

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES (SSO)
NATIONAL ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT SERVICES for
SOUTH FARALLON ISLANDS HOUSE MOUSE ERADICATION
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STATEMENT

1. GENERAL:

1.1 Introduction. Under this task order, the Contractor shall assist the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) in the preparation of a Final Environmental Impact Statement (EIS) and related environmental compliance documents for the proposed South Farallon Islands House Mouse Eradication. The Draft EIS was completed in 2013.

1.2. Background.

1.2.1. Site description. The South Farallon Islands are located about 27 miles west of San Francisco, California. The islands encompass 120 acres and are part of the Farallon National Wildlife Refuge (Farallon NWR), managed by the Service, San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex (Complex). The Farallon NWR headquarters is located in Fremont, California.

The Farallon Islands host a unique ecosystem of the Northeast Pacific Ocean. The largest islands of the group, the South Farallon Islands, include two main islands (Southeast Farallon and West End Islands) and several smaller islets. These islands host the largest seabird breeding colony in the contiguous United States, with nearly 300,000 birds of 13 species. Three species have their largest colonies in the world here: ashy storm-petrel (*Oceanodroma homochroa*), Brandt's cormorant (*Phalacrocorax penicillatus*) and western gull (*Larus occidentalis*). Five species of marine mammal also occur and breed there regularly. The islands host the endemic Farallon camel cricket (*Farallonophilus cavernicolus*), an endemic subspecies of the arboreal salamander (*Aneides lugubris farallonensis*), and many other species of insects and other invertebrates. The native plant community is unique and is dominated by the maritime goldfield (*Lasthenia maritima*), an annual composite that is endemic to California and Oregon seabird nesting islands.

House mice (*Mus musculus*) are native to Eurasia and were introduced to the South Farallon Islands, probably in the 19th century. The mice are highly invasive, and like thousands of islands worldwide, the South Farallones have experienced considerable ecosystem degradation as a result. On the Farallones, house mice experience strong population cycles: numbers peak in the fall, decline through winter, and are low in spring and summer. In the fall, peak mouse numbers attract migratory burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*), which then attempt to overwinter on the islands on a diet of house mice. When the mouse population crashes in winter, owls switch to preying primarily on ashy storm-petrels (*Oceanodroma homochroa*), adversely impacting this rare species' population. The invasive mice feed on a variety of items including native insects and other invertebrates, as well as plants and plant seeds, impacting their populations and disrupting the native Farallon ecosystem. Mice feed on the extremely rare and endemic Farallon camel cricket, found nowhere else. The mice likely suppress native plant populations and spread the seeds of invasive plants. Also, mice likely compete for food with the endemic Farallon arboreal salamander and may even feed on salamander eggs or young.

1.2.2. Description of NEPA process to date. To address impacts from invasive house mice on the Farallon ecosystem, the Service has proposed eradicating the mice. Successful eradications of invasive mice and rats have been conducted on over 500 islands worldwide. The Service, along with project partners Island Conservation and Point Blue Conservation Science, began work on an Environmental Assessment (EA) to develop and analyze alternatives for proposed house mouse eradication from the South Farallon Islands in 2006. After an initial draft was completed, a decision was made to switch from an EA to an EIS based on potential significant impacts to the human environment, including potential public controversy regarding the project. On April 13, 2011, the Service published a Notice of Intent (NOI) to prepare an EIS to analyze and develop alternatives to eradicate house mice from the South Farallon Islands. On May 12, 2011, a public scoping meeting was held to describe the project and take public comments.

Starting with the NOI, the mouse eradication project has been controversial with certain public groups. Shortly after the NOI public meeting, Marin County-based wildlife rehabilitation facility *Wildcare* circulated a petition denouncing the project because of the potential use of rodenticides in the eradication. Rodenticides, in particular the anti-coagulant rodenticides brodifacoum and diphacinone, have been the primary chemical tools used in previous island eradications of invasive rats and mice worldwide, and the potential use of brodifacoum was stated in the NOI. The negative public sentiment on the use of rodenticides stems mainly from their effects on non-target wildlife that are exposed to the rodenticide by either consuming the rodent bait directly (direct exposure) or by consuming prey items, including rodents, that have eaten the bait (secondary exposure). Exposed animals can then become sickened and die. Because of widespread household and agricultural use of rodenticides to control rodents, exposure and mortality of non-target wildlife is widespread.

Since the project's inception, the Service had been working with the non-profit organizations Island Conservation (formerly Island Conservation and Ecology Group) and Point Blue Conservation Science (Point Blue; formerly PRBO Conservation Science) to develop the NEPA documents for the proposed house mouse eradication project. Island Conservation is regarded as the leading expert organization in the United States in eradication of invasive rodents and certain other wildlife species from islands, and has conducted island rodent eradications both in the U.S. and abroad. Point Blue has operated a research field station on the South Farallon Islands since 1967, and has continuously held cooperative agreements with the Service for wildlife monitoring and refuge stewardship of the Farallon NWR since 1969. Their expertise on the Farallon ecosystem is unparalleled.

In August 2011, the Service entered into a Cooperative Agreement with Island Conservation to assist the Service with developing the mouse eradication EIS and provided funds for the task. The Service, Island Conservation, and Point Blue worked as a partnership on the draft EIS, including developing alternatives, conducting needed research to inform the EIS, and writing the DEIS, with Island Conservation performing the bulk of the writing and advising the Service on alternatives.

On August 16, 2013, the Service's Farallon NWR published a draft Environmental Impact Statement titled *South Farallon Islands Invasive House Mouse Eradication Project: Draft Environmental Impact Statement* (DEIS). A slightly revised version was released on October 25,

2013. In the DEIS, the Service considered three alternatives to address the problem of invasive mice on the South Farallones, with no preferred alternative identified:

- A. *Alternative A: No Action, which would allow house mice to remain on the South Farallon Islands to continue to negatively impact storm-petrels and other native and endemic species of the islands;*
- B. *Alternative B: Eradicate invasive house mice from the South Farallon Islands by aerial broadcast of rodent bait containing Brodifacoum-25D Conservation as the primary method of bait delivery; and*
- C. *Alternative C: Eradicate invasive house mice from the South Farallon Islands by aerial broadcast of rodent bait containing Diphacinone-50 Conservation as the primary method of bait delivery.*

The DEIS outlined the proposed methods for house mouse management for each action alternative and analyzed the potential impacts to each of the three alternatives on the affected environment including fish, wildlife, plants, soil, water, wilderness, recreation, commercial enterprise, and others. The public comment period ended December 9, 2013. Over 550 correspondences were received, including 212 People for the Ethical Treatment of Animals call to action letters (duplicated) and two petitions denouncing the project because of proposed use of rodenticides: one from *Wildcare*, and another from *Change.org* that was initiated by a private citizen. Following the comment period, a preliminary assessment of comments was conducted, but due to funding constraints, the EIS has not been finalized. Thus, the Service has a need to formally analyze public comments on the DEIS, conduct additional research to close information gaps, conduct additional analyses of potential impacts to the human environment, revise and finalize the EIS, and obtain a Record of Decision.

The public DEIS was released on August 16, 2013 with no preferred alternative selected. A slightly revised version of the DEIS was released on October 25, 2013. The public comment period ended December 9, 2013.

Following the comment period, a preliminary review of comments was conducted. At that time, funds provided to Island Conservation for their work on the EIS were expended and no other funds were available to support the project.

2. AUTHORITIES:

This agreement is authorized by the Fish and Wildlife Coordination Act, 16 U.S.C. Sections 661-666c; and the Fish and Wildlife Act of 1956 16 U.S.C. 742a-742j.

3. PURPOSE AND NEED:

The purpose of this EIS is to present a range of alternatives to meet the Service's management goal of eradicating invasive house mice from the Farallon NWR in order to eliminate their negative impacts on seabirds and other native species of the Farallon Islands. The need of this EIS is to comply with the 2009 Farallon NWR Comprehensive Conservation Plan (CCP) which provided that the Service should, within five years of the completion of the CCP, develop a plan

to reduce the impacts of non-native species on the islands' ecosystem. To implement this goal, the CCP determined that the Service would, "develop and implement a plan to eradicate the non-native house mouse and prevent future human introductions of mice."

It is anticipated that the complete removal of mice from the South Farallon Islands would allow many of the island's natural ecosystem processes to be restored. The following benefits to the Farallon Islands ecosystem are anticipated as a consequence of eradicating house mice:

1. **Seabirds:** Nesting seabirds are expected to benefit as a consequence of improved survivorship. In particular, eradicating house mice is expected to result in increased populations of at least two seabird species, the ash storm-petrel (Figure 1.1) and Leach's storm-petrel (*Oceanodroma leucorhoa*), by reducing the numbers of overwintering burrowing owls and resulting owl predation on storm-petrels.
2. **Salamanders:** The endemic Farallon arboreal salamander *is anticipated to benefit from* the removal of a likely competitor for invertebrate prey and a potential predator of salamander eggs and juveniles.
3. **Invertebrates:** Native invertebrates of the South Farallon Islands, including the endemic Farallon camel cricket (*Farallonophilus cavernicolus*), are expected to benefit from reduced predation pressure from invasive mice and other predators attracted to the islands by the mice, such as burrowing owls.
4. **Plants:** Native plants stand to benefit as a consequence of reduced seed and seedling predation by mice.
5. **Pinnipeds:** Marine mammals may benefit as a result of removing house mice, which are known vectors of pathogens that affect marine mammals.
6. **Burrowing owls:** Migrant burrowing owls stop at the islands each autumn. Attracted by the abundance of mice present in autumn, each year several owls remain through the winter or spring. In winter, after the mouse population crashes and storm-petrels begin arriving back at the island for breeding activities, owls switch their diet to feed primarily on rare ash storm-petrels; this adversely affects storm-petrel populations. In addition to storm-petrels, terrestrial insects are also consumed. The loss of mice as a food resource would greatly reduce the suitability of the Farallon Islands as a wintering ground for burrowing owls, reducing or eliminating the combined adverse impacts of owls and mice on storm-petrels.

4. PROJECT GOALS AND OBJECTIVES:

The goal of this project is to procure a contract with an entity with demonstrated background, knowledge, and experience necessary to assist the Service with finalizing the EIS and other applicable regulatory compliance for the proposed Farallon house mouse eradication project so that a Record of Decision can be obtained. This will include analyzing public comments received on the DEIS, conducting additional analyses based on new information obtained, resolving information gaps from the DEIS, revising the EIS, finalizing the EIS, and preparing documentation and permit applications for other regulatory compliance (depending upon the alternative chosen).

5. DELIVERABLES:

The successful Contractor shall assist the Service with development of a final EIS (FEIS) for eradication of house mice from the South Farallon Islands that is technically and legally defensible and in full compliance with the requirements of NEPA (42 U.S.C. 4321 et seq.); the Council on Environmental Quality Regulations (CEQ; 40 CFR §1500-1508); and the Service NEPA Handbook.

The Contractor shall furnish all personnel, equipment, supervision, supplies, and incidentals except those indicated as Government-furnished, to perform all work necessary to complete the work in accordance with the contract. The Contractor shall be responsible for transportation costs/arrangements for essential Contractor staff to attend meetings associated with this contract.

Specifically, the Contractor must perform the following tasks:

A. Scoping Report:

The Contractor shall finalize the Government-furnished draft EIS scoping report.

B. Analyses of public comments and other information:

a. The Contractor shall conduct analyses of public comments received on the DEIS and prepare a comment summary report. The Contractor shall submit the draft comment summary report to the Service's Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR) for review and comment by the COTR and Interdisciplinary Team. At the direction of the COTR, the Contractor shall incorporate the review comments into the report and finalize the report. Development of the report shall be consistent with 40 CFR Part 1503.4 and the Service's Handbook for NEPA on National Wildlife Refuges.

b. At the direction of the COTR, the Contractor shall conduct analyses of potential impacts of each of the alternatives to the affected environment based on the review of public comments, new studies or other new information (obtained as a deliverable of this statement of work and Government-furnished information). Examples of possible additional analyses include potential impacts to salamanders and potential impacts to commercial and recreational fisheries. Other information to be incorporated may include revised, government-furnished project reports or newly published literature (government or contractor-furnished).

C. Revise EIS based on public comments and other information

The Contractor shall revise the EIS to incorporate applicable public or agency comments, new information and analyses, and other applicable information obtained by the Contractor or government-furnished. For each revision or as directed by the COTR, analysis provided under this scope shall be supported with appropriate technical citations by peer reviewed scientific literature; non-peer reviewed literature may be substituted when peer-reviewed literature is not available.

- a. The contractor shall prepare a Preliminary Administrative Draft Final EIS (FEIS) to the COTR for review and comment by the COTR and Interdisciplinary Team, formatted consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA and instructions provided by the COTR.
- b. The contractor shall prepare a Administrative Draft Final EIS (FEIS) to the COTR for review and comment by the COTR and Interdisciplinary Team, formatted consistent

with the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA and instructions provided by the COTR.

- c. The Contractor shall prepare an Administrative t Final EIS deliverable, formatted consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA and instructions provided by the COTR.
- d. The contractor shall prepare an Administrative Draft Record of Decision, formatted consistent with the Council on Environmental Quality's regulations for implementing NEPA and instructions provided by the COTR.
- e. The Contractor shall submit a list of references (technical reference list) to support the technical citations that are used in the EIS as a part of this scope, and a PDF of each document cited.

D. Mailing List:

The contractor shall maintain, compile, and deliver a project mailing list to include members of the interdisciplinary team, other project partners, applicable regulatory agency contacts, and interested members of the public.

E. Administrative Record:

- a. The Contractor shall compile, maintain and deliver the Administrative Record for the project according to protocols provided by the Service.
- b. The Contractor shall compile an Index according to protocols provided by the Service.
- c. The Contractor shall deliver portions of the Administrative Record on a quarterly basis, to include all records accrued for the quarter.
- d. At the conclusion of the NEPA process, the Contractor shall complete the compilation of the Administrative Record.
- e. The Contractor shall deliver all Administrative Record materials, including all documents and Index, on three DVDs to the COTR.

F. Meetings:

- a. The Contractor shall prepare schedules, agendas, minutes, presentations and other informational materials as requested by the COTR for meetings with Service staff, project partners, cooperating or other agencies, interested organizations and members of the public, as applicable;
- b. The Contractor shall attend and participate in up to ten all-day meetings associated with the project, as requested. The majority of meetings will be held at the San Francisco Bay National Wildlife Refuge Complex headquarters in Fremont, California. Most other meetings will occur at various other locations within the Greater San Francisco Bay Area. A small number of meetings (up to three) may require travel beyond the Greater San Francisco Bay Area. In-person meetings will be held with Service staff or the Interdisciplinary Team at least every two months or more frequently as needed, up to once each month. The Contractor

shall be available for additional meetings by teleconference, as determined necessary by the COTR.

G. Notification of developments

Notify the COTR of developments that have a significant impact on activities and schedule covered by this agreement.

5.1 Option item: Additional Regulatory Compliance

If an action alternative is selected in the FEIS, the proposed mouse eradication would be carried out in compliance with all applicable Federal and state laws and regulations. The Contractor will be responsible for preparing all necessary compliance documentation including, but not limited to those listed below unless otherwise agreed upon in writing by the COTR. The compliance documentation will be reviewed and approved by the COTR. Unless a different time frame is specified by the COTR, the Contractor shall submit the compliance documentation deliverables to coincide with the administrative draft of the FEIS. The Contractor shall prepare permit applications and additional compliance documents for:

- a. Consistency Determination under the Coastal Zone Management Act;
- b. Application for Manager's Authorization from Greater Farallones National Marine Sanctuary;
- c. Application for incidental take of migratory birds (under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act);
- d. Application for National Pollution Discharge Elimination System individual permit (under the Clean Water Act);
- e. Application for marine mammal Incidental Harassment Authorization (under the Marine Mammal Protection Act);
- f. Documentation to obtain a Pesticide Use Permit from the Service;
- g. Documentation to support a Biological Opinion under the Endangered Species Act;
- h. Documentation to support authorization under the National Historic Preservation Act (Section 106);
- i. Documentation to support authorization under the Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act; and
- j. OPTION ITEM: Other regulatory compliance as it may arise, as directed by the COTR.

Any future deviations from the procedures or objectives specified in this purchase order must be presented to and approved by the Service for specific approval before implementation.

6. DELIVERABLES SCHEDULE:

This schedule may require modifications due to delays (or advance) in obtaining expected new information considered pertinent to the NEPA process, delays due to unavailability of critical Service or Interdisciplinary Team staff, completion of tasks prior to due dates, or other factors beyond the control of the Contractor. Updates to the schedule will be done regularly as needed.

- Initial Project Coordination - The Contractor shall assign a Project Planner within seven (7) days of the Notice to Proceed. All tasks will be completed with oversight from the COTR. Within seven (7) days of the Notice to Proceed, the Project Planner shall coordinate via telephone with the COTR to discuss the project schedule and to arrange to receive the Government furnished materials necessary to allow the Project Planner to develop a basic understanding of the Refuge and the mouse eradication NEPA process to date, as determined by the COTR.

A planning initiation meeting will be held with the COTR and Interdisciplinary Team within 4 weeks of the contract Notice to Proceed. The purpose of the initiation meeting is to clarify the project deliverables; to discuss the overall planning process; to acquaint the Contractor with the Interdisciplinary Team; to answer questions about the management alternatives analyzed in the DEIS; to review public comments received on the DEIS, and to provide other relevant information needed to begin work on the FEIS. Prior to the planning initiation meeting, through review of the Government furnished materials, the Contractor shall have developed a basic understanding of the Refuge, the mouse eradication NEPA process, and proposed management alternatives, and shall be prepared to discuss the EIS.

- Administrative Draft Public Comment Summary Report – Within 45 days of the Notice to Proceed, the contractor shall submit the preliminary administrative draft public comment summary report deliverable.
- Revised Administrative Draft Public Scoping Summary Report: Within 60 days of the Notice to Proceed, the contractor shall submit the revised administrative draft public scoping summary report deliverable (government-furnished preliminary report supplied previously).
- Administrative Final Public Comment Summary Report – Within 30 calendar days of receipt of comments and instructions on the Administrative Draft Public Comment Summary Report, the Contractor shall address and incorporate the Government's comments and instructions and submit the Administrative Final Public Comment Summary Report deliverable.
- Administrative Final Public Scoping Summary Report – Within 30 calendar days of receipt of comments and instructions on the Revised Administrative Draft Public Scoping Summary Report, the Contractor shall address and incorporate the Government's comments and instructions and submit the Administrative Final Public Scoping Summary Report deliverable.
- Additional research and analyses - The Service, Interdisciplinary Team, and the Contractor conduct additional research, literature searches; and meet with experts other agency staff, and potentially affected members of the public to gather additional information. Contractor incorporates updated information into analyses of alternatives. This will be ongoing until the Administrative FEIS is completed.

- Preliminary Administrative Draft Final EIS – Within 60 calendar days of receipt of notice of the Service’s decision on a preferred alternative and instructions on how to proceed, contractor submits the Preliminary Administrative Draft Final EIS deliverables.
- Administrative Draft Final EIS – Within 45 calendar days of receipt of review comments on the Preliminary Administrative Draft Final EIS, the Contractor shall address and incorporate the Government’s review comments and submit the Administrative Draft Final EIS deliverables.
- Administrative Final EIS – Within 30 calendar days of receipt of review comments on the Preliminary Administrative Draft Final EIS, the Contractor shall address and incorporate the Government’s review comments and submit the Administrative Final EIS deliverables.
- Administrative Draft Record of Decision – Within 14 calendar days of receipt of instructions from the COTR, submit an Administrative Draft Record of Decision.
- Meeting agendas – Unless instructed otherwise by the COR, submit draft meeting agendas no later than five working days prior to scheduled meetings for review by the COR and the Interdisciplinary Team, as applicable. After incorporating comments, submit a final agenda to the COR and other invitees by close of business the day prior to the meeting.
- Meeting minutes – Unless instructed otherwise by the COR, submit draft meeting minutes no later than five working days following scheduled meetings for review by the COR and the Interdisciplinary Team, as applicable. Within 5 working days of receipt of comments, submit final meeting minutes.
- Final Administrative Record and Mailing List – Within 30 calendar days of submitting the Administrative Final EIS deliverables, contractor delivers any outstanding Administrative Record materials and the project mailing list.

7. DELIVERABLES FORMAT

The format of deliverables shall fully comply with the draft planning Chapter of the Service’s (FWS) Manual. All deliverables shall be submitted to the Technical Coordinator in the following formats:

- One (1) master (editable) in MS Word or compatible format suitable for editing; and
- One (1) duplicate master in Adobe Acrobat (PDF) format suitable for printing or copying.

At the discretion and direction of the COTR, the deliverable may be submitted electronically. The use of “drop boxes” is prohibited.

8. PLACE/DELIVERY AND PERIOD OF PERFORMANCE:

No site visits are required. The work shall be conducted at Contractor's place of business. The period of performance for this task order is from the date of the Notice to Proceed (estimated to be September 20, 2016 through January 31, 2018).

9. INSPECTION AND ACCEPTANCE:

The deliverables shall be consistent with the format and content specified in the draft planning chapter for the Service Manual and Service's graphic standards. The documents shall be no longer than necessary to concisely address required contents, extensively use references to documents already in existence, describe which resources are eliminated from detailed analysis and why, focus on resources affected by the proposed action, and be written so that the layperson can understand the documents. The use of technical jargon shall be minimized. Technical data shall be provided in appendices if needed for the reader's understanding, or shall be available from the Service if requested. The Contractor is encouraged to submit products (or sections of products), as they are completed, to the Technical Coordinator prior to the deadlines.

10. GOVERNMENT FURNISHED EQUIPMENT OR MATERIALS/ INFORMATION

1. Provide overall project management for the EIS process, as well as oversight and guidance to the Contractor on this project.
2. Provide an electronic copy of the public DEIS, including appendices;
3. Provide an electronic copy of all public comments received on the DEIS.
4. Provide an electronic copy of public scoping comments received and draft public scoping report.
5. Provide existing environmental compliance documents, Farallon NWR Comprehensive Conservation Plan, resource survey reports, and other available literature, as determined by the COTR.
6. Conduct public or interagency meetings.
7. Prepare all required Federal Register Notices.
8. Manage all printing requirements for public distribution documents.
9. Provide a current project mailing list of names and contact information of Interdisciplinary Team members, cooperating agency staff, other regulatory agency staff (when known); and the interested public.
10. Provide technical expertise as it relates to the federally listed species, migratory birds, and other natural resources of the South Farallon Islands;
11. Serve as the lead agency for the National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) compliance. Provide a NEPA expert to liaise with the contractor and provide timely response to questions about process and content;
12. Throughout the NEPA process, maintain primary decision-making responsibility for the content of the EIS and independently evaluate information and analyses submitted by the contractor;

13. Oversee the environmental analysis through a Service Interdisciplinary Team which will provide guidance to the contractor regarding the issues and alternatives to be addressed as part of the EIS;
14. Review administrative drafts of the public comment summary report and public scoping summary report and provide comments within 30 calendar days of receipt. Make final determinations on the inclusion or deletion of material from such documents.
15. Provide the Contractor with the list of resources that shall be analyzed by the Contractor in the FEIS.
16. Review preliminary draft materials from portions of the FEIS as necessary and agreed upon by the Service, and provide comments within 30 calendar days.
17. Review of Preliminary Administrative Draft FEIS and Administrative Draft FEIS and provide comments within 60 calendar days of receipt. Make final determinations on the inclusion or deletion of material from the FEIS;
18. Choose a preferred alternative;
19. Prepare a Minimum Requirements Analysis under the National Wilderness Act;
20. Direct the contractor on protocols for compiling, maintaining and delivering the Administrative Record for the project and directions for other record keeping practices.

11. SPECIAL CONSIDERATIONS:

- 1. Confidentiality.** Government furnished materials, Contractor work products, deliverables, and information regarding this project shall not be disclosed outside the Contractor's work team and are the property of the U.S. Government. The Contractor, its work team, and employees shall maintain the aforementioned documents and information pertaining to this project as confidential.
- 2. Within-Scope Alterations.** The Government reserves the right at its option to further define the focus of work in order to meet the requirements of NEPA, the National Wildlife Refuge Improvement Act of 1997 and associated environmental laws and procedures.
- 3. Representative of the Government.** All product(s) resulting from services provided to the Government by the Contractor or his/her sub-consultants as a result of this contract become the sole property of the U.S. Government. Under this context and the provisions of the Government Printing and Binding Regulation of the Joint Committee Printing of the Congress of the United States, April 1977, Title III, Section 13, paragraphs 13, 14, and 15, the use of "logos" and Contractor's identification on individual plates or in places other than those accepted and in the proper format, contained in documents submitted to the U.S. Government for final approval are unacceptable.

12. ADDITIONAL INFORMATION:

The Revised DEIS, support documents, and public comments are available at <http://www.regulations.gov>. In the Search box, enter FWS-R8-NWRS-2013-0036, which is the

docket number for this notice. Then, on Open Docket Folder to access links to the DEIS and associated documents.

13. PROPOSAL EVALUATION CRITERIA

13.1 Selection Criteria

Each submitted proposal will be evaluated on the criteria below and cost. Proposals will also be evaluated with respect to ability to observe the proposal instructions. Incomplete proposals or failure to provide the information required by the Request for Quote (RFQ) may result in the proposal not being considered.

Selection criteria in addition to price include:

NEPA Experience. Contractor's and Project Team's qualifications will be evaluated primarily upon the expertise and experience of personnel that are assigned and committed to the project. Experience and demonstrated ability in technical writing, editing, and formatting similar natural resource planning and NEPA documents will be given greater weight.

50 points

Natural Resources Planning Experience. Contractor's and Project Team's qualifications will be evaluated primarily upon the expertise and experience of personnel that are assigned and committed to the project. Experience, knowledge, and demonstrated ability in environmental compliance and planning for national wildlife refuges or other similar natural resources planning projects will be given greater weight.

30 points

Performance. Past similar experience demonstrating ability to perform the tasks described in this Statement of Work (SOW) within agreed upon budgets and schedules.

20 points

Total Points: 100

13.2 Project Team Qualifications

Project Team must demonstrate expertise and experience in the following:

1. Specific experience preparing NEPA documents for Federal agencies. Prior experience with the Department of the Interior, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and national wildlife refuges, as well as prior experience preparing EIS documents, will be given greater weight.

2. Technical writing skills to ensure a clear and concise NEPA document. Familiarity with environmental issues related to management of federal lands and natural resources, including national wildlife refuges.

3. Demonstrated expertise of the Project Team in resource sectors such as:

- a. The laws and policies governing the Department of the Interior and Service including the National Wildlife Refuge System;

- b. Offshore island ecosystems;
- c. Natural resources management;
- d. Rodent eradication from islands;
- e. Rodenticide use including federal and California environmental compliance regulations;
- f. Other environmental compliance requirements including preparation of environmental compliance permit applications;
- g. Maintenance and compilation of a NEPA administrative record;
- h. Organizing meetings and preparing meeting agendas, minutes, presentations, and other materials; and
- i. Working in a diverse group with individuals from multiple federal, state, and private organizations.
- j. Environmental justice.

4. The Project Team's qualifications are to be demonstrated by providing the following information:

- a. Key Personnel. Submit a personnel table identifying key personnel and proposed subcontractors, identifying the expertise of the key personnel and proposed subcontractors as related to the requirements of this SOW. Include measures to assure the consistency and retention of key personnel of the Project Team. The key personnel in the Project Team shall remain on the Project Team throughout the contract term unless the Government consents in writing to a personnel change.
- b. Submit a summary of the Contractor's business operations and capabilities as they pertain to the proposed project of not more than two (2) pages in length.
- c. If the proposed Project Team includes subcontractors, a summary of not more than one (1) page in length may be provided for each subcontractor. Inclusion of any other descriptions of a firm's overall business, or promotional material is not encouraged and will not receive consideration.
- d. For the Project Team's key personnel, submit a resume and, at a minimum, the following information for each individual. Each resume for key personnel shall not exceed one (1) page.
 - 1. Name and firm;
 - 2. Project team assignment and responsibilities;
 - 3. Availability during contract term;
 - 4. Summary of expertise and experience with respect to the qualifications requirements listed above;
 - 5. Education and relevant registrations;
 - 6. Years of professional experience;
 - 7. Experience with preparation of NEPA analysis including how many and their scope of involvement and role in the preparation of NEPA documents;
 - 8. Experience in coordinating complex NEPA analysis involving multiple disciplines.

- e. For the proposed Project Manager, key personnel, and subcontractors, provide a list of no less than two (2) relevant projects. The list and summary of projects shall be no more than five (5) pages each.
 - 1. The Project Manager, key personnel, and subcontractors shall only list projects which their company performed at least 50% of the work.
 - 2. For each project, provide a summary of the project including the individual's role, the date the project was completed, and a current reference that may be contacted.

DRAFT

14. OPTIONAL ITEM

In accordance with the Option Items listed in Section 5.1 above, the preparation of additional environmental compliance applications will be exercised at the discretion of the Government, and shall be identified and proposed separately. Submit as required by section 13.2.4 herein, the Project Team member(s)'s or subcontractor's expertise and experience in preparing environmental compliance permit applications applicable to those listed in Section 5.1.

15. AVAILABILITY:

Access to the Refuge is not implied or required under this statement of work. Site visits, access, and guided visits to the Refuge are not included in this statement of work.

16. Contracting Officer's Technical Representative (COTR):

Gerry McChesney, Wildlife Refuge Manager
Farallon National Wildlife Refuge
1 Marshlands Road
Fremont, CA 94555

Phone: (510) 792-0222, x222
gerry_mcchesney@fws.gov