

**From:** [Brad Keitt](#)  
**To:** [Gerry\\_McChesney@fws.gov](mailto:Gerry_McChesney@fws.gov)  
**Cc:** [Dan Grout](#)  
**Subject:** alternatives  
**Date:** 06/02/2011 05:10 PM

---

Gerry,

Now that we have a coop agreement agreed upon and starting through the process, we should shift focus to the alternatives workshop.

I know you are about to depart for the field, or may have already departed? However, we do need to set the date and the process for the alternatives. July 29 was assessed to be a good date.

In regards to the process: I have asked our staff and they are still looking into alternatives. What I can say is that from my perspective the formal processes out there are focused on helping assess a broader range of options. By this I mean the CBA process, and other formal processes, are likely a good fit if we were trying to assess how we wanted to restore the Farallones and were considering things like mouse eradication, habitat restoration, habitat creation etc. Since we already have a narrow focus of the alternatives- i.e. the eradication of house mice from the Farallones – we are working with a more restricted range of alternatives to review.

My recommendation at this point is that we proceed with a partner meeting that involves your office, PRBO, IC and the other entities that you have invited to participate. I do not recommend public involvement in this alternatives development process- my take is that has been covered by having the extensive public scoping already undertaken. I think that it will be important to have a facilitator at that meeting and someone to record the decision process- a note taker. These would preferably be FWS employees, but could also be outside contracted help. The process I recommend is a review of the current options that have been identified in the scoping process, and using a template to rank the various attributes of the alternatives. This is the kind of alternative development process we have used in the past. The key is that all of the parties are present, get to participate and see the process, and that it is faithfully recorded so others can review and understand it.

To make this workshop effective it is going to need some prep work- we need to have the scoping comments compiled. We will need some partner meetings to agree upon the issues that have been identified to bring forward for consideration. Among other things.

If we come up with any other ideas for structured alternatives processes I will let you know. But for now, I think a custom process that focuses on the limited range of options out there (limited by the goal of the project being eradication of mice from the Farallones) will be most effective.

Let me know what we can do to help get this process moving ahead.

Thanks

Bradford S. Keitt  
Director of Conservation  
Island Conservation  
100 Shaffer Road LML  
University of California  
Santa Cruz, CA 95060  
831.359.4787 ext. 107 office  
831.459.1476 fax  
831.420.7115 cell