budget to handle additional requests.

Lastly, I can say that post project costs in the current budget are low. Again, when we re-budgeted, we were working to keep as close as possible to available funds. This meant scrimping on the back end. If this project is implemented, I guarantee there will be interest in publishing the results, making presentations at PSG and maybe the CA island symposium. The current post implementation budget has none of this in there. And what is there is pretty minimal for post project monitoring of success. I think we were hoping that there would be ways to leverage existing staff on island to accomplish some of this. But this is a good place to identify additional sources of funding for PRBO- since they may do some of this and are usually underfunded for what they do. So, to wrap up- I think it would be good to add another \$20,000 in post project monitoring of project success and up to \$50,000 for IC, FWS and PRBO staff to publish and present findings after the project.

I am around tomorrow if you want to talk this through. I think it is fair to say there is always additional, worthy work related to an eradication and it would be really valuable to have a little extra to cover implementation contingencies, and then if all goes well with implementation, to use for post project reporting and information sharing.

It would be good to catch up as we still do not have a contract for the 2012 costs and we need to get that rolling ASAP.

Brad

From: Gerry_McChesney@fws.gov [mailto:Gerry_McChesney@fws.gov]
Sent: Tuesday, July 24, 2012 9:32 AM
To: Brad Keitt; Dan Grout
Subject: mouse project budget
Importance: High

Brad and Dan,

I'm having to go back through our long-term project budget for the NPFC, including putting it into the same format as the original budget back in 2006 (attached). One thing I noticed from the old version was the inclusion of toxicological monitoring, which I don't see in the last budget you provided. Can you tell me if toxicological monitoring is included somewhere in your last budget estimate for the project (see attached)? This, of course, assumes certain methods would be used, but for budgeting purposes, we need to. Is there anything else not included in the last budget you provided that should be? I've already included another \$100,000 for non-target bird mitigation (including raptor capture and hold, hazing), but I'm not even sure at this point that it's enough. Any suggestions you have on that would be appreciated. I need to get this back to them ASAP, by the end of the week.

Thanks for any help you can provide.

Gerry

(See attached file: IC budget estimate_Luckenbach_2013-2015.xlsx)(See attached file: Farallon mouse eradication budget minus video.xls)

Gerry McChesney
Manager, Farallon National Wildlife Refuge and
Common Murre Restoration Project
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex
1 Marshlands Road
Fremont, CA 94555
Phone: 510-792-0222, ext. 222, cell: 510-435-9151
Fax: 510-745-9285
Email: Gerry_McChesney@fws.gov
<http://www.fws.gov/sfbayrefuges/murre/murrehome.htm>
<http://www.fws.gov/sfbayrefuges/Farallon/>
