United States Department of the Interior

FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
South Florida Ecological Services Office
1339 20th Street
Vero Beach, Florida 32960

Service Log Number: 41910-2011-F-0170

March 13, 2015

Alan M. Dodd, Colonel
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
701 San Marco Boulevard, Room 372
Jacksonville, Florida 32207-8175

Dear Colonel Dodd:

This letter transmits the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's revised Statewide Programmatic Biological Opinion (SPBO) for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) Civil Works and Regulatory sand placement activities in Florida and their effects on the following sea turtles: Northwest Atlantic Ocean distinct population segment (NWAO DPS) of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and its designated terrestrial critical habitat; green (*Chelonia mydas);* leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*); hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricata*); and Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) ; and the following beach mice: southeastern (*Peromyscus polionotus niveiventris*); Anastasia Island (*Peromyscus polionotus phasma*); Choctawhatchee (*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*); St. Andrews (*Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis*) ; and Perdido Key (*Peromyscus polionotus trissyllepsis*) and their designated critical habitat. It does not address effects of these activities on the non-breeding piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) and its designated critical habitat or for the red knot (*Calidris canutus rufa*), a species currently proposed for listing. Effects of Corps planning and regulatory shore protection activities on the non-breeding piping plover and its designated critical habitat within the North Florida Ecological Services office area of responsibility and the South Florida Ecological Services office area of responsibility are addressed in the Service's May 22, 2013, Programmatic Piping Plover Biological Opinion. Effects of shore protection activities for the piping plover in the Panama City Ecological Services office area of responsibility will be addressed on a project by project basis.

Each proposed project will undergo an evaluation process by the Corps to determine if it properly fits within a programmatic approach. The project description will determine if the project is appropriate to apply to this programmatic consultation. If it is determined that the minimization measures, Reasonable and Prudent Measures, and Terms and Conditions in the SPBO are applicable to the project, it will be covered by this programmatic consultation. If not, the Corps will consult separately on individual projects that do not fit within this programmatic approach.

We will meet annually during the fourth week of August to review the sand placement projects, assess new data, identify information needs, and scope methods to address those needs, including, but not limited to, evaluations and monitoring specified in this SPBO, reviewing results, formulating or amending actions that minimize take of listed species, and monitoring the effectiveness of those actions.

The entire programmatic consultation will be reviewed every five years or sooner if new information concerning the projects or protected species occurs. Reinitiation of formal consultation is also required 10 years after the issuance of this SPBO.

We are available to meet with agency representatives to discuss the remaining issues with this consultation. If you have any questions, please contact Peter Plage at the North Florida Ecological Services Office at (904) 731-3085, Jeffrey Howe at the South Florida Ecological Services Office at (772) 469-4283, or Lisa Lehnhoff at the Panama City Ecological Services Office at (850) 769-0552, extension 241.

Sincerely,

for Larry Williams
State Supervisor

Shore Protection Activities along the Coast of Florida

Statewide Programmatic Biological Opinion

(Revised)

February 27, 2015

Prepared by:
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION **1**

MIGRATORY BIRDS **13**

CONSULTATION HISTORY **14**

BIOLOGICAL OPINION **17**

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION **17**

- **Corps Commitments** **18**
- **Sea Turtles** **18**
- **Beach Mice** **19**

ACTION AREA **19**

STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT **21**

- **LOGGERHEAD SEA TURTLE** **21**
- **GREEN SEA TURTLE** **22**
- **LEATHERBACK SEA TURTLE** **23**
- **HAWKSBILL SEA TURTLE** **25**
- **KEMP'S RIDLEY SEA TURTLE** **25**

LIFE HISTORY **26**

- **LOGGERHEAD SEA TURTLE** **26**
- **GREEN SEA TURTLE** **30**
- **LEATHERBACK SEA TURTLE** **30**
- **HAWKSBILL SEA TURTLE** **30**
- **KEMP'S RIDLEY SEA TURTLE** **30**

POPULATION DYNAMICS **31**

- **LOGGERHEAD SEA TURTLE** **31**
- **GREEN SEA TURTLE** **32**
- **LEATHERBACK SEA TURTLE** **32**
- **HAWKSBILL SEA TURTLE** **33**
- **KEMP'S RIDLEY SEA TURTLE** **33**

ANALYSIS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT LIKELY TO BE AFFECTED **43**

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE **45**

EFFECTS OF THE ACTION **56**

- **Factors to be considered** **56**
- **ANALYSES FOR EFFECTS OF THE ACTION** **57**
  - ***Beneficial Effects*** **57**
  - ***Direct Effects*** **58**
  - **Indirect Effects** **60**

SPECIES' RESPONSE TO A PROPOSED ACTION **64**

STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT **65**

SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT DESCRIPTION 65
LIFE HISTORY (ALL SUBSPECIES OF BEACH MICE) 82
POPULATION DYNAMICS 86
STATUS AND DISTRIBUTION 92
Recovery Criteria 98
ANALYSIS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT LIKELY TO BE AFFECTED 107
ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE 108
STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT WITHIN THE ACTION AREA (ALL SUBSPECIES OF BEACH MICE) 108
FACTORS AFFECTING THE SPECIES ENVIRONMENT WITHIN THE ACTION AREA 108
EFFECTS OF THE ACTION 110
FACTORS TO BE CONSIDERED 110
SPECIES' RESPONSE TO A PROPOSED ACTION 113
CUMULATIVE EFFECTS 114
CONCLUSION 115
SEA TURTLES 115
BEACH MICE 116
INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT 117
EFFECT OF THE TAKE 120
REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES (RPM) 121
TERMS AND CONDITIONS 124
CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS 160
LITERATURE CITED 164
APPENDIX A 196
APPENDIX B 2
APPENDIX C 2
APPENDIX D 2

LIST OF FIGURES

FIGURE 1. LIFE HISTORY STAGES OF A LOGGERHEAD TURTLE. THE BOXES REPRESENT LIFE STAGES AND THE CORRESPONDING ECOSYSTEMS, SOLID LINES REPRESENT MOVEMENTS BETWEEN LIFE STAGES AND ECOSYSTEMS, AND DOTTED LINES ARE SPECULATIVE. 27
FIGURE 2. MAP OF THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE LOGGERHEAD RECOVERY UNITS. 35
FIGURE 3. DISTRIBUTION OF LOGGERHEAD NESTING IN THE PFRU AND NGMRU IN FLORIDA..... 47
FIGURE 4. DISTRIBUTION OF GREEN TURTLE NESTING IN FLORIDA. 48
FIGURE 5. DISTRIBUTION OF LEATHERBACK TURTLE NESTING IN FLORIDA. 49
FIGURE 6. REVIEW OF SEA TURTLE NESTING SITE SELECTION FOLLOWING NOURISHMENT..... 62
FIGURE 7. THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE SOUTHEASTERN BEACH MOUSE. 67
FIGURE 8. THE DISTRIBUTION OF THE ANASTASIA ISLAND BEACH MOUSE. 68
FIGURE 9. HISTORICAL RANGE OF GULF COAST BEACH MOUSE SUBSPECIES. 70
FIGURE 10. CRITICAL HABITAT UNITS DESIGNATED FOR THE PERDIDO KEY BEACH MOUSE. 71
FIGURE 11. CRITICAL HABITAT UNITS DESIGNATED FOR THE CHOCTAWHATCHEE BEACH MOUSE. 76
FIGURE 12. CRITICAL HABITAT UNITS DESIGNATED FOR THE ST. ANDREW BEACH MOUSE. 80
FIGURE 13. RECOMMENDED SLOPE ON A HIGH EROSION BEACH FOR SAND PLACEMENT PROJECTS THAT INCLUDE THE CREATION OF A DUNE. 127
FIGURE 14. RECOMMENDED SLOPE ON A LOW EROSION BEACH FOR SAND PLACEMENT PROJECTS THAT INCLUDE THE CREATION OF A DUNE. 127
FIGURE 15. BEACH LIGHTING SCHEMATIC. 138
FIGURE 16. EQUIPMENT PLACEMENT FOR PROJECTS OCCURRING IN BEACH MOUSE OCCUPIED HABITAT. 140

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1. STATUS OF FEDERALLY LISTED SPECIES WITHIN THE ACTION AREA THAT MAY BE ADVERSELY AFFECTED BY THE SHORE PROTECTION ACTIVITIES. 2
TABLE 2. SPECIES AND CRITICAL HABITAT EVALUATED FOR EFFECTS AND THOSE WHERE THE SERVICE HAS CONCURRED WITH A "MAY AFFECT, NOT LIKELY TO ADVERSELY AFFECT (MANLAA)" DETERMINATION. 3
TABLE 3. FWS ECOLOGICAL SERVICES (ES) OFFICES AND AREAS OF RESPONSIBILITY (COUNTIES). 5
TABLE 4. LIST OF NWAO DPS LOGGERHEAD CRITICAL HABITAT IN THE TERRESTRIAL HABITAT FLORIDA AND OWNERSHIP. 6
TABLE 5. TYPICAL VALUES OF LIFE HISTORY PARAMETERS FOR LOGGERHEADS NESTING IN THE U.S. (NMFS AND SERVICE 2008). 28
TABLE 6. LOGGERHEAD SEA TURTLE NESTING AND HATCHING SEASON FOR FLORIDA. 47
TABLE 7. GREEN SEA TURTLE NESTING AND HATCHING SEASON FOR FLORIDA. 49
TABLE 8. LEATHERBACK SEA TURTLE NESTING AND HATCHING SEASON FOR FLORIDA. 50
TABLE 9. HAWKSBILL SEA TURTLE NESTING AND HATCHING SEASON FOR FLORIDA. 50
TABLE 10. DOCUMENTED DISORIENTATIONS ALONG THE FLORIDA COAST (FWC 2007A). 53
TABLE 11. CRITICAL HABITAT UNITS DESIGNATED FOR THE PERDIDO KEY BEACH MOUSE. 71
TABLE 12. CRITICAL HABITAT UNITS DESIGNATED FOR THE CHOCTAWHATCHEE BEACH MOUSE. . 76
TABLE 13. CRITICAL HABITAT UNITS DESIGNATED FOR THE ST. ANDREW BEACH MOUSE. 80
TABLE 14. PERDIDO KEY BEACH MOUSE HABITAT ON PERDIDO KEY IN FLORIDA AND ALABAMA 95
TABLE 15. PREVIOUS BIOLOGICAL OPINIONS WITHIN FLORIDA THAT HAVE BEEN ISSUED FOR PROJECTS THAT HAD ADVERSE IMPACT TO THE NESTING BEACH MICE. 99
TABLE 16. BEACH SAND PLACEMENT AND SEA TURTLE NEST MONITORING/RELOCATION WINDOWS, BREVARD THROUGH BROWARD COUNTIES, COAST OF FLORIDA. 129
TABLE 17. BEACH SAND PLACEMENT AND SEA TURTLE NEST MONITORING/RELOCATION WINDOWS, OUTSIDE OF BREVARD THROUGH BROWARD COUNTIES, COAST OF FLORIDA. 130
TABLE 18. POST-CONSTRUCTION SEA TURTLE MONITORING. 134
TABLE 19. DATES FOR COMPACTION MONITORING AND ESCARPMENT SURVEYS BY COUNTY. .. 135
TABLE 20. INFORMATION TO INCLUDE IN THE REPORT FOLLOWING THE PROJECT COMPLETION. . 141
TABLE 21. SEA TURTLE MONITORING FOLLOWING SAND PLACEMENT ACTIVITY. 142
TABLE 22. INFORMATION TO INCLUDE IN THE REPORT FOLLOWING THE PROJECT COMPLETION. . 160

Acronyms

ABM	Alabama Beach Mouse
Act	Endangered Species Act
AFB	Air Force Base
AIBM	Anastasia Island Beach Mouse
ASP	Anastasia State Park
BO	Biological Opinion
CBM	Choctawhatchee Beach Mouse
CBRA	Coastal Barrier Resources Act
CCAFS	Cape Canaveral Air Force Station
CFR	Code of Federal Regulations
CH	Critical Habitat
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
Corps	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
DOI	U.S. Department of the Interior
DTRU	Dry Tortugas Recovery Unit
F	Fahrenheit
FAC	Florida Administrative Code
FDEP	Florida Department of Environmental Protection
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
FMNM	Fort Matanzas National Monument
FR	*Federal Register*
FWC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission

FWC/FWRI	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute
GCRU	Greater Caribbean Recovery Unit
GINS	Gulf Islands National Seashore
GTMNERR	Guana Tolomato Matanzas National Estuarine Research Reserve
HCP	Habitat Conservation Plan
IMA	Important Manatee Areas
INBS	Index Nesting Beach Survey
IPCC	Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change
ITP	Incidental Take Permit
K	Carrying Capacity
MANLAA	May Affect, but is Not Likely to Adversely Affect
MHW	Mean High Water
MHWL	Mean High Water Line
MMPA	Marine Mammal Protection Act
mtDNA	Mitochondrial Deoxyribonucleic Acid
NGMRU	Northern Gulf of Mexico Recovery Unit
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOAA	National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration
NRU	Northern Recovery Unit
NWAO DPS	Northwest Atlantic Ocean Distinct Population Segment
NWR	National Wildlife Refuge
PBA	Programmatic Biological Assessment
PCE	Primary Constituent Elements

PFRU	Peninsular Florida Recovery Unit
PHVA	Population and Habitat Viability Analysis
PKBM	Perdido Key Beach Mouse
PKSP	Perdido Key State Park
PSI	Per Square Inch
PVA	Population Viability Analysis
SABM	St. Andrews Beach Mouse
SAJ	South Atlantic Jacksonville
SAM	South Atlantic Mobile
SAV	submerged aquatic vegetation
SEBM	Southeastern Beach Mouse
Service	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
SNBS	Statewide Nesting Beach Survey
SPBO	Statewide Programmatic Biological Opinion
SR	State Road
TED	Turtle Excluder Device
TEWG	Turtle Expert Working Group
U.S.C.	United States Code
U.S.	United States

March 13, 2015

Alan M. Dodd, Colonel
District Commander
U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
701 San Marco Boulevard, Room 372
Jacksonville, Florida 32207-8175

Service Federal Activity No:	41910-2010-F-0284
Applicant:	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
Date Started:	May 30, 2007
Project Title:	Shore Protection Activities
Ecosystem:	Florida Coastline
Counties:	Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Escambia.

Dear Colonel Dodd:

This document is the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's (Service) Statewide Programmatic Biological Opinion (SPBO) for the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) planning and regulatory shore protection activities in Florida and their effects on the Northwest Atlantic Ocean distinct population (NWAO DPS) of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) and its designated terrestrial critical habitat, green (*Chelonia mydas)*, leatherback (*Dermochelys coriacea*), hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricata*), and Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) sea turtles, and southeastern (*Peromyscus polionotus niveiventris*), Anastasia Island (*Peromyscus polionotus phasma*), Choctawhatchee (*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*), St. Andrews (*Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis*), and Perdido Key (*Peromyscus polionotus trissyllepsis*) beach mice and designated critical habitat (CH) for the Perdido Key beach mouse (PKBM), Choctawhatchee beach mouse (CBM), and St. Andrews beach mouse (SABM) **(Table 1)**. This SPBO is provided in accordance with section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (Act) of 1973, as amended (16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq*.). We have assigned Service Federal Activity number 41910-2010-F-0284 for this consultation.

The Corps determined that the proposed project "may affect and is likely to adversely affect the above listed species (**Table 1)**. The Corps also has determined that the proposed project "may affect, but is not likely to adversely affect" (MANLAA) the West Indian (Florida) manatee (*Trichechus manatus latirostris*), the roseate tern (*Sterna dougallii dougallii*), the beach jacquemontia (*Jacquemontia reclinata*), and the Garber's spurge (*Chamaesyce garberi*) **(Table 2)**. Based on our review of the project plans and the incorporation of the minimization measures listed

in the final Programmatic Biological Assessment (PBA) as conditions of the projects where these species are known to exist, we concur with these determinations.

Table 1. Status of federally listed species within the Action Area that may be adversely affected by the shore protection activities.

SPECIES COMMON NAME	SPECIES SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS/CH
Mammals		
Choctawhatchee beach mouse	*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*	Endangered(CH)
Southeastern beach mouse	*Peromyscus polionotus niveiventris*	Threatened
Anastasia Island beach mouse	*Peromyscus polionotus phasma*	Endangered
St. Andrews beach mouse	*Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis*	Endangered (CH)
Perdido Key beach mouse	*Peromyscus polionotus trissyllepsis*	Endangered (CH)
Birds		
Piping Plover*	*Charadrius melodus*	Threatened
Red Knot*	*Calidris canutus rufa*	Proposed
Reptiles		
Green sea turtle	*Chelonia mydas*	Endangered
Hawksbill turtle	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	Endangered
Kemp's ridley sea turtle	*Lepidochelys kempii*	Endangered
Leatherback sea turtle	*Dermochelys coriacea*	Endangered
Loggerhead sea turtle (Northwest Atlantic Ocean population)	*Caretta caretta*	Threatened (CH)

* Not covered by the revised SPBO

Table 2. Species and critical habitat evaluated for effects and those where the Service has concurred with a "may affect, not likely to adversely affect (MANLAA)" determination.

SPECIES COMMON NAME	SPECIES SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS/CH	PRESENT IN ACTION AREA	MANLAA
Florida manatee	*Trichechus manatus latirostris*	Endangered (CH)	Yes	Yes
Roseate tern	*Sterna dougallii dougallii*	Threatened	Yes	Yes
Beach jacquemontia	*Jacquemontia reclinata*	Endangered	Yes	Yes
Garber's spurge	*Chamaesyce garberi*	Threatened	Yes	Yes

Florida Manatee

For all dredging activities, including offshore dredging activities associated with submerged borrow areas and navigational channel maintenance:

The Corps has determined that the proposed projects "may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect" the Florida manatee. The Service has reviewed the draft PBA and concurs that, if the 2011 Standard Manatee In-water Construction Conditions are made a condition of the issued permit or Corps project plan and implemented, these activities are not likely to adversely affect the Florida manatee. We also conclude that these activities will not adversely modify its critical habitat. These findings fulfill section 7 requirements of the Act in regard to manatees. In addition, because no incidental take of manatees is anticipated, no such authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) is needed. The web link to these conditions: http://www.fws.gov/northflorida/Manatee/Manate_Key_Programmatic/20130425_gd_Appendix%20B_2011_Standard%20Manatee%20Construction%20Conditions.pdf.

For all dredging activities within estuaries and adjacent to the shore, inlets, and/or inshore areas including channels associated with submerged borrow areas and navigational channels:

If the 2011 Standard Manatee In-water Construction Conditions and the following additional conditions are made a condition of the issued permit or Corps project plan and implemented, the Service would be able to concur with a determination by the Corps that these activities are not likely to adversely affect the Florida manatee. We also conclude that these activities will not

adversely modify its critical habitat. These findings fulfill section 7 requirements of the Act in regard to manatees. In addition, because no incidental take of manatees is anticipated, no such authorization under the Marine Mammal Protection Act (MMPA) is needed.

Additional conditions:

1. Barges shall install mooring bumpers that provide a minimum 4-foot standoff distance under maximum compression between other moored barges and large vessels, when in the vicinity of inlets, river mouths, and large estuaries where manatees are known to congregate.

2. Pipelines shall be positioned such that they do not restrict manatee movement to the maximum extent possible. Plastic pipelines shall be weighted or floated. Pipelines transporting dredged material within the vicinity of inlets, river mouths, and large estuaries where manatees are known to congregate shall be weighted or secured to the bottom substrate as necessary to prevent movement of the pipeline and to prevent manatee entrapment or crushing.

3. In the event that such positioning has the potential to impact submerged aquatic vegetation (SAV) or nearshore hardbottom, the pipeline may be elevated or secured to the bottom substrate to minimize impacts to SAV.

For dredging activities located within Important Manatee Areas (IMAs), including Warm Water Aggregation Areas (WWAAs):

Important Manatee Areas (IMAs) are areas where large numbers of manatees occur because of the presence of warm water sites (including power plants, springs, etc.), feeding sites, drinking water sites, and other attractants. Manatees congregate at these sites to shelter from the cold, rest, feed and drink, travel, and engage in other activities. Current IMA maps, including maps of Warm Water Aggregation Areas (WWAAs) and areas of inadequate protection (AIPs), can be found at the Corps' weblink: http://www.saj.usace.army.mil/Missions/Regulatory/SourceBook.aspx.

Dredging activities that occur within the IMA sites (including WWAAs) are not included in this SPBO. For dredging activities within IMAs, the Corps shall contact the appropriate FWS Ecological Services Office for project-specific conditions. See Table 3.

Table 3. FWS Ecological Services (ES) offices and areas of responsibility (counties).

County	Service ES Office	Address	Telephone
Brevard, Citrus, Dixie, Duval, Flagler, Hernando, Hillsborough, Levy, Manatee, Nassau, Pasco, Pinellas, St Johns, Taylor, Volusia	North Florida ES Office	7915 Baymeadows Way Jacksonville, FL 32256	(904) 731-3336
Broward, Charlotte, Collier, Indian River, Lee, Martin, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Palm Beach, St Lucie, Sarasota	South Florida ES Office	1339 20th Street Vero Beach, FL 32960	(772) 562-3909
Bay, Escambia, Franklin, Gulf, Jefferson, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Taylor, Wakulla, Walton,	Panama City ES Office	1601 Balboa Avenue Panama City, FL 32405	(850) 769-0552

Although this does not represent a biological opinion for the manatee as described in section 7 of the Act, it does fulfill the requirements of the Act and no further action is required regarding manatees. It also fulfills the requirements of the MMPA. If modifications are made in the programmatic action or additional information becomes available, re-initiation of consultation may be required.

Loggerhead Terrestrial Critical Habitat

The Corps has determined that the proposed projects "may affect, but are not likely to adversely affect" the terrestrial critical habitat of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean loggerhead sea turtle population. The Service concurs with the Corps' determination and furthermore concludes that the proposed projects will not adversely modify the terrestrial critical habitat of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean loggerhead sea turtle population.Designated Critical Habitat: The Service has designated terrestrial critical habitat for Northwest Atlantic loggerhead population on July 10, 2014. NOTE: The proposed rule was dated March 25, 2013 (78 FR 18000) and the notice of availability of the economic analysis for the proposed rule (78 FR 42921) was dated July 18, 2013. The final rule of terrestrial critical habitat includes 88 units encompassing approximately 1,102 kilometers (685 miles) of mapped shoreline along the coasts of North Carolina, South Carolina, Georgia, Florida, Alabama, and Mississippi: http://www.fws.gov/northflorida/SeaTurtles/2014_Loggerhead_CH/Maps/2014_NWA_Loggerhead_Terrestrial_CH_index_maps.pdf.

Table 4. List of NWAO DPS loggerhead critical habitat in the terrestrial habitat Florida and ownership.

Critical Habitat Unit	Length of Unit in kilometers (miles)	Federal Lands	State Lands	Private and Other (counties and municipalities)
LOGG-T-FL-01: South Duval County Beaches–County line at Duval and St. Johns Counties	11.5 (7.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	11.5 (7.1)
LOGG-T-FL-02: Fort Matanzas National Monument, St. Johns County	1.4 (0.9)	1.4 (0.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-03: River to Sea Preserve at Marineland — North Peninsula State Park, Flagler and Volusia Counties	31.8 (19.8)	0 (0)	6.1 (3.8) North Peninsula State Park, Washington Oaks Garden State Park (in Guana Tolomato Matanzas NERR), and Gamble Rogers Memorial State Recreation Area at Flagler Beach	25.7 (16.0)
LOGG-T-FL-04: Canaveral National Seashore North, Volusia County	18.2 (11.3)	18.2 (11.3) Canaveral National Seashore	0 (0)	0 (0)

Critical Habitat Unit	Length of Unit in kilometers (miles)	Federal Lands	State Lands	Private and Other (counties and municipalities)
LOGG-T-FL-05: Canaveral National Seashore South — Merritt Island NWR-Kennedy Space, Brevard County	28.4 (17.6)	28.4 (17.6) includes Canaveral National Seashore (Brevard portion) and Merritt Island NWR/KSC	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-06: Central Brevard Beaches, Brevard County	19.5 (12.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	19.5 (12.1)
LOGG-T-FL-07: South Brevard Beaches, Brevard County	20.8 (12.9)	4.2 (2.6) Archie Carr NWR	1.5 (1.0) Sebastian Inlet State Park	15.0 (9.3)
LOGG-T-FL-08: Sebastian Inlet — Indian River Shores, Indian River County	4.1 (2.5)	0.9 (0.6) Archie Carr NWR	3.2 (2.0) Sebastian Inlet State Park	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-09: Fort Pierce Inlet — St. Lucie Inlet, St. Lucie and Martin Counties	35.2 (21.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	35.2 (21.9)
LOGG-T-FL-10: St. Lucie Inlet — Jupiter Inlet, Martin and Palm Beach Counties	24.9 (15.5)	4.8 (3.0) Hobe Sound NWR	3.7 (2.3) St. Lucie Inlet Preserve State Park	16.4 (10.2)
LOGG-T-FL-11: Jupiter Inlet — Lake Worth Inlet, Palm Beach County	18.8 (11.7)	0 (0)	2.5 (1.5) John D. MacArthur Beach State Park	16.3 (10.1)

Critical Habitat Unit	Length of Unit in kilometers (miles)	Federal Lands	State Lands	Private and Other (counties and municipalities)
LOGG-T-FL-12: Lake Worth Inlet — Boynton Inlet, Palm Beach County	24.3 (15.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	24.3 (15.1)
LOGG-T-FL-13: Boynton Inlet — Boca Raton Inlet, Palm Beach County	22.6 (14.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	22.6 (14.1)
LOGG-T-FL-14: Boca Raton Inlet — Hillsboro Inlet, Palm Beach and Broward Counties	8.3 (5.2)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8.3 (5.2)
LOGG-T-FL-15: Long Key, Monroe County	4.2 (2.6)	0 (0)	4.2 (2.6) Long Key State Park	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-16: Bahia Honda Key, Monroe County	3.7 (2.3)	0 (0)	3.7 (2.3) Bahia Honda Key State Park	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-17: Longboat Key, Manatee and Sarasota Counties	16.0 (9.9)	0 (0)	0 (0)	16.0 (9.9)
LOGG-T-FL-18: Siesta and Casey Keys, Sarasota County	20.8 (13.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	20.8 (13.0)
LOGG-T-FL-19: Venice Beaches and Manasota Key, Sarasota and Charlotte Counties	26.0 (16.1)	0 (0)	1.9 (1.2) Stump Pass Beach State Park	24.1 (15.0)

Critical Habitat Unit	Length of Unit in kilometers (miles)	Federal Lands	State Lands	Private and Other (counties and municipalities)
LOGG-T-FL-20: Knight, Don Pedro, and Little Gasparilla Islands, Charlotte County	10.8 (6.7)	0 (0)	1.9 (1.2) Don Pedro Island State Park	8.9 (5.5)
LOGG-T-FL-21: Gasparilla Island, Charlotte and Lee Counties	11.2 (6.9)	0 (0)	1.5 (1.0) Gasparilla Island State Park	9.6 (6.0)
LOGG-T-FL-22: Cayo Costa, Lee County	13.5 (8.4)	0 (0)	13.2 (8.2) Cayo Costa State Park	0.3 (0.2)
LOGG-T-FL-23: Captiva Island, Lee County	7.6 (4.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	7.6 (4.7)
LOGG-T-FL-24: Sanibel Island West, Lee County	12.2 (7.6)	0 (0)	0 (0)	12.2 (7.6)
LOGG-T-FL-25: Little Hickory Island, Lee and Collier Counties	8.7 (5.4)	0 (0)	0 (0)	8.7 (5.4)
LOGG-T-FL-26: Wiggins Pass — Clam Pass, Collier County	7.7 (4.8)	0 (0)	2.0 (1.2) Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park	5.7 (3.6)
LOGG-T-FL-27: Clam Pass — Doctors Pass, Collier County	4.9 (3.0)	0 (0)	0 (0)	4.9 (3.0)
LOGG-T-FL-28: Keewaydin Island and Sea Oat Island, Collier County	13.1 (8.1)	0 (0)	12.4 (7.7) Rookery Bay NERR	0.7 (0.5)
LOGG-T-FL-29: Cape Romano, Collier County	9.2 (5.7)	0 (0)	7.2 (4.5) Rookery Bay NERR	2.0 (1.2)

Critical Habitat Unit	Length of Unit in kilometers (miles)	Federal Lands	State Lands	Private and Other (counties and municipalities)
LOGG-T-FL-30: Ten Thousand Islands North, Collier County	7.8 (4.9)	2.9 (1.8) Ten Thousand Islands NWR	4.9 (3.1) Rookery Bay NERR	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-31: Highland Beach, Monroe County	7.2 (4.5)	7.2 (4.5) Everglades National Park	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-32: Graveyard Creek — Shark Point, Monroe County	0.9 (0.6)	0.9 (0.6) Everglades National Park	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-33: Cape Sable, Monroe County	21.3 (13.2)	21.3 (13.2) Everglades National Park	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-34: Dry Tortugas, Monroe County	5.7 (3.6)	5.7 (3.6) Dry Tortugas National Park	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-35: Marquesas Keys, Monroe County	5.6 (3.5)	5.6 (3.5) Key West NWR	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-36: Boca Grande Key, Monroe County	1.3 (0.8)	1.3 (0.8) Key West NWR	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-37: Woman Key, Monroe County	1.3 (0.8)	1.3 (0.8) Key West NWR	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-38: Perdido Key, Escambia County	20.2 (12.6)	11.0 (6.8) Gulf Islands National Seashore	2.5 (1.6) Perdido Key State Park	6.7 (4.2)
LOGG-T-FL-39: Mexico Beach and St. Joe Beach, Bay and Gulf Counties	18.7 (11.7)	0 (0)	0 (0)	18.7 (11.7)

Critical Habitat Unit	Length of Unit in kilometers (miles)	Federal Lands	State Lands	Private and Other (counties and municipalities)
LOGG-T-FL-40: St. Joseph Peninsula, Gulf County	23.5 (14.6)	0 (0)	15.5 (9.7) T.H. Stone Memorial St. Joseph Peninsula State Park and St. Joe Bay State Buffer Preserve	8.0 (4.9)
LOST-T-FL-41: Cape San Blas, Gulf County	11.0 (6.8)	0 (0)	0.1 (0.1) St. Joseph Bay State Buffer Preserve	10.8 (6.7)
LOGG-T-FL-42: St. Vincent Island, Franklin County	15.1 (9.4)	15.1 (9.4) St. Vincent NWR	0 (0)	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-43: Little St. George Island, Franklin County	15.4 (9.6)	0 (0)	15.4 (9.6) Apalachicola NERR	0 (0)
LOGG-T-FL-44: St. George Island, Franklin County:	30.7 (19.1)	0 (0)	14.0 (8.7) Dr. Julian G. Bruce St. George Island State Park	16.7 (10.4)
LOGG-T-FL-45: Dog Island, Franklin County	13.1 (8.1)	0 (0)	0 (0)	13.1 (8.1)
Florida State Totals	**637.1 (396.4)**	**130.3 (81.0)**	**117.4.0 (72.9)**	**390.3 (242.6)**

The primary constituent elements (PCEs) for loggerhead terrestrial critical habitat are those specific elements of the biological and physical features (BPF) that provide for the species' life-history processes and are essential to the conservation of the species. PBFs include those habitat components that support foraging, roosting, and sheltering and the physical features necessary for maintaining the natural processes that support these habitat components. The PBFs and PCEs are described as follows:

Physical and Biological Features (PBF):

PBF 1: Sites for Breeding, Reproduction, or Rearing (or Development) of Offspring

PBF 2: Habitats Protected from Disturbance or Representative of the Historical, Geographic, and Ecological Distributions of the Species

Primary Constituent Elements (PCE):

(1) Suitable nesting beach habitat that has (a) relatively unimpeded nearshore access from the ocean to the beach for nesting females and from the beach to the ocean for both post-nesting females and hatchlings and (b) is located above MHW to avoid being inundated frequently by high tides.

(2) Sand that (a) allows for suitable nest construction, (b) is suitable for facilitating gas diffusion conducive to embryo development, and (c) is able to develop and maintain temperatures and a moisture content conducive to embryo development.

(3) Suitable nesting beach habitat with sufficient darkness to ensure nesting turtles are not deterred from emerging onto the beach and allows hatchlings and post-nesting females to orient successfully to the sea.

(4) Natural coastal processes or artificially created or maintained habitat mimicking natural conditions.

Substantial amounts of sand are deposited along Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean beaches to protect coastal properties in anticipation of preventing erosion and to mimic what otherwise would be natural processes of overwash and island migration. Constructed beaches tend to differ from natural beaches in several important ways for sea turtles. They are typically wider, flatter, and more compacted, and the sediments are moister than those on natural beaches (Nelson *et al*. 1987; Ackerman *et al.* 1991; Ernest and Martin 1999).

Regarding PCE 1 and PCE 4 for sand placement projects, construction on the beach during sea turtle nesting and hatching season can obstruct nesting females from accessing the beach and hatchlings from entering the water unimpeded. To minimize these impacts, the Corps has agreed to avoid construction during peak nesting and hatching season in the higher density beaches within the entire NWAO DPS of the loggerhead sea turtle as described. This SPBO includes required terms and conditions that minimize incidental take of turtles and reduces the impacts to the PCE 3 by limiting activities at night and placing equipment and staging areas off the nesting beach.

More nests are washed out on the wide, flat beaches resulting from sand placement than narrower steeply sloped natural beaches. This phenomenon may persist through the second postconstruction year and results from the placement of nests near the seaward edge of the beach berm where dramatic profile changes, caused by erosion and scarping occur as the beach equilibrates to a more natural contour.

A study performed for the Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) promoted the test construction of a more “turtle-friendly” beach. The Service, along with the National Fish and Wildlife Foundation and the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), began a study to determine if statistically significant improvements in nesting success, nest densities, and/or hatchling production can be achieved through modifications to the traditional construction template for beach nourishment projects. It is anticipated that a more natural beach profile will reduce the incidence of scarping, improve nesting success, and reduce the proportion of nests placed along the seaward portion of the berm (those at increased risk of being lost to erosion

during profile equilibration), relative to a traditionally built beach. The Corps remains committed to incorporating the results of this study into future design templates.

A significantly larger proportion of turtles emerging on engineered beaches abandon their nesting attempts than turtles emerging on natural or prenourished beaches, even though more nesting habitat is available (Trindell *et al*. 1998; Ernest and Martin 1999; Herren 1999), with nesting success approximately 10 to 34 percent lower on nourished beaches than on control beaches during the first year post-nourishment. This reduction in nesting success is most pronounced during the first year following project construction and is most likely the result of changes in physical beach characteristics (beach profile, sediment grain size, beach compaction, frequency and extent of escarpments) associated with the nourishment project (Ernest and Martin 1999). This directly impacts PCE 2 above; however, on severely eroded sections of beach, where little or no suitable nesting habitat exists, and sand placement can result in increased nesting (Ernest and Martin 1999). The placement of sand on a beach with reduced dry foredune habitat may increase sea turtle nesting habitat if the placed sand is highly compatible (i.e., grain size, shape, color, etc.) with naturally occurring beach sediments in the area, and compaction and escarpment remediation measures are incorporated into the project. In addition, a nourished beach that is designed and constructed to mimic a natural beach system may benefit sea turtles more than the eroding beach it replaces.

Regarding PCE 3, during construction, any lights directly visible on the beach during the nesting and hatching seasons are minimized by shielding and directing the lights downward and away from the nesting beach as required in the Terms and Conditions of this SPBO.

The newly created wider and flatter beach berm exposes sea turtles and their nests to lights that were less visible, or not visible, from nesting areas before the sand placement activity leading to a higher probability of hatchling mortality due to disorientation. Changing to sea turtle compatible lighting can be accomplished at the local level through voluntary compliance or by adopting appropriate regulations. The Terms and Conditions in the Biological Opinion require a lighting survey prior to construction and post construction to determine the additional level of impacts as a result of the proposed project. The Terms and Conditions include working with the local sponsor to minimize the impacts of lighting as a result of the proposed project.

The Service has determined that with the incorporation of the conservation measures as described above, that the proposed projects will not adversely affect nor adversely modify the terrestrial critical habitat of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean loggerhead sea turtle population.

Migratory Birds

In order to comply with the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 U.S.C. 701 *et seq*.) and reduce the potential for this project to impact nesting shorebirds, the Corps or the Applicant should follow the latest Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) standard guidelines to protect

against impacts to nesting shorebirds during implementation of this project during the periods from February 15 to August 31.

Consultation History

1980s and 1990s — Beach nourishment projects in Florida began to occur frequently in the late 1980s and early 1990s. During that time, sea turtle protection measures were developed based on research findings available at that time. These measures addressed sand compaction, escarpment formation, and timing restrictions for projects in six south Florida counties with high nesting densities. In the mid-1990s, a sea turtle Biological Opinion (BO) template was developed that included protection measures and information on the status of sea turtles. In 1995, an expanded version of the sea turtle template BO was developed to incorporate new guidance on the required format for BOs and a biological rationale for the Terms and Conditions to be imposed. This document underwent review by four State conservation agencies and the Corps, and was subsequently revised. The primary purposes of the template BO were to: (1) incorporate a standardized format and language required for use in all BOs based on guidance from the Service's Washington Office, (2) assist Service biologists in the preparation of BOs, (3) increase consistency among Service field offices, and (4) increase consistency between the Service and the State agencies.

March 7 and 8, 2006 — The Corps met with the Services' three Florida field office representatives, a representative of the FWC, and a representative of the FDEP. The purpose of that meeting was to begin discussions about a regional consultation for sand placement activities along the coast of Florida and preparation of a PBA for sand placement activities in Florida. In addition to sea turtles, other Federal and state protected species were included in the discussions. At that meeting, the following topics were discussed:

1. Sand placement activities;
2. Sand source and placement methods;
3. Species and habitat;
4. Geographic scope;
5. Information availability; and
6. Minimization of impacts.

July 13, 2006 — A second meeting was held to further discuss the draft PBA. The Service provided the Corps with copies of the latest BO templates for each species to be considered. The Service held conference calls with the species recovery leads during August 2006.

October 16, 2006 The Service received the draft PBA via email from the Corps for sand placement activities along the coast of Florida.

October 27, 2006 The Service provided the Corps with draft comments on the PBA via email.

October 31, 2006 The Corps provided a response to the Service's comments on the PBA via email.

November 9, 2006 The Service and the Corps held a conference call to discuss the comments.

December 20, 2006 The Service sent the Corps a letter with the final comments on the draft PBA.

September 18 and 19, 2007
The Corps met with the Services' three Florida field office representatives, a representative of the FWC, and a representative of the FDEP. The purpose of this meeting was to discuss the Terms and Conditions to be included in the BO.

October 5, 2007 The Service sent the Corps, via email, the modifications to the draft Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions for the sea turtles and beach mice as discussed in the previous meeting.

November 1, 2007 The Corps provided the Service with comments via email on the revised Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions for the sea turtles and beach mice.

March 31, 2008 The Service revised the Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions for the sea turtles and beach mice. The Service also revised the minimization measures for the manatee. The revisions were sent to the Corps.

September 16, 2008 The Service sent the Corps via mail the draft SPBO.

October 2, 2008 The Corps provided the Service via email with a summary of the remaining issues concerning the Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions for the sea turtles and beach mice.

October 15, 2008 The Service sent the Corps, via email, the modifications to the draft Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions for the sea turtles and beach mice as discussed in the previous email.

March 11, 2009	The Service received via email examples of previous agreements between the Corps and the local sponsor to carry out the Terms and Conditions in previous BOs.
April 7, 2009	The Service sent an email to the Corps with an update of the progress of our analysis of including piping plovers in the SPBO.
August 26, 2009	The Service sent to the Corps via email the latest Terms and Conditions for sea turtles and beach mice.
September 17, 2009	The Corps sent an email to the Service describing the actions to be taken for the completion and submittal of the PBA.
January 6, 2010	The Corps and the Service participated in a meeting to finalize the draft SPBO.
January 21, 2010	The Corps sent to the Service via email the revised draft PBA.
March 25, 2010	The Corps and the Service participated in an implementation meeting and submittal of the final PBA.
February 22, 2011	The Corps submitted the final PBA to the Service.
April 18, 2011	The Service sent the final Statewide PBO to the Corps.
June 21, 2010	The Corps provided written concerns with the final Statewide PBO
June 30, 2011	The Service revised the final Statewide PBO.
July 18, 2011	The Corps provided written agreement with the changes that were made and asked for additional changes.
July 22, 2011	The Service made additional revisions per the Corps request.
July 25, 2011	The Corps provided written agreement with the additional revisions.
March 25, 2013	The Service published the proposed rule for loggerhead terrestrial critical habitat.
March 3, 2014	The Corps contacted the Service on revising the SPBO to include loggerhead critical habitat in the terrestrial environment.
August 25, 2014	The Service provided the Corps with a Draft Revised SPBO

September 4, 2014	The Corps and Service met and discussed the Draft Revised SPBO at the annual SPBO meeting.
October 23, 2014	The Service received a letter from the Corps requesting the SPBO be revised to include loggerhead critical habitat.
November 3, 2014	The Service sent a draft Revised SPBO to the Corps for review and comment
November 20, 2014	The Corps agreed with the changes made to the draft Revised SPBO
November 24, 2014	The Corps submitted proposed section 7(a)(1) conservation recommendations
January 30, 2014	The Corps and Service agreed on proposed section 7(a)(1) conservation recommendations and finalized draft revised SPBO

This SPBO is based on the PBA, and information provided during meetings and discussions with the Corps' representatives and information from the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWC/FWRI) sea turtle databases. A complete administrative record of this consultation is on file in the Service's North Florida, Panama City, and South Florida Ecological Services Offices.

BIOLOGICAL OPINION

DESCRIPTION OF THE PROPOSED ACTION

The proposed action includes all activities associated with the placement of compatible sediment on beaches of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of Florida encompassing both South Atlantic Jacksonville (SAJ) and South Atlantic Mobile (SAM) Corps Districts. Additionally, the proposed action includes the replacement and rehabilitation of groins that are included as design components of beach projects for longer retention time and stabilization of associated sediment placed on the beach. This SPBO includes projects authorized through the Corps Regulatory Program, and funded or carried out as part of its Civil Works program. Corps Regulatory activities may include the involvement of other Federal agencies, such as the Department of Defense, Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, and the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA). The shore protection activities covered in the SPBO encompass the following shore protection activities:

1. Sand placement originating from Dredged Material Management Areas (DMMAs), offshore borrow sites, and other compatible sand sources;
2. Sand placement as an associated authorization of sand extraction from the outer continental shelf by the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management;

3. Sand washed onto the beach from being placed in the swash zone;
4. Sand by-passing/back-passing (sand discharge on beach);
5. Current Operations and Maintenance (O&M) dredging of navigation channels with beach disposal (does not include new navigation projects or expansion (deepening or widening) of existing authorized navigation projects); and
6. Groins and jetty repair or replacement.

For nearshore borrow sites, the Corps must provide information to the Service on the sand flow when this sand is removed from these nearshore areas. If removal of sand from these nearshore areas is shown to cause increased erosion on the adjacent beach, a separate consultation will be required.

A detailed description of each activity is found in the final PBA. The history of shore protection activities throughout the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of Florida is extensive and consists of a myriad of actions performed by local, State, and Federal entities. Future beach placement actions addressed in this SPBO may include maintenance of these existing projects or beaches that have not experienced a history of beach placement activities.

The Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) share Federal jurisdiction for sea turtles under the Act. The Service has responsibility for sea turtles on the nesting beach. NMFS has jurisdiction for sea turtles in the marine environment. This SPBO only addresses activities that may impact nesting sea turtles, their nests and eggs, and hatchlings as they emerge from the nest and crawl to the sea. NMFS will assess and consult with the Corps concerning potential impacts to sea turtles in the marine environment and the shoreline updrift and downdrift area of the project.

Corps Commitments as listed in the final PBA

The following paragraph from the final PBA summarizes the Corps' Commitments as listed below:

"For Corps projects, please note that "fish and wildlife enhancement" activities (which are beyond mitigation of project impacts) must be authorized as a project purpose or project feature or must be otherwise approved through Corps headquarters (Engineer Regulation ER 1105-2-100 Appendix G, Amendment #1, 30 Jun 2004). At the present time, no beach fill placement or shore protection activity in Florida has fish and wildlife enhancement as a project purpose or project feature. Since adding fish and wildlife enhancement as a project purpose or feature is not a budgetary priority (ER 1105-2-100 22 Apr 2000, Appendix C, part C-3b.(3)), authorization and funding for such is not expected."

<u>Sea Turtles</u>

1. Avoid construction during the peak nesting and hatching season in the higher density beaches, and to the maximum extent practicable during all other nesting times and locations;

2. Except for O&M disposal actions, implement sea turtle nest monitoring and relocation plan during construction if nesting window cannot be adhered to;

3. Except for O&M disposal actions, escarpments that are identified prior to or during the nesting season that interfere with sea turtle nesting (exceed 18 inches in height for a distance of 100 feet) can be leveled to the natural beach for a given area. If it is determined that escarpment leveling is required during the nesting or hatching season, leveling actions should be directed by the Service. For Corps Civil Works projects, leveling of escarpments would be limited to the term of the construction or as otherwise may be authorized and funded;

4. Placement of pipe parallel to the shoreline and as far landward as possible so that a significant portion of available nesting habitat can be utilized, nest placement is not subject to inundation or washout, and turtles do not become trapped landward of the pipe;

5. Temporary storage of pipes and equipment will be located off the beach to the maximum extent possible;

6. The Corps will continue to work with the FDEP to identify aspects of beach nourishment construction templates that negatively impact sea turtles and develop and implement alternative design criteria that may minimize these impacts;

7. Except for O&M disposal actions, Service compaction assessment guidelines will be followed and tilling will be performed where appropriate. For Corps Civil Works projects, assessment of compaction and tilling will be limited to the term of the construction or as otherwise may be authorized and funded; and

8. All lighting associated with project construction will be minimized to the maximum extent possible, through reduction, shielding, angling, etc., while maintaining compliance with all Corps, U.S. Coast Guard, and OSHA safety requirements.

<u>Beach Mice</u>

1. Pipeline routes for beach construction projects will avoid identified primary constituent elements for beach mouse critical habitat to the maximum extent practicable;

2. Implementation of a trapping and relocation plan if avoidance alternatives of occupied habitat are not practical; and

3. Implementation of a lighting plan to reduce, shield, lower, angle, etc. light sources in order to minimize illumination impacts on nocturnal beach mice during construction.

Action Area

The Service has described the action area to include sandy beaches of the Atlantic Coast of Florida (Key West to Fernandina/Kings Bay) and the Gulf Coast (Ten Thousand Islands to Alabama State

Line) for reasons that will be explained and discussed in the "EFFECTS OF THE ACTION" section of this consultation.

Underlying Dynamics of a Barrier Island

Of all the states and provinces in North America, Florida is most intimately linked with the sea. Florida's 1,200-mile coastline (exclusive of the Keys) is easily the longest in the continental U.S. Of the 1,200 miles, 745 miles are sandy and mostly in the form of barrier islands. The coastline is dynamic and constantly changing as a result of waves, wind, tides, currents, sea level change, and storms. The entire state lies within the coastal plain, with a maximum elevation of about 400 feet, and no part is more than 60 miles from the Atlantic Ocean or Gulf of Mexico.

The east coast of Florida consists of a dynamic shoreline, with a relatively sloped berm, coarse-grained sand, and moderate to high surf (Witherington 1986). The southeast coast of Florida consists of continuous, narrow, sandy barrier islands bordering a narrow continental shelf (Wanless and Maier 2007). The dynamics of the east coast shoreline are due to the occurrence of storm surges and seas from tropical storms that occur mainly during August through early October. More erosion events can also occur during late September through March due to nor'easters. The impacts of these two types of storms may vary from event to event and year to year.

Northwest (panhandle) and Southwest Florida beaches are considered to be low energy beaches with a gradual offshore slope and low sloped fine grained quartz sand beaches. As along the east coast of Florida, the shoreline dynamics are shaped by tropical storms and hurricanes. Although Gulf beaches may experience winter erosion, they are largely protected from the severe nor'easters.

Coasts with greater tidal ranges are more buffered against storm surges than are those with low tidal ranges, except when the storm strikes during high tide. Mean tidal ranges decrease southward along the Atlantic coast from a mean of seven feet at the Florida-Georgia line to less than two feet in Palm Beach County. The mean tidal range along the Gulf Coast is less than three feet (microtidal) except in the extreme south where it ranges from three to four feet. Because of its lower elevation and lower wave energy regime, the West Coast of the peninsula is subject to greater changes during storm events than is the east coast.

Microtidal coasts have a high vulnerability to sea level rise and barrier islands respond by migrating landward. Migration occurs as a result of overwash from extreme storms that flatten topography and deposit sand on the backside of the island, extending the island landward (Young 2007). Significant widening can occur from a single storm event. For example, Dauphin Island, a barrier island in Alabama, has nearly doubled its width following Hurricanes Ivan and Katrina in 2004 and 2005, respectively.

Sea level has risen globally approximately 7.1 inches in the past century (Douglas 1997). Climate models predict a doubling of the rate of sea level rise over the next 100 years (Pendleton *et al.* 2004). Recent studies indicate a trend toward increasing hurricane number and intensity (Emanuel

2005, Webster *et al.* 2005). Barrier islands need to be able to move and respond to these conditions. By locking in a barrier island's location with infrastructure, the island loses its ability to migrate to higher elevations which can lead to its eventual collapse (Moore 2007).

Overwash from less intense storms can positively affect island topography. Low natural berms can develop along beach fronts, but generally can be exceeded by overwash from frontal storms. The berm is an accretionary feature at the landward extreme of wave influence. Sediment is transported over the berm crest and is deposited in a nearshore overwash fan and in breach corridors. Overwash deposition provides source sand for re-establishing dunes. Onshore winds transport the sediment from overwash fans to the dunes, gradually building back dune elevation during storm-free periods.

The interaction between the biology and geomorphology of barrier islands is complex. Just as the barrier island undergoes a process of continual change, so do the ecological communities present. Vegetation zones gradually re-establish following storms, and in turn affect physical processes such as sand accretion, erosion, and overwash. The beach front, dunes, and overwash areas all provide important habitat components. Many barrier island species are adapted to respond positively to periodic disturbance. As the island widens, new feeding habitat (sand/mud flats) is created for shorebirds such as the piping plover. The beaches provide nesting habitat for sea turtles. Early colonizer plants are favored as a food source by beach mice. These barrier island habitats are becoming increasingly rare as our Nation's coastlines rapidly develop and are stabilized.

SEA TURTLES

STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT

The Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) share Federal jurisdiction for sea turtles under the Act. The Service has responsibility for sea turtles on the nesting beach. NMFS has jurisdiction for sea turtles in the marine environment. This SPBO addresses nesting sea turtles, their nests and eggs, and hatchlings as they emerge from the nest and crawl to the sea. Five species of sea turtles are analyzed in this SPBO: the loggerhead, green, leatherback, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley.

<u>Loggerhead Sea Turtle</u>

The loggerhead sea turtle was federally listed as a threatened species on July 28, 1978 (43 *Federal Register* [*FR*] 32800). The Service and the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) listed the Northwest Atlantic Ocean distinct population segment (DPS) of the loggerhead sea turtle as threatened on September 22, 2011 (76 *FR* 58868). The loggerhead occurs throughout the temperate and tropical regions of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans.

The loggerhead sea turtle grows to an average weight of about 200 pounds and is characterized by a large head with blunt jaws. Adults and subadults have a reddish-brown carapace. Scales on the top of the head and top of the flippers are also reddish-brown with yellow on the borders. Hatchlings are a dull brown color (NMFS 2009a). The loggerhead feeds on mollusks, crustaceans, fish, and other marine animals.

The loggerhead may be found hundreds of miles out to sea, as well as in inshore areas such as bays, lagoons, salt marshes, creeks, ship channels, and the mouths of large rivers. Coral reefs, rocky places, and ship wrecks are often used as feeding areas.

Within the Northwest Atlantic, the majority of nesting activity occurs from April through September, with a peak in June and July (Williams-Walls *et al*. 1983, Dodd 1988, Weishampel *et al*. 2006). Nesting occurs within the Northwest Atlantic along the coasts of North America, Central America, northern South America, the Antilles, Bahamas, and Bermuda, but is concentrated in the southeastern U.S. and on the Yucatán Peninsula in Mexico on open beaches or along narrow bays having suitable sand (Sternberg 1981, Ehrhart 1989, Ehrhart *et al*. 2003, NMFS and Service 2008).

Critical habitat has been designated for the NWAO DPS of the loggerhead sea turtle. **Table 4** has the list of the critical habitat units within the project area.

Green Sea Turtle

The green sea turtle was federally listed on July 28, 1978 (43 *FR* 32800). Breeding populations of the green turtle in Florida and along the Pacific Coast of Mexico are listed as endangered; all other populations are listed as threatened. The green sea turtle has a worldwide distribution in tropical and subtropical waters.

The green sea turtle grows to a maximum size of about four feet and a weight of 440 pounds. It has a heart-shaped shell, small head, and single-clawed flippers. The carapace is smooth and colored gray, green, brown and black. Hatchlings are black on top and white on the bottom (NMFS 2009b). Hatchling green turtles eat a variety of plants and animals, but adults feed almost exclusively on seagrasses and marine algae.

Major green turtle nesting colonies in the Atlantic occur on Ascension Island, Aves Island, Costa Rica, and Surinam. Within the U.S., green turtles nest in small numbers in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico, and in larger numbers along the east coast of Florida, particularly in Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties (NMFS and Service 1991). Nesting also has been documented along the Gulf coast of Florida from Escambia County through Santa Rosa County in northwest Florida and from Pinellas County through Collier County in southwest Florida (FWC 2009a).

Most green turtles spend the majority of their lives in coastal foraging grounds. These areas include fairly shallow waters both open coastline and protected bays and lagoons. While in these

areas, green turtles rely on marine algae and seagrass as their primary diet constituents, although some populations also forage heavily on invertebrates. These marine habitats are often highly dynamic and in areas with annual fluctuations in seawater and air temperatures, which can cause the distribution and abundance of potential green turtle food items to vary substantially between seasons and years (Carballo *et al.*, 2002). Many prey species that are abundant during winter and spring periods become patchy during warm summer periods. Some species may altogether vanish during extreme temperatures, such as those that occur during El Niño Southern Oscillation events (Carballo *et al.*, 2002).

Open beaches with a sloping platform and minimal disturbance are required for nesting.

Critical habitat for the green sea turtle has been designated for the waters surrounding Culebra Island, Puerto Rico, and its outlying keys.

Leatherback Sea Turtle

The leatherback sea turtle was federally listed as an endangered species on June 2, 1970 (35 *FR* 8491). Leatherbacks have the widest distribution of the sea turtles; nonbreeding animals have been recorded as far north as the British Isles and the Maritime Provinces of Canada and as far south as Argentina and the Cape of Good Hope (Pritchard 1992). Foraging leatherback excursions have been documented into higher-latitude subpolar waters. They have evolved physiological and anatomical adaptations (Frair *et al.* 1972, Greer *et al.* 1973) that allow them to exploit waters far colder than any other sea turtle species would be capable of surviving.

The adult leatherback can reach four to eight feet in length and weigh 500 to 2,000 pounds. The carapace is distinguished by a rubber-like texture, about 1.6 inches thick, made primarily of tough, oil-saturated connective tissue. Hatchlings are dorsally mostly black and are covered with tiny scales; the flippers are edged in white, and rows of white scales appear as stripes along the length of the back (NMFS 2009c). Jellyfish are the main staple of its diet, but it is also known to feed on sea urchins, squid, crustaceans, tunicates, fish, blue-green algae, and floating seaweed. This is the largest, deepest diving of all sea turtle species.

Leatherback turtle nesting grounds are distributed worldwide in the Atlantic, Pacific and Indian Oceans on beaches in the tropics and sub-tropics. The Pacific Coast of Mexico historically supported the world's largest known concentration of nesting leatherbacks.

The leatherback turtle regularly nests in the U.S. Caribbean in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. Along the U.S. Atlantic coast, most nesting occurs in Florida (NMFS and Service 1992). Leatherback nesting has also been reported on the northwest coast of Florida (LeBuff 1990, FWC 2009a); and in southwest Florida a false crawl (nonnesting emergence) has been observed on Sanibel Island (LeBuff 1990). Nesting has also been reported in Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina (Rabon *et al.* 2003) and in Texas (Shaver 2008).

Adult females require sandy nesting beaches backed with vegetation and sloped sufficiently so the distance to dry sand is limited. Their preferred beaches have proximity to deep water and generally rough seas.

Marine and terrestrial critical habitat for the leatherback sea turtle has been designated at Sandy Point on the western end of the island of St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands (50 Code of Federal Regulations (CFR) 17.95).

Hawksbill Sea Turtle

The hawksbill sea turtle was federally listed as an endangered species on June 2, 1970 (35 *FR* 8491). The hawksbill is found in tropical and subtropical seas of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans. The species is widely distributed in the Caribbean Sea and western Atlantic Ocean.

Data collected in the Wider Caribbean reported that hawksbills typically weigh around 176 pounds or less; hatchlings average about 1.6 inches straight length and range in weight from 0.5 to 0.7 ounces. The carapace is heart shaped in young turtles, and becomes more elongated or egg-shaped with maturity. The top scutes are often richly patterned with irregularly radiating streaks of brown or black on an amber background. The head is elongated and tapers sharply to a point. The lower jaw is V-shaped (NMFS 2009d).

Within the continental U.S., hawksbill sea turtle nesting is rare and is restricted to the southeastern coast of Florida (Volusia through Miami-Dade Counties) and the Florida Keys (Monroe County) (Meylan 1992, Meylan *et al.* 1995). However, hawksbill tracks are difficult to differentiate from those of loggerheads and may not be recognized by surveyors. Therefore, surveys in Florida likely underestimate actual hawksbill nesting numbers (Meylan *et al.* 1995). In the U.S. Caribbean, hawksbill nesting occurs on beaches throughout Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands (NMFS and Service 1993).

Critical habitat for the hawksbill sea turtle has been designated for selected beaches and/or waters of Mona, Monito, Culebrita, and Culebra Islands, Puerto Rico.

Kemp’s Ridley Sea Turtle

The Kemp’s ridley sea turtle was federally listed as endangered on December 2, 1970 (35 *FR* 18320). The Kemp's ridley, along with the flatback sea turtle (*Natator depressus*), has the most geographically restricted distribution of any sea turtle species. The range of the Kemp’s ridley includes the Gulf coasts of Mexico and the U.S., and the Atlantic coast of North America as far north as Nova Scotia and Newfoundland.

Adult Kemp's ridleys, considered the smallest sea turtle in the world, weigh an average of 100 pounds with a carapace measuring between 24-28 inches in length. The almost circular carapace has a grayish green color while the plastron is pale yellowish to cream in color. The carapace is often as wide as it is long. Their diet consists mainly of swimming crabs, but may also include fish, jellyfish, and an array of mollusks.

The majority of nesting for the entire species occurs on the primary nesting beach at Rancho Nuevo, Mexico (Marquez-Millan 1994). Outside of nesting, adult Kemp's ridleys are believed to spend most of their time in the Gulf of Mexico, while juveniles and subadults also regularly occur along the eastern seaboard of the U.S. (Service and NMFS 1992). There have been rare instances when immature ridleys have been documented making transatlantic movements (Service and NMFS 1992). It was originally speculated that ridleys that make it out of the Gulf of Mexico might be lost to the breeding population (Hendrickson 1980), but data indicate that many of these

turtles are capable of moving back into the Gulf of Mexico (Henwood and Ogren 1987). In fact, there are documented cases of ridleys captured in the Atlantic that migrated back to the nesting beach at Rancho Nuevo (Schmid and Witzell 1997, Schmid 1998, Witzell 1998).

Hatchlings, after leaving the nesting beach, are believed to become entrained in eddies within the Gulf of Mexico, where they are dispersed within the Gulf and Atlantic by oceanic surface currents until they reach about 7.9 inches in length, at which size they enter coastal shallow water habitats (Ogren 1989).

No critical habitat has been designated for the Kemp's ridley sea turtle.

Life history

Loggerhead Sea Turtle

Loggerheads are long-lived, slow-growing animals that use multiple habitats across entire ocean basins throughout their life history. This complex life history encompasses terrestrial, nearshore, and open ocean habitats. The three basic ecosystems in which loggerheads live are the:

1. Terrestrial zone (supralittoral) - the nesting beach where both oviposition (egg laying) and embryonic development and hatching occur.

2. Neritic zone - the inshore marine environment (from the surface to the sea floor) where water depths do not exceed 656 feet (200 meters). The neritic zone generally includes the continental shelf, but in areas where the continental shelf is very narrow or nonexistent, the neritic zone conventionally extends to areas where water depths are less than 656 feet.

3. Oceanic zone - the vast open ocean environment (from the surface to the sea floor) where water depths are greater than 656 feet.

Maximum intrinsic growth rates of sea turtles are limited by the extremely long duration of the juvenile stage and fecundity. Loggerheads require high survival rates in the juvenile and adult stages, common constraints critical to maintaining long-lived, slow-growing species, to achieve positive or stable long-term population growth (Congdon *et al.* 1993, Heppell 1998, Crouse 1999, Heppell *et al.* 1999, 2003, Musick 1999).

The generalized life history of Atlantic loggerheads is shown in **Figure 1** (from Bolten 2003).



Figure 1. Life history stages of a loggerhead turtle. The boxes represent life stages and the corresponding ecosystems, solid lines represent movements between life stages and ecosystems, and dotted lines are speculative (Bolten 2003).

Numbers of nests and nesting females are often highly variable from year to year due to a number of factors including environmental stochasticity, periodicity in ocean conditions, anthropogenic effects, and density-dependent and density-independent factors affecting survival, somatic growth, and reproduction (Meylan 1982, Hays 2000, Chaloupka 2001, Solow *et al.* 2002). Despite these sources of variation, and because female turtles exhibit strong nest site fidelity, a nesting beach survey can provide a valuable assessment of changes in the adult female population, provided that the study is sufficiently long and effort and methods are standardized (Meylan 1982, Gerrodette and Brandon 2000, Reina *et al*. 2002). **Table 4** summarizes key life history characteristics for loggerheads nesting in the U.S.

Table 5. Typical values of life history parameters for loggerheads nesting in the U.S. (NMFS and Service 2008).

Life History Trait	Data
Clutch size (mean)	100-126 eggs[1]
Incubation duration (varies depending on time of year and latitude)	Range = 42-75 days[2,3]
Pivotal temperature (incubation temperature that produces an equal number of males and females)	84˚F[5]
Nest productivity (emerged hatchlings/total eggs) x 100 (varies depending on site specific factors)	45-70 percent[2,6]
Clutch frequency (number of nests/female/season)	3-4 nests[7]
Internesting interval (number of days between successive nests within a season)	12-15 days[8]
Juvenile (<34 inches Curved Carapace Length) sex ratio	65-70 percent female[4]
Remigration interval (number of years between successive nesting migrations)	2.5-3.7 years[9]
Nesting season	late April-early September
Hatching season	late June-early November
Age at sexual maturity	32-35 years[10]
Life span	>57 years[11]

[1] Dodd (1988).
[2] Dodd and Mackinnon (1999, 2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004).
[3] Witherington (2006) (information based on nests monitored throughout Florida beaches in 2005, n = 865).
[4] National Marine Fisheries Service (2001); Foley (2005).
[5] Mrosovsky (1988).
[6] Witherington (2006) (information based on nests monitored throughout Florida beaches in 2005, n = 1,680).
[7] Murphy and Hopkins (1984); Frazer and Richardson (1985); Hawkes *et al*. 2005; Scott 2006.
[8] Caldwell (1962), Dodd (1988).
[9] Richardson *et al.* (1978); Bjorndal *et al.* (1983).
[10] Snover (2005).
[11] Dahlen *et al.* (2000).

Loggerheads nest on ocean beaches and occasionally on estuarine shorelines with suitable sand. Nests are typically laid between the high tide line and the dune front (Routa 1968, Witherington

1986, Hailman and Elowson 1992). Wood and Bjorndal (2000) evaluated four environmental factors (slope, temperature, moisture, and salinity) and found that slope had the greatest influence on loggerhead nest-site selection on a beach in Florida. Loggerheads appear to prefer relatively narrow, steeply sloped, coarse-grained beaches, although nearshore contours may also play a role in nesting beach site selection (Mortimer 1982; Provancha and Ehrhart 1987).

The warmer the sand surrounding the egg chamber, the faster the embryos develop (Mrosovsky and Yntema 1980). Sand temperatures prevailing during the middle third of the incubation period also determine the sex of hatchling sea turtles (Mrosovsky and Yntema 1980). Incubation temperatures near the upper end of the tolerable range produce only female hatchlings while incubation temperatures near the lower end of the tolerable range produce only male hatchlings.

Loggerhead hatchlings pip and escape from their eggs over a one to three day interval and move upward and out of the nest over a two to four day interval (Christens 1990). The time from pipping to emergence ranges from four to seven days with an average of 4.1 days (Godfrey and Mrosovsky 1997). Hatchlings emerge from their nests en masse almost exclusively at night, and presumably using decreasing sand temperature as a cue (Hendrickson 1958, Mrosovsky 1968, Witherington *et al.* 1990). Moran *et al*. (1999) concluded that a lowering of sand temperatures below a critical threshold, which most typically occurs after nightfall, is the most probable trigger for hatchling emergence from a nest. After an initial emergence, there may be secondary emergences on subsequent nights (Carr and Ogren 1960, Witherington 1986, Ernest and Martin 1993, Houghton and Hays 2001).

Hatchlings use a progression of orientation cues to guide their movement from the nest to the marine environments where they spend their early years (Lohmann and Lohmann 2003). Hatchlings first use light cues to find the ocean. On naturally lighted beaches without artificial lighting, ambient light from the open sky creates a relatively bright horizon compared to the dark silhouette of the dune and vegetation landward of the nest. This contrast guides the hatchlings to the ocean (Daniel and Smith 1947, Limpus 1971, Salmon *et al.* 1992, Witherington and Martin 1996, Witherington 1997, Stewart and Wyneken 2004).

Loggerheads in the Northwest Atlantic display complex population structure based on life history stages. Based on mitochondrial deoxyribonucleic acid (mtDNA), oceanic juveniles show no structure, neritic juveniles show moderate structure and nesting colonies show strong structure (Bowen *et al*. 2005). In contrast, a survey using microsatellite (nuclear) markers showed no significant population structure among nesting populations (Bowen *et al*. 2005), indicating that while females exhibit strong philopatry, males may provide an avenue of gene flow between nesting colonies in this region.

Green Sea Turtle

Green sea turtles deposit from one to nine clutches within a nesting season, but the overall average is about 3.3 nests. The interval between nesting events within a season varies around a mean of about 13 days (Hirth 1997). Mean clutch size varies widely among populations. Average clutch size reported for Florida was 136 eggs in 130 clutches (Witherington and Ehrhart 1989). Only occasionally do females produce clutches in successive years. Usually two or more years intervene between breeding seasons (NMFS and Service 1991). Age at sexual maturity is believed to be 20 to 50 years (Hirth 1997).

Leatherback Sea Turtle

Leatherbacks nest an average of five to seven times within a nesting season, with an observed maximum of 11 nests (NMFS and Service 1992). The interval between nesting events within a season is about nine to 10 days. Clutch size averages 80 to 85 yolked eggs, with the addition of usually a few dozen smaller, yolkless eggs, mostly laid toward the end of the clutch (Pritchard 1992). Nesting migration intervals of two to three years were observed in leatherbacks nesting on the Sandy Point National Wildlife Refuge, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands (McDonald and Dutton 1996). Leatherbacks are believed to reach sexual maturity in six to 10 years (Zug and Parham 1996).

Hawksbill Sea Turtle

Hawksbills nest on average about 4.5 times per season at intervals of approximately 14 days (Corliss *et al.* 1989). In Florida and the U.S. Caribbean, clutch size is approximately 140 eggs, although several records exist of over 200 eggs per nest (NMFS and Service 1993). On the basis of limited information, nesting migration intervals of two to three years appear to predominate. Hawksbills are recruited into the reef environment at about 14 inches in length and are believed to begin breeding about 30 years later. However, the time required to reach 14 inches in length is unknown and growth rates vary geographically. As a result, actual age at sexual maturity is unknown.

Kemp’s Ridley Sea Turtle

Nesting occurs from April into July during which time the turtles appear off the Tamaulipas and Veracruz coasts of Mexico. Precipitated by strong winds, the females swarm to mass nesting emergences, known as “arribadas or arribazones,” to nest during daylight hours. The period between Kemp's ridley arribadas averages approximately 25 days (Rostal *et al.* 1997), but the precise timing of the arribadas is highly variable and unpredictable (Bernardo and Plotkin 2007). Clutch size averages 100 eggs and eggs typically take 45 to 58 days to hatch depending on temperatures (Marquez-Millan 1994, Rostal 2007).

Some females breed annually and nest an average of one to four times in a season at intervals of 10 to 28 days. Analysis by Rostal (2007) suggested that ridley females lay approximately 3.1 nests per nesting season. Interannual remigration rate for female ridleys is estimated to be

approximately 1.8 (Rostal 2007) to 2.0 years (Marquez-Millan *et al.* 1989). Age at sexual maturity is believed to be between 10 to 17 years (Snover *et al*. 2007).

Population dynamics

Loggerhead Sea Turtle

The loggerhead occurs throughout the temperate and tropical regions of the Atlantic, Pacific, and Indian Oceans. However, the majority of loggerhead nesting is at the western rims of the Atlantic and Indian Oceans. The most recent reviews show that only two loggerhead nesting beaches have greater than 10,000 females nesting per year (Baldwin *et al.* 2003, Ehrhart *et al.* 2003, Kamezaki *et al.* 2003, Limpus and Limpus 2003, Margaritoulis *et al.* 2003): South Florida (U.S.) and Masirah (Oman). Those beaches with 1,000 to 9,999 females nesting each year are Georgia through North Carolina (U.S.), Quintana Roo and Yucatán (Mexico), Cape Verde Islands (Cape Verde, eastern Atlantic off Africa), and Western Australia (Australia). Smaller nesting aggregations with 100 to 999 nesting females annually occur in the Northern Gulf of Mexico (U.S.), Dry Tortugas (U.S.), Cay Sal Bank (Bahamas), Sergipe and Northern Bahia (Brazil), Southern Bahia to Rio de Janerio (Brazil), Tongaland (South Africa), Mozambique, Arabian Sea Coast (Oman), Halaniyat Islands (Oman), Cyprus, Peloponnesus (Greece), Island of Zakynthos (Greece), Turkey, Queensland (Australia), and Japan.

The loggerhead is commonly found throughout the North Atlantic including the Gulf of Mexico, the northern Caribbean, the Bahamas archipelago, and eastward to West Africa, the western Mediterranean, and the west coast of Europe.

The major nesting concentrations in the U.S. are found in South Florida. However, loggerheads nest from Texas to Virginia. Total estimated nesting in Florida, where 90 percent of nesting occurs, has fluctuated between 52,374 and 98,602 nests per year from 2009-2013 (FWC 2014, http://myfwc.com/media/2786250/loggerheadnestingdata09-13.pdf). About 80 percent of loggerhead nesting in the southeast U.S. occurs in six Florida counties (Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties). Adult loggerheads are known to make considerable migrations between foraging areas and nesting beaches (Schroeder *et al.* 2003, Foley *et al.* 2008). During non-nesting years, adult females from U.S. beaches are distributed in waters off the eastern U.S. and throughout the Gulf of Mexico, Bahamas, Greater Antilles, and Yucatán.

From a global perspective, the U.S. nesting aggregation is of paramount importance to the survival of the species as is the population that nests on islands in the Arabian Sea off Oman (Ross 1982, Ehrhart 1989). The status of the Oman loggerhead nesting population, reported to be the largest in the world (Ross 1979), is uncertain because of the lack of long-term standardized nesting or foraging ground surveys and its vulnerability to increasing development pressures near major nesting beaches and threats from fisheries interaction on foraging grounds and migration routes (Possardt 2005). The loggerhead nesting aggregations in Oman and the U.S. account for the majority of nesting worldwide.

Green Sea Turtle

The majority of nesting occurs along the Atlantic coast of eastern central Florida, with an average of 10,377 each year from 2008 to 2012 (B. Witherington, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, pers. comm., 2013). In the U.S. Pacific, over 90 percent of nesting throughout the Hawaiian archipelago occurs at the French Frigate Shoals, where about 200 to 700 females nest each year (NMFS and Service 1998b). Elsewhere in the U.S. Pacific, nesting takes place at scattered locations in the Commonwealth of the Northern Marianas, Guam, and American Samoa. In the western Pacific, the largest green turtle nesting aggregation in the world occurs on Raine Island, Australia, where thousands of females nest nightly in an average nesting season (Limpus *et al.* 1993). In the Indian Ocean, major nesting beaches occur in Oman where 30,000 females are reported to nest annually (Ross and Barwani 1995).

Leatherback Sea Turtle

A dramatic drop in nesting numbers has been recorded on major nesting beaches in the Pacific. Spotila *et al.* (2000) have highlighted the dramatic decline and possible extirpation of leatherbacks in the Pacific.

The East Pacific and Malaysia leatherback populations have collapsed. Spotila *et al.* (1996) estimated that only 34,500 females nested annually worldwide in 1995, which is a dramatic decline from the 115,000 estimated in 1980 (Pritchard 1982). In the eastern Pacific, the major nesting beaches occur in Costa Rica and Mexico. At Playa Grande, Costa Rica, considered the most important nesting beach in the eastern Pacific, numbers have dropped from 1,367 leatherbacks in 1988-1989 to an average of 188 females nesting between 2000-2001 and 2003-2004. In Pacific Mexico, 1982 aerial surveys of adult female leatherbacks indicated this area had become the most important leatherback nesting beach in the world. Tens of thousands of nests were laid on the beaches in 1980s, but during the 2003-2004 seasons a total of 120 nests was recorded. In the western Pacific, the major nesting beaches lie in Papua New Guinea, Papua, Indonesia, and the Solomon Islands. These are some of the last remaining significant nesting assemblages in the Pacific. Compiled nesting data estimated approximately 5,000 to 9,200 nests annually with 75 percent of the nests being laid in Papua, Indonesia.

However, the most recent population size estimate for the North Atlantic alone is a range of 34,000 to 94,000 adult leatherbacks (TEWG 2007). In Florida, the number of nests has been increasing since 1979 (Stewart *et al.* 2011). The average annual number of nests in the 1980s was 63 nests, which rose to 263 nests in the 1990s and to 754 nests in the 2000s (Stewart *et al.* 2011). In 2012, 1,712 nests were recorded statewide (http://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/).

Nesting in the Southern Caribbean occurs in the Guianas (Guyana, Suriname, and French Guiana), Trinidad, Dominica, and Venezuela. The largest nesting populations at present occur in the western Atlantic in French Guiana with nesting varying between a low of 5,029 nests in 1967 to a high of 63,294 nests in 2005, which represents a 92 percent increase since 1967 (TEWG 2007). Trinidad supports an estimated 6,000 leatherbacks nesting annually, which represents more than 80

percent of the nesting in the insular Caribbean Sea. Leatherback nesting along the Caribbean Central American coast takes place between Honduras and Colombia. In Atlantic Costa Rica, at Tortuguero, the number of nests laid annually between 1995 and 2006 was estimated to range from 199 to 1,623.

In Puerto Rico, the main nesting areas are at Fajardo on the main island of Puerto Rico and on the island of Culebra. Between 1978 and 2005, annual population growth rate was estimated to be 1.10 percent (TEWG 2007). Recorded leatherback nesting on the Sandy Point National Wildlife Refuge on the island of St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands between 1990 and 2005, ranged from a low of 143 in 1990 to a high of 1,008 in 2001 (Garner *et al*. 2005). In the British Virgin Islands, annual nest numbers have increased in Tortola from zero to six nests per year in the late 1980s to 35 to 65 nests per year in the 2000s (TEWG 2007).

The most important nesting beach for leatherbacks in the eastern Atlantic lies in Gabon, Africa. It was estimated there were 30,000 nests along 60 miles of Mayumba Beach in southern Gabon during the 1999-2000 nesting season (Billes *et al*. 2000). Some nesting has been reported in Mauritania, Senegal, the Bijagos Archipelago of Guinea-Bissau, Turtle Islands and Sherbro Island of Sierra Leone, Liberia, Togo, Benin, Nigeria, Cameroon, Sao Tome and Principe, continental Equatorial Guinea, Islands of Corisco in the Gulf of Guinea and the Democratic Republic of the Congo, and Angola. In addition, a large nesting population is found on the island of Bioko (Equatorial Guinea) (Fretey *et al*. 2007). .

Hawksbill Sea Turtle

About 15,000 females are estimated to nest each year throughout the world with the Caribbean accounting for 20 to 30 percent of the world's hawksbill population. Only five regional populations remain with more than 1,000 females nesting annually (Seychelles, Mexico, Indonesia, and two in Australia) (Meylan and Donnelly 1999). Mexico is now the most important region for hawksbills in the Caribbean with about 3,000 nests per year (Meylan 1999). In the U.S. Pacific, hawksbills nest only on main island beaches in Hawaii, primarily along the east coast of the island of Hawaii. Hawksbill nesting has also been documented in American Samoa and Guam (NMFS and Service 1998c).

Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle

Most Kemp's ridleys nest on the coastal beaches of the Mexican states of Tamaulipas and Veracruz, although a small number of Kemp's ridleys nest consistently along the Texas coast (TEWG 1998). In addition, rare nesting events have been reported in Alabama, Florida, Georgia, South Carolina, and North Carolina. Historical information indicates that tens of thousands of ridleys nested near Rancho Nuevo, Mexico, during the late 1940s (Hildebrand 1963). The Kemp's ridley population experienced a devastating decline between the late 1940s and the mid 1980s. The total number of nests per nesting season at Rancho Nuevo remained below 1,000 throughout the 1980s, but gradually began to increase in the 1990s. In 2009, 16,273 nests were documented along the 18.6 miles of coastline patrolled at Rancho Nuevo, and the total number of nests

documented for all the monitored beaches in Mexico was 21,144 (Service 2009). In 2010, a total of 13,302 nests were documented in Mexico (Service 2010). In addition, 207 and 153 nests were recorded during 2009 and 2010, respectively, in the U.S., primarily in Texas.

Status and distribution

Loggerhead Sea turtle

Five recovery units have been identified in the Northwest Atlantic based on genetic differences and a combination of geographic distribution of nesting densities, geographic separation, and geopolitical boundaries (NMFS and Service 2008). Recovery units are subunits of a listed species that are geographically or otherwise identifiable and essential to the recovery of the species. Recovery units are individually necessary to conserve genetic robustness, demographic robustness, important life history stages, or some other feature necessary for long-term sustainability of the species. The five recovery units identified in the Northwest Atlantic (**Figure 2**) are:

1. Northern Recovery Unit (NRU) - defined as loggerheads originating from nesting beaches from the Florida-Georgia border through southern Virginia (the northern extent of the nesting range);

2. Peninsula Florida Recovery Unit (PFRU) - defined as loggerheads originating from nesting beaches from the Florida-Georgia border through Pinellas County on the west coast of Florida, excluding the islands west of Key West, Florida;

3. Dry Tortugas Recovery Unit (DTRU) - defined as loggerheads originating from nesting beaches throughout the islands located west of Key West, Florida;

4. Northern Gulf of Mexico Recovery Unit (NGMRU) - defined as loggerheads originating from nesting beaches from Franklin County on the northwest Gulf coast of Florida through Texas; and

5. Greater Caribbean Recovery Unit (GCRU) - composed of loggerheads originating from all other nesting assemblages within the Greater Caribbean (Mexico through French Guiana, The Bahamas, Lesser Antilles, and Greater Antilles).



Figure 2. Map of the distribution of the loggerhead recovery units.

The mtDNA analyses show that there is limited exchange of females among these recovery units (Ehrhart 1989, Foote *et al.* 2000, NMFS 2001, Hawkes *et al.* 2005). Based on the number of haplotypes, the highest level of loggerhead mtDNA genetic diversity in the Northwest Atlantic has been observed in females of the GCRU that nest at Quintana Roo, Mexico (Encalada *et al.* 1999, Nielsen *et al*. 2012).

Nuclear DNA analyses show that there are no substantial subdivisions across the loggerhead nesting colonies in the southeastern U.S. Male-mediated gene flow appears to be keeping the subpopulations genetically similar on a nuclear DNA level (Francisco-Pearce 2001).

Historically, the literature has suggested that the northern U.S. nesting beaches (NRU and NGMRU) produce a relatively high percentage of males and the more southern nesting beaches (PFRU, DTRU, and GCRU) a relatively high percentage of females (e.g., Hanson *et al.* 1998, NMFS 2001, Mrosovsky and Provancha 1989). The NRU and NGMRU were believed to play an important role in providing males to mate with females from the more female-dominated subpopulations to the south. However, in 2002 and 2003, researchers studied loggerhead sex ratios

for two of the U.S. nesting subpopulations, the northern and southern subpopulations (NGU and PFRU, respectively) (Blair 2005, Wyneken *et al.* 2005). The study produced interesting results. In 2002, the northern beaches produced more females and the southern beaches produced more males than previously believed. However, the opposite was true in 2003 with the northern beaches producing more males and the southern beaches producing more females in keeping with prior literature. Wyneken *et al.* (2005) speculated that the 2002 result may have been anomalous; however, the study did point out the potential for males to be produced on the southern beaches. Although this study revealed that more males may be produced on southern recovery unit beaches than previously believed, the Service maintains that the NRU and NGMRU play an important role in the production of males to mate with females from the more southern recovery units.

The NRU is the second largest loggerhead nesting aggregation in the Northwest Atlantic. Annual nest totals from northern beaches averaged 5,215 nests from 1989-2008, a period of near-complete surveys of NRU nesting beaches (NMFS and Service 2008), representing approximately 1,272 nesting females per year (4.1 nests per female, Murphy and Hopkins 1984). The loggerhead nesting trend from daily beach surveys showed a significant decline of 1.3 percent annually. Nest totals from aerial surveys conducted by the South Carolina Department of Natural Resources showed a 1.9 percent annual decline in nesting in South Carolina since 1980. Overall, there is strong statistical data to suggest the NRU has experienced a long-term decline (NMFS and Service 2008).

The PFRU is the largest loggerhead nesting assemblage in the Northwest Atlantic. A near-complete nest census of the PFRU undertaken from 1989 to 2007 reveals a mean of 64,513 loggerhead nests per year representing approximately 15,735 females nesting per year (4.1 nests per female, Murphy and Hopkins 1984) (FWC 2008d). This near-complete census provides the best statewide estimate of total abundance, but because of variable survey effort, these numbers cannot be used to assess trends. Loggerhead nesting trends are best assessed using standardized nest counts made at INBS sites surveyed with constant effort over time. In 1979, the Statewide Nesting Beach Survey (SNBS) program was initiated to document the total distribution, seasonality, and abundance of sea turtle nesting in Florida. In 1989, the INBS program was initiated in Florida to measure seasonal productivity, allowing comparisons between beaches and between years (FWC 2009b). Of the 190 SNBS surveyed areas, 33 participate in the INBS program (representing 30 percent of the SNBS beach length).

INBS nest counts from 1989–2010 show a shallow decline. However, recent trends (1998–2010) in nest counts have shown a 25 percent decline, with increases only observed in the most recent 6-year period, 2008–2013 although there was no trend observed (FWC/FWRI 2014). The analysis that reveals this decline uses nest-count data from 345 representative Atlantic-coast index zones (total length = 187 miles) and 23 representative zones on Florida's southern Gulf coast (total length = 14.3 miles). The spatial and temporal coverage (annually, 109 days and 368 zones) accounted for an average of 70 percent of statewide loggerhead nesting activity between 1989 and 2010.

The NGMRU is the third largest nesting assemblage among the four U.S. recovery units. Nesting surveys conducted on approximately 186 miles of beach within the NGMRU (Alabama and Florida only) were undertaken between 1995 and 2007 (statewide surveys in Alabama began in 2002). The mean nest count during this 13-year period was 906 nests per year, which equates to about 221 females nesting per year (4.1 nests per female, Murphy and Hopkins 1984; FWC 2008d). Evaluation of long-term nesting trends for the NGMRU is difficult because of changed and expanded beach coverage. Loggerhead nesting trends are best assessed using standardized nest counts made at INBS sites surveyed with constant effort over time. There are 12 years (1997-2008) of Florida INBS data for the NGMRU (FWC 2008d). A log-linear regression showed a significant declining trend of 4.7 percent annually (NMFS and Service 2008).

The DTRU, located west of the Florida Keys, is the smallest of the identified recovery units. A near-complete nest census of the DTRU undertaken from 1995 to 2004, excluding 2002, (nine years surveyed) reveals a mean of 246 nests per year, which equates to about 60 females nesting per year (4.1 nests per female, Murphy and Hopkins 1984) (FWC 2008d). Surveys after 2004 did not include principal nesting beaches within the recovery unit (*i.e.*, Dry Tortugas National Park). The nesting trend data for the DTRU are from beaches that are not part of the INBS program, but are part of the SNBS program. There are nine years of data for this recovery unit. A simple linear regression accounting for temporal autocorrelation revealed no trend in nesting numbers. Because of the annual variability in nest totals, a longer time series is needed to detect a trend (NMFS and Service 2008).

The GCRU is composed of all other nesting assemblages of loggerheads within the Greater Caribbean. Statistically valid analyses of long-term nesting trends for the entire GCRU are not available because there are few long-term standardized nesting surveys representative of the region. Additionally, changing survey effort at monitored beaches and scattered and low-level nesting by loggerheads at many locations currently precludes comprehensive analyses. The most complete data are from Quintana Roo and Yucatán, Mexico, where an increasing trend was reported over a 15-year period from 1987-2001 (Zurita *et al.* 2003). However, since 2001, nesting has declined and the previously reported increasing trend appears not to have been sustained (NMFS and Service 2008). Other smaller nesting populations have experienced declines over the past few decades (e.g., Amorocho 2003).

Recovery Criteria (only the Demographic Recovery Criteria are presented below; for the Listing Factor Recovery Criteria, please see NMFS and Service 2008)

1. Number of Nests and Number of Nesting Females
   a. Northern Recovery Unit
      i. There is statistical confidence (95 percent) that the annual rate of increase over a generation time of 50 years is 2 percent or greater resulting in a total annual number of nests of 14,000 or greater for this recovery unit (approximate distribution of nests is North Carolina =14 percent [2,000 nests], South Carolina =66 percent [9,200 nests], and Georgia =20 percent [2,800 nests]); and

ii. This increase in number of nests must be a result of corresponding increases in number of nesting females (estimated from nests, clutch frequency, and remigration interval).

b. Peninsular Florida Recovery Unit
   i. There is statistical confidence (95 percent) that the annual rate of increase over a generation time of 50 years is statistically detectable (one percent) resulting in a total annual number of nests of 106,100 or greater for this recovery unit; and
   ii. This increase in number of nests must be a result of corresponding increases in number of nesting females (estimated from nests, clutch frequency, and remigration interval).

c. Dry Tortugas Recovery Unit
   i. There is statistical confidence (95 percent) that the annual rate of increase over a generation time of 50 years is three percent or greater resulting in a total annual number of nests of 1,100 or greater for this recovery unit; and
   ii. This increase in number of nests must be a result of corresponding increases in number of nesting females (estimated from nests, clutch frequency, and remigration interval).

d. Northern Gulf of Mexico Recovery Unit
   i. There is statistical confidence (95 percent) that the annual rate of increase over a generation time of 50 years is three percent or greater resulting in a total annual number of nests of 4,000 or greater for this recovery unit (approximate distribution of nests (2002-2007) is Florida= 92 percent [3,700 nests] and Alabama =8 percent [300 nests]); and
   ii. This increase in number of nests must be a result of corresponding increases in number of nesting females (estimated from nests, clutch frequency, and remigration interval).

e. Greater Caribbean Recovery Unit
   i. The total annual number of nests at a minimum of three nesting assemblages, averaging greater than 100 nests annually (e.g., Yucatán, Mexico; Cay Sal Bank, Bahamas) has increased over a generation time of 50 years; and
   ii. This increase in number of nests must be a result of corresponding increases in number of nesting females (estimated from nests, clutch frequency, and remigration interval).

2. Trends in Abundance on Foraging Grounds
   A network of in-water sites, both oceanic and neritic, across the foraging range is established and monitoring is implemented to measure abundance. There is statistical confidence (95 percent) that a composite estimate of relative abundance from these sites is increasing for at least one generation.

3. Trends in Neritic Strandings Relative to In-water Abundance
   Stranding trends are not increasing at a rate greater than the trends in in-water relative abundance for similar age classes for at least one generation.

The Recovery Plan for the Northwest Atlantic Population of the Loggerhead Sea Turtle was signed in 2008 (NMFS and Service 2008), and the Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Loggerhead Turtle was signed in 1998 (NMFS and Service 1998e).

Green Sea Turtle

Annual nest totals documented as part of the Florida SNBS program from 1989-2008 have ranged from 435 nests laid in 1993 to 12,752 in 2007. The nest count for 2013 was more than twice the count from 2007 with a total of 36,195 nests recorded (http://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/statewide/). Nesting occurs in 26 counties with a peak along the east coast, from Volusia through Broward Counties. Although the SNBS program provides information on distribution and total abundance statewide, it cannot be used to assess trends because of variable survey effort. Therefore, green turtle nesting trends are best assessed using standardized nest counts made at INBS sites surveyed with constant effort over time (1989-2009). Green sea turtle nesting in Florida is increasing based on 19 years (1989-2009) of INBS data from throughout the state (FWC 2009a). The increase in nesting in Florida is likely a result of several factors, including: (1) a Florida statute enacted in the early 1970s that prohibited the killing of green turtles in Florida; (2) the species listing under the Act afforded complete protection to eggs, juveniles, and adults in all U.S. waters; (3) the passage of Florida's constitutional net ban amendment in 1994 and its subsequent enactment, making it illegal to use any gillnets or other entangling nets in State waters; (4) the likelihood that the majority of Florida green turtles reside within Florida waters where they are fully protected; (5) the protections afforded Florida green turtles while they inhabit the waters of other nations that have enacted strong sea turtle conservation measures (e.g., Bermuda); and (6) the listing of the species on Appendix I of Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES), which stopped international trade and reduced incentives for illegal trade from the U.S.

Recovery Criteria

The U.S. Atlantic population of green sea turtles can be considered for delisting if, over a period of 25 years, the following conditions are met:

1. The level of nesting in Florida has increased to an average of 5,000 nests per year for at least six years. Nesting data must be based on standardized surveys;

2. At least 25 percent (65 miles) of all available nesting beaches (260 miles) is in public ownership and encompasses at least 50 percent of the nesting activity;

3. A reduction in stage class mortality is reflected in higher counts of individuals on foraging grounds; and

4. All priority one tasks identified in the recovery plan have been successfully implemented.

The Recovery Plan for U.S. Population of Atlantic Green Turtle was signed in 1991 (NMFS and Service 1991), the Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Green Turtle was signed in 1998 (NMFS and Service 1998b), and the Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the East Pacific Green Turtle was signed in 1998 (NMFS and Service 1998a).

Leatherback Sea Turtle

Declines in leatherback nesting have occurred over the last two decades along the Pacific coasts of Mexico and Costa Rica. The Mexican leatherback nesting population, once considered to be the world's largest leatherback nesting population (historically estimated to be 65 percent of the worldwide population), is now less than one percent of its estimated size in 1980. Spotila *et al.* (1996) estimated the number of leatherback sea turtles nesting on 28 beaches throughout the world from the literature and from communications with investigators studying those beaches. The estimated worldwide population of leatherbacks in 1995 was about 34,500 females on these beaches with a lower limit of about 26,200, and an upper limit of about 42,900. This is less than one-third the 1980 estimate of 115,000. Leatherbacks are rare in the Indian Ocean and in very low numbers in the western Pacific Ocean. The largest population is in the western Atlantic. Using an age-based demographic model, Spotila *et al.* (1996) determined that leatherback populations in the Indian Ocean and western Pacific Ocean cannot withstand even moderate levels of adult mortality and that the Atlantic populations are being exploited at a rate that cannot be sustained. They concluded that leatherbacks are on the road to extinction and further population declines can be expected unless action is taken to reduce adult mortality and increase survival of eggs and hatchlings.

In the U.S., nesting populations occur in Florida, Puerto Rico, and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In Florida, the SNBS program documented an increase in leatherback nesting numbers from 98 nests in 1988 to between 800 and 900 nests per season in the early 2000s (FWC 2009a, Stewart and Johnson 2006). Although the SNBS program provides information on distribution and total abundance statewide, it cannot be used to assess trends because of variable survey effort. Therefore, leatherback nesting trends are best assessed using standardized nest counts made at INBS sites surveyed with constant effort over time (1989-2009). An analysis of the INBS data has shown a substantial increase in leatherback nesting in Florida since 1989 (FWC 2009b, TEWG Group 2007).

Recovery Criteria

The U.S. Atlantic population of leatherbacks can be considered for delisting if the following conditions are met:

1. The adult female population increases over the next 25 years, as evidenced by a statistically significant trend in the number of nests at Culebra, Puerto Rico, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, and along the east coast of Florida;

2. Nesting habitat encompassing at least 75 percent of nesting activity in U.S. Virgin Islands, Puerto Rico, and Florida is in public ownership; and.

3. All priority one tasks identified in the recovery plan have been successfully implemented.

The Recovery Plan for Leatherback Turtles in the U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico was signed in 1992 (NMFS and Service 1992), and the Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Leatherback Turtle was signed in 1998 (NMFS and Service 1998d).

Hawksbill Sea Turtle

The hawksbill sea turtle has experienced global population declines of 80 percent or more during the past century and continued declines are projected (Meylan and Donnelly 1999). Most populations are declining, depleted, or remnants of larger aggregations. Hawksbills were previously abundant, as evidenced by high-density nesting at a few remaining sites and by trade statistics.

Recovery Criteria

The U.S. Atlantic population of hawksbills can be considered for delisting if, over a period of 25 years, the following conditions are met:

1. The adult female population is increasing, as evidenced by a statistically significant trend in the annual number of nests on at least five index beaches, including Mona Island and Buck Island Reef National Monument;

2. Habitat for at least 50 percent of the nesting activity that occurs in the U.S. Virgin Islands and Puerto Rico is protected in perpetuity;

3. Numbers of adults, subadults, and juveniles are increasing, as evidenced by a statistically significant trend on at least five key foraging areas within Puerto Rico, U.S. Virgin Islands, and Florida; and

4. All priority one tasks identified in the recovery plan have been successfully implemented.

The Recovery Plan for the Hawksbill Turtle in the U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico was signed in 1993 (NMFS and Service 1993), and the Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Hawksbill Turtle was signed in 1998 (NMFS and Service 1998c).

Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle

Today, under strict protection, the population appears to be in the early stages of recovery. The recent nesting increase can be attributed to full protection of nesting females and their nests in Mexico resulting from a binational effort between Mexico and the U.S. to prevent the extinction of the Kemp's ridley, and the requirement to use Turtle Excluder Devices (TEDs) in shrimp trawls both in the U.S. and Mexico.

The Mexico government also prohibits harvesting and is working to increase the population through more intensive law enforcement, by fencing nest areas to diminish natural predation, and by relocating most nests into corrals to prevent poaching and predation. While relocation of nests into corrals is currently a necessary management measure, this relocation and concentration of eggs into a "safe" area is of concern since it can reduce egg viability.

Recovery Criteria

The goal of the recovery plan is for the species to be reduced from endangered to threatened status. The Recovery Team members feel that the criteria for a complete removal of this species from the endangered species list need not be considered now, but rather left for future revisions of the plan. Complete removal from the federal list would certainly necessitate that some other instrument of protection, similar to the MMPA, be in place and be international in scope. Kemp's ridley can be considered for reclassification to threatened status when the following four criteria are met:

1. Continuation of complete and active protection of the known nesting habitat and the waters adjacent to the nesting beach (concentrating on the Rancho Nuevo area) and continuation of the bi-national protection project;

2. Elimination of mortality from incidental catch in commercial shrimping in the U.S. and Mexico through the use of TEDs and achievement of full compliance with the regulations requiring TED use;

3. Attainment of a population of at least 10,000 females nesting in a season; and

4. Successful implementation of all priority one recovery tasks in the recovery plan.

The Recovery Plan for the Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle was signed in 1992 (Service and NMFS 1992). Significant new information on the biology and population status of Kemp's ridley has become available since 1992. Consequently, a full revision of the recovery plan has been completed by the Service and NMFS. The Bi-National Recover Plan for the Kemp's Ridley Sea

turtle (2011) provides updated species biology and population status information, objective and measurable recovery criteria, and updated and prioritized recovery actions.

Common threats to sea turtles in Florida

Anthropogenic factors that impact hatchlings and adult female turtles on land, or the success of nesting and hatching include: beach erosion; armoring and nourishment; artificial lighting; beach cleaning; increased human presence; recreational beach equipment; beach driving; coastal construction and fishing piers; exotic dune and beach vegetation; and poaching. An increased human presence at some nesting beaches or close to nesting beaches has led to secondary threats such as the introduction of exotic fire ants (*Solenopsis* spp.), feral hogs (*Sus scrofa*), dogs (*Canis familiaris),* and an increased presence of native species (e.g., raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), armadillos (*Dasypus novemcinctus*), and opossums (*Didelphis virginiana*)), which raid nests and feed on turtle eggs. Although sea turtle nesting beaches are protected along large expanses of the western North Atlantic coast, other areas along these coasts have limited or no protection.

Anthropogenic threats in the marine environment include oil and gas exploration and transportation; marine pollution; underwater explosions; hopper dredging; offshore artificial lighting; power plant entrainment or impingement; entanglement in debris; ingestion of marine debris; marina and dock construction and operation; boat collisions; and poaching and fishery interactions. On April 20, 2010, an explosion and fire on the Mobile Offshore Drilling Unit *Deepwater Horizon* MC252 occurred approximately 50 miles southeast of the Mississippi Delta. A broken well head at the sea floor resulted in a sustained release of oil, estimated at 35,000 and 60,000 barrels per day. On July 15, the valves on the cap were closed, which effectively shut in the well and all sub-sea containment systems. Damage assessment from the sustained release of oil is currently ongoing and the Service does not have a basis at the present time to predict the complete scope of effects to sea turtles range-wide.

Fibropapillomatosis, a disease of sea turtles characterized by the development of multiple tumors on the skin and internal organs, is also a mortality factor, particularly for green turtles. This disease has seriously impacted green turtle populations in Florida, Hawaii, and other parts of the world. The tumors interfere with swimming, eating, breathing, vision, and reproduction, and turtles with heavy tumor burdens may die.

Analysis of the species/critical habitat likely to be affected

The threatened loggerhead sea turtle, the endangered green sea turtle, the endangered leatherback sea turtle, the endangered hawksbill sea turtle, and the endangered Kemp's ridley sea turtle are currently listed because of their reduced population sizes caused by overharvest and habitat loss with continuing anthropogenic threats from commercial fishing, disease, and degradation of remaining habitat. The proposed action has the potential to adversely affect nesting females of these species, their nests, and hatchlings on all nesting beaches where shore protection activities (including the placement of compatible sediment, repair or replacement of groins and jetties, and navigation channel maintenance on the beaches of the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of Florida) occur.

The Service and the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration's National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) share Federal jurisdiction for sea turtles under the Act. The Service has responsibility for sea turtles on the nesting beach. NMFS has jurisdiction for sea turtles in the marine environment.

In accordance with the Act, the Service completes consultations with all Federal agencies for actions that may adversely affect sea turtles on the nesting beach. The Service's analysis only addresses activities that may impact nesting sea turtles, their nests and eggs, and hatchlings as they emerge from the nest and crawl to the sea. NMFS assesses and consults with Federal agencies concerning potential impacts to sea turtles in the marine environment, including updrift and downdrift nearshore areas affected by sand placement projects on the beach.

The proposed action has the potential to adversely affect nesting females, nests, and hatchlings within the proposed project area. Potential effects include destruction of nests deposited within the boundaries of the proposed project, harassment as a result of construction activities in the form of disturbing or interfering with female turtles attempting to nest within the construction area or on adjacent beaches; disorientation of hatchling turtles resulting from project lighting on beaches adjacent to the construction area as they emerge from the nest and crawl to the water; disorientation that occurs after project construction due to landward lights impacting the elevated berm; and behavior modification of nesting females due to escarpment formation within the project area during a nesting season resulting in false crawls or situations where they choose marginal or unsuitable nesting areas to deposit eggs. The quality of the placed sand could affect the ability of female turtles to nest, the suitability of the nest incubation environment, and the ability of hatchlings to emerge from the nest. The effects of the proposed action on sea turtles will be considered further in the remaining sections of this biological opinion.

Some individuals in a population are more "valuable" than others in terms of the number of offspring they are expected to produce. An individual's potential for contributing offspring to future generations is its reproductive value. Because of delayed sexual maturity, reproductive longevity, and low survivorship in early life stages, nesting females are of high value to a population. The loss of a nesting female in a small recovery unit would represent a significant loss to the recovery unit. The reproductive value for a nesting female has been estimated to be approximately 253 times greater than an egg or a hatchling (NMFS and Service 2008). However, the SPBO includes avoidance and minimization measures that reduce the possibility of mortality of a nesting female on the beach as a result of the project. Therefore, we do not anticipate the loss of any nesting females on the beach as a result of the activities listed in this SPBO.

Sand placement projects are anticipated to result in decreased nesting and loss of nests that do get laid within the project area for two subsequent nesting seasons following the completion of the proposed sand placement. However, it is important to note that it is unknown whether nests that would have been laid in a project area during the two subsequent nesting seasons had the project not occurred are actually lost from the population or if nesting is simply displaced to adjacent beaches. Regardless, eggs and hatchlings have a low reproductive value; each egg or hatchling has been estimated to have only 0.004 percent of the value of a nesting female (NMFS and Service

2008). Thus, even if the majority of the eggs and hatchlings that would have been produced on the project beach are not realized for up to 2 years following project completion, the Service would not expect this loss to have a significant effect on the recovery and survival of the species, for the following reasons: 1) some nesting is likely just displaced to adjacent non-project beaches, 2) not all eggs will produce hatchlings, and 3) destruction and/or failure of nests will not always result from a sand placement project. A variety of natural and unknown factors negatively affect incubating egg clutches, including tidal inundation, storm events, and predation.

During project construction, direct mortality of the developing embryos in nests within the project area may occur for nests that are missed and not relocated. The exact number of these missed nests is not known. However, in two separate monitoring programs on the east coast of Florida where hand digging was performed to confirm the presence of nests and thus reduce the chance of missing nests through misinterpretation, trained observers still missed about 6 to 8 percent of the nests because of natural elements (Martin 1992, Ernest and Martin 1993). This must be considered a conservative number, because nests missed during surveys are not always discovered after hatching. In another study, Schroeder (1994) found that even under the best of conditions, about 7 percent of nests can be misidentified as false crawls by highly experienced sea turtle nest surveyors. Missed nests are usually identified by signs of hatchling emergences in areas where no nest was previously documented. Signs of hatchling emergence are very easily obliterated by the same elements that interfere with detection of nests.

In the U.S., consultations with the Service have included military missions and operations, beach nourishment and other shoreline protection projects, and actions related to protection of coastal development on sandy beaches along the coast. Much of the Service's section 7 consultation involves beach nourishment projects. A list of the Service's consultations completed over the last 5 years is included in Appendix A. The Act does not require entities conducting projects with no Federal nexus to apply for a section 10(a)(1)(B) permit. This is a voluntary process and is applicant driven. Section 10(a)(1)(A) permits are scientific permits that include activities that would enhance the survival and conservation of a listed species. Those permits are not listed as they are expected to benefit the species and are not expected to contribute to the cumulative take assessment.

A list of completed NMFS consultations is included in Appendix B.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

Status of the species/critical habitat within the action area

INBS nest counts represent approximately 69 percent of known loggerhead nesting in Florida, 74 percent of known green turtle nesting, and 34 percent of known leatherback nesting (FWC 2009a). The INBS program was established with a set of standardized data-collection criteria to measure seasonal nesting, and to allow accurate comparisons between both beaches and years. The reliability of these comparisons results from the uniformity of beach-survey effort in space and time, and from the specialized annual training of beach surveyors. Under the core INBS program,

178 miles of nesting beach have been divided into zones, known as core index zones, averaging 0.5 mile in length. These beaches are monitored daily beginning May 15 and ending August 31. On all index beaches, researchers record nests and nesting attempts by species, the location of each nest, and the date each nest was laid.

Nesting surveys begin at or just before sunrise. Turtle crawls are identified as a true nesting crawl or false crawl (*i.e.*, nonnesting emergence). Nests are marked with stakes and some are surrounded with surveyor flagging tape and, if needed, screened or caged to prevent predation. The marked nests are monitored throughout the incubation period for storm damage, predation, hatching activity and hatching and emerging success. Nest productivity surveys may continue into mid-November depending on nest incubation periods. All monitoring is conducted in accordance with the FWC's Marine Turtle Conservation Guidelines.

Loggerhead Sea Turtle

Five loggerhead sea turtle recovery units have been identified in the Northwest Atlantic (NMFS and Service 2008). Mitochondrial DNA analyses show that there is limited exchange of females among these recovery units (Foote *et al*. 2000, NMFS 2001, Hawkes *et al*. 2005). However, nuclear DNA analyses show that there are no substantial subdivisions across the loggerhead nesting colonies in the southeastern U.S. Male-mediated gene flow appears to be keeping the subpopulations genetically similar on a nuclear DNA level (Francisco-Pearce 2001). The NRU and NGMRU are believed to play an important role in providing males to mate with females from the more female-dominated recovery units.

Two (NGMRU and PFRU) of the five nesting subpopulations occur within the proposed Action Area. Northwest Florida, which accounts for 92 percent of the NGMRU in nest numbers, consists of approximately 234 miles of nesting shoreline. The PFRU makes up 1,166 miles of shoreline and consists of approximately was 69,982 nests per year (2008 to 2012)..

Recovery Units	**Nesting Range**
NGMRU	Escambia through Franklin Counties
PFRU	Pinellas through Nassau Counties



Figure 3. Distribution of loggerhead sea nesting in the PFRU and NGMRU in Florida.

The main loggerhead sea turtle nesting and hatching season throughout Florida is shown in **Table 5.**

Table 6. Loggerhead sea turtle nesting and hatching season for Florida.

AREA	COUNTIES	SEA TURTLE NESTING SEASON THROUGH HATCHING SEASON
Northern Gulf of Mexico	Escambia through Pasco	May 1 through October 31
Southern Gulf of Mexico	Pinellas through Monroe	April 1 through November 30
Southern Florida Atlantic	Brevard through Miami-Dade	March 1 through November 30
Northern Florida Atlantic	Nassau through Volusia	April 15 through November 30

An updated analysis by FWC/FWRI reveals a shallow decline in loggerhead nest numbers around the State of Florida based on INBS nest counts from 1989 through 2010 (FWC/FWRI 2010). Analysis of nest counts over the last six years (2009 through 2013) have found no trend, although when added to the data from 1989, the overall change is an increase in loggerhead nests since 1989 (FWC/FWRI 2014). The five year average (2008 to2012) for the PFRU was 69,982 nests. The five-year average (2008 to 2012) for the NGMRU was 966 nests.

Sea turtles play a vital role in maintaining healthy and productive ecosystems. Nesting sea turtles introduce large quantities of nutrients from the marine ecosystem to the beach and dune system (Bouchard and Bjorndal 2000). In the U.S., loggerheads play a particularly important role in this regard due to their greater nesting numbers. The nutrients they leave behind on the nesting beaches in the form of eggs and eggshells play an important role for dune vegetation and terrestrial predator populations (Bouchard and Bjorndal 2000). In a study at Melbourne Beach, Florida, Bouchard and Bjorndal (2000) estimated that only 25 percent of the organic matter introduced into nests by loggerheads returned to the ocean as hatchlings. They found that 29-40 percent of all nutrients were made available to detritivores, decomposers, and plants, while 26-31 percent of all nutrients were consumed by nest predators. Thus, all loggerhead recovery units play a vital role in the maintenance of a healthy beach and dune ecosystem within their geographic distribution.

Green Sea Turtle

Green turtle nest numbers are increasing in Florida with a record number of nests being recorded during the 2013 season (FWC 2014). The five year average (2008 to 2012) for green turtles within the action area was 10,384 nests. The number of green turtle nests recorded in Florida during the 2013 nesting season was a record high of 36,195.



Figure 4. Distribution of green sea turtle nesting in Florida.

The main green sea turtle nesting and hatching season throughout Florida is shown in **Table 6**.

Table 7. Green sea turtle nesting and hatching season for Florida.

AREA	COUNTIES	SEA TURTLE NESTING SEASON THROUGH HATCHING SEASON
Northern Gulf of Mexico	Escambia through Pasco	May 15 through October 31
Southern Gulf of Mexico	Pinellas through Monroe	May 15 through October 31
Southern Florida Atlantic	Brevard through Miami-Dade	May 1 through November 30
Northern Florida Atlantic	Nassau through Volusia	May 15 through November 15

Leatherback Sea Turtle

Leatherback nest numbers are increasing in Florida with a record number of leatherback nests recorded during the 2009 season (FWC 2009a). The five year average (2008 to 2012) for leatherback sea turtles within the action area was 1,435 nests with a total of 896 nests recorded in 2013.



Figure 5. Distribution of leatherback sea turtle nesting in Florida.

The main leatherback sea turtle nesting and hatching season throughout Florida is shown in **Table 7**.

Table 8. Leatherback sea turtle nesting and hatching season for Florida.

AREA	COUNTIES	SEA TURTLE NESTING SEASON THROUGH HATCHING SEASON
Northern Gulf of Mexico	Escambia through Pasco	May 1 through September 30
Southern Florida Atlantic	Brevard through Miami-Dade	February 15 through November 30
Northern Florida Atlantic	Nassau through Volusia	April 15 through September 30

Hawksbill Sea Turtle

Forty-six hawksbill nests have been documented in Florida from 1979-2013 in Volusia, Martin, Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, Monroe, and Manatee counties (FWC/FWRI 2014a). The hawksbill sea turtle nesting and hatching season throughout Florida is shown in **Table 8**.

Table 9. Hawksbill sea turtle nesting and hatching season for Florida.

AREA	COUNTIES	SEA TURTLE NESTING SEASON THROUGH HATCHING SEASON
Southern tip of Florida	Monroe	June 1 through December 31
Southern Florida Atlantic	Brevard through Miami-Dade	June 1 through December 31
Northeast Florida	Volusia	June 1 through December 31
Southwest Florida	Manatee	June 1 through December 31

Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle

Eighty Kemp's ridley nests have been documented in Florida from 1979-2013 in Duval, Flagler, Volusia, Brevard, Martin, Palm Beach, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, and Escambia counties (FWC/FWRI 2014).

Factors affecting species habitat within the action area

In accordance with the Act, the Service completes consultations with all federal agencies for actions that may adversely affect sea turtles. In Florida, consultations have included military missions and operations, beach nourishment and other shoreline protection, and actions related to protection of coastal development on sandy beaches of Florida's Atlantic Coast (Key West to

Fernandina/Kings Bay) and the Gulf Coast (Ten Thousand Islands to Alabama State Line) (**Appendix A**).

Coastal Development

Loss of nesting habitat related to coastal development has had the greatest impact on nesting sea turtles in Florida. Beachfront development not only causes the loss of suitable nesting habitat, but can result in the disruption of powerful coastal processes accelerating erosion and interrupting the natural shoreline migration (National Research Council 1990b). This may in turn cause the need to protect upland structures and infrastructure by armoring, groin placement, beach emergency berm construction and repair, and beach nourishment which cause changes in, additional loss of, or impact to, the remaining sea turtle habitat.

Hurricanes

Hurricanes were probably responsible for maintaining coastal beach habitat upon which sea turtles depend through repeated cycles of destruction, alteration, and recovery of beach and dune habitat. Hurricanes generally produce damaging winds, storm tides and surges, and rain, which can result in severe erosion of the beach and dune systems. Overwash and blowouts are common on barrier islands. Hurricanes and other storms can result in the direct or indirect loss of sea turtle nests, either by erosion or washing away of the nests by wave action, inundation or "drowning" of the eggs or hatchlings developing within the nest or indirectly by loss of nesting habitat. Depending on their frequency, storms can affect sea turtles on either a short-term basis (nests lost for one season and/or temporary loss of nesting habitat) or long term, if frequent (habitat unable to recover). How hurricanes affect sea turtle nesting also depends on its characteristics (winds, storm surge, rainfall), the time of year (within or outside of the nesting season), and where the northeast edge of the hurricane crosses land.

Because of the limited remaining nesting habitat in a natural state with no development landward of the sandy beach, frequent or successive severe weather events could threaten the ability of certain sea turtle populations to survive and recover. Sea turtles evolved under natural coastal environmental events such as hurricanes. The extensive amount of predevelopment coastal beach and dune habitat allowed sea turtles to survive even the most severe hurricane events. It is only within the last 20 to 30 years that the combination of habitat loss to beachfront development and destruction of remaining habitat by hurricanes has increased the threat to sea turtle survival and recovery. On developed beaches, typically little space remains for sandy beaches to become reestablished after periodic storms. While the beach itself moves landward during such storms, reconstruction or persistence of structures at their prestorm locations can result in a loss of nesting habitat.

The 2004 hurricane season was the most active storm season in Florida since weather records began in 1851. Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, and Jeanne, along with Tropical Storm Bonnie, damaged the beach and dune system, upland structures and properties, and infrastructure in the

majority of Florida's coastal counties. The cumulative impact of these storms exacerbated erosion conditions throughout the state.

The 2005 hurricane season was a record-breaking season with 27 named storms. Hurricanes Dennis, Katrina, Ophelia, Rita, and Wilma, and Tropical Storms Arlene and Tammy impacted Florida. The cumulative impact of these storms exacerbated erosion conditions in south and northwest Florida.

A common question is whether the 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons contributed to reduced loggerhead nest numbers observed from 2004-2007. Although Florida has been subject to numerous hurricanes in recent years, these storm events cannot account for the recent decline (1998-2010) observed in the number of loggerhead nests on Florida beaches. The hurricanes have a very limited effect on nesting activity of adult female turtles. Because loggerheads that hatch on Florida beaches require some 20 to 30 years to reach maturity, storm impacts would not manifest themselves for many years. Moreover, hurricane impacts to nests tend to be localized and often occur after the main hatching season for the loggerhead is over (FWC 2008a).

Erosion

The designation of a Critically Eroded Beach is a planning requirement of the State's Beach Management Funding Assistance Program http://www.dep.state.fl.us/beaches/programs/becp/index.htm. A segment of beach shall first be designated as critically eroded in order to be eligible for State funding. A critically eroded area is a segment of shoreline where natural processes or human activity have caused or contributed to erosion and recession of the beach or dune system to such a degree that upland development, recreational interests, wildlife habitat, or important cultural resources are threatened or lost. Critically eroded areas may also include peripheral segments or gaps between identified critically eroded areas which, although they may be stable or slightly erosional now, their inclusion is necessary for continuity of management of the coastal system or for the design integrity of adjacent beach management projects (FDEP 2009). It is important to note, that for an erosion problem area to be critical, there shall exist a threat to or loss of one of four specific interests – upland development, recreation, wildlife habitat, or important cultural resources.

Beachfront Lighting

Artificial beachfront lighting may cause disorientation (loss of bearings) and misorientation (incorrect orientation) of sea turtle hatchlings. Visual signs are the primary sea-finding mechanism for hatchlings (Mrosovsky and Carr 1967, Mrosovsky and Shettleworth 1968, Dickerson and Nelson 1989, Witherington and Bjorndal 1991). Artificial beachfront lighting is a documented cause of hatchling disorientation and misorientation on nesting beaches (Philibosian 1976, Mann 1977, Witherington and Martin 1996). The emergence from the nest and crawl to the sea is one of the most critical periods of a sea turtle's life. Hatchlings that do not make it to the sea quickly become food for ghost crabs, birds, and other predators, or become dehydrated and may never reach the sea. Some types of beachfront lighting attract hatchlings away from the sea while some lights cause adult turtles to avoid stretches of brightly illuminated beach. Research has

documented significant reduction in sea turtle nesting activity on beaches illuminated with artificial lights (Witherington 1992). During the 2007 to 2010 sea turtle nesting seasons in Florida, turtle hatchlings that were documented as being disoriented ranged from 44,828 to more than 64,000 hatchlings per year (**Table 9**) (FWC/FWRI 2014b). Exterior and interior lighting associated with condominiums had the greatest impact causing approximately 42 percent of documented hatchling disorientation/misorientation. Other causes included urban sky glow and street lights (FWC 2007a).

Table 10. Documented disorientations along the Florida coast (FWC 2007a).

Year	Total Number of Hatchling Disorientation Events	Total Number of Hatchlings Involved in Disorientation Events	Total Number of Adult Disorientation Events
2001	743	28,674	19
2002	896	43,226	37
2003	1,446	79,357	18
2004	888	46,487	24
2005	976	41,521	50
2006	1,521	71,798	40
2007	1,410	64,433	25
2008	1,192	49,623	62
2009	1,274	44,828	42
2010	1,513	46,978	82

Predation

Predation of sea turtle eggs and hatchlings by native and introduced species occurs on almost all nesting beaches. Predation by a variety of predators can considerably decrease sea turtle nest hatching success. The most common predators in the southeastern U.S. are ghost crabs (*Ocypode quadrata*), raccoons, feral hogs, foxes (*Urocyon cinereoargenteus* and *Vulpes vulpes*), coyotes (*Canis latrans*), armadillos, and fire ants (Dodd 1988, Stancyk 1995). In the absence of nest protection programs in a number of locations throughout the southeast U.S., raccoons may depredate up to 96 percent of all nests deposited on a beach (Davis and Whiting 1977, Hopkins and Murphy 1980, Stancyk *et al.* 1980, Talbert *et al*. 1980, Schroeder 1981, Labisky *et al.* 1986). In response to increasing predation of sea turtle nests by coyotes, foxes, hogs, and raccoons, multi-agency cooperative efforts have been initiated and are ongoing throughout Florida, particularly on public lands.

Driving on the Beach

The operation of motor vehicles on the beach affects sea turtle nesting by interrupting or striking a female turtle on the beach, headlights disorienting or misorienting emergent hatchlings, vehicles running over nests or hatchlings attempting to reach the ocean, and vehicle tracks traversing the beach which interfere with hatchlings crawling to the ocean. Hatchlings appear to become diverted not because they cannot physically climb out of the rut (Hughes and Caine 1994), but because the sides of the track cast a shadow and the hatchlings lose their line of sight to the ocean horizon (Mann 1977). The extended period of travel required to negotiate tire tracks and ruts may increase the susceptibility of hatchlings to dehydration and depredation during migration to the ocean (Hosier *et al.* 1981). Driving on the beach can cause sand compaction which may result in adverse impacts on nest site selection, digging behavior, clutch viability, and emergence by hatchlings, decreasing nest success and directly killing preemergent hatchlings (Mann 1977, Nelson and Dickerson 1987, Nelson 1988).

The physical changes and loss of plant cover caused by vehicles on dunes can lead to various degrees of instability, and therefore encourage dune migration. As vehicles move either up or down a slope, sand is displaced downward. Since the vehicles also inhibit plant growth, and open the area to wind erosion, dunes may become unstable, and begin to migrate. Unvegetated sand dunes may continue to migrate across stable areas as long as vehicle traffic continues. Vehicular traffic through dune breaches or low dunes on an eroding beach may cause an accelerated rate of overwash and beach erosion (Godfrey *et al.* 1978). If driving is required, the area where the least amount of impact occurs is the beach between the low and high tide water lines. Vegetation on the dunes can quickly reestablish provided the mechanical impact is removed.

In 1985, the Florida Legislature severely restricted vehicular driving on Florida's beaches, except that which is necessary for cleanup, repair, or public safety. This legislation also allowed an exception for five counties to continue to allow vehicular access on coastal beaches due to the availability of less than 50 percent of its peak user demand for off-beach parking. The counties affected by this exception are Volusia, St. Johns, Gulf, Nassau, and Flagler Counties, as well as limited vehicular access on Walton County beaches for boat launching.

Climate Change

The varying and dynamic elements of climate science are inherently long term, complex, and interrelated. Regardless of the underlying causes of climate change, glacial melting and expansion of warming oceans are causing sea level rise, although its extent or rate cannot as yet be predicted with certainty. At present, the science is not exact enough to precisely predict when and where climate impacts will occur. Although we may know the direction of change, it may not be possible to predict its precise timing or magnitude. These impacts may take place gradually or episodically in major leaps.

Climate change is evident from observations of increases in average global air and ocean temperatures, widespread melting of snow and ice, and rising sea level, according to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Report (IPCC 2007a). The IPCC Report (2007a) describes changes in natural ecosystems with potential widespread effects on many organisms,

including marine mammals and migratory birds. The potential for rapid climate change poses a significant challenge for fish and wildlife conservation. Species' abundance and distribution are dynamic, relative to a variety of factors, including climate. As climate changes, the abundance and distribution of fish and wildlife will also change. Highly specialized or endemic species are likely to be most susceptible to the stresses of changing climate. Based on these findings and other similar studies, the U.S. Department of the Interior (DOI) requires agencies under its direction to consider potential climate change effects as part of their long-range planning activities (Service 2007c).

Climatic changes in Florida could amplify current land management challenges involving habitat fragmentation, urbanization, invasive species, disease, parasites, and water management. Global warming will be a particular challenge for endangered, threatened, and other "at risk" species. It is difficult to estimate, with any degree of precision, which species will be affected by climate change or exactly how they will be affected. The Service will use Strategic Habitat Conservation planning, an adaptive science-driven process that begins with explicit trust resource population objectives, as the framework for adjusting our management strategies in response to climate change (Service 2006). As the level of information increases relative to the effects of global climate change on sea turtles and its designated critical habitat, the Service will have a better basis to address the nature and magnitude of this potential threat and will more effectively evaluate these effects to the range-wide status of sea turtles.

Florida is one of the areas most vulnerable to the consequences of climate change. Sea level rise and the possibility of more intense hurricanes are the most serious threats to Florida potentially from climate change. Florida has over 1,350 miles of coastline, low-lying topography, and proximity to the hurricane-prone subtropical mid-Atlantic Ocean and Gulf of Mexico.

One of the most serious threats to Florida's coasts comes from the combination of elevated sea levels and intense hurricanes. Florida experiences more landings of tropical storms and hurricanes than any other state in the U.S. Storm surges due to hurricanes will be on top of elevated sea levels, tides, and wave action. As a result, barrier islands and low-lying areas of Florida will be more susceptible to the effects of storm surge. An important element of adaptation strategy is how to protect beaches, buildings and infrastructure against the effects of rising seas and wind, wave action, and storm surge due to hurricanes while maintaining viable nesting habitat along Florida's coasts.

Temperatures are predicted to rise from 1.6^{o}F to 9°F for North America by the end of this century (IPCC 2007a,b). Alterations of thermal sand characteristics could result in highly female-biased sex ratios because sea turtles exhibit temperature dependent sex determination (e.g., Glen and Mrosovsky 2004, Hawkes *et al*. 2008).

Along developed coastlines, and especially in areas where shoreline protection structures have been constructed to limit shoreline movement, rising sea levels will cause severe effects on nesting females and their eggs. Erosion control structures can result in the permanent loss of dry nesting beach or deter nesting females from reaching suitable nesting sites (National Research Council

1990a). Nesting females may deposit eggs seaward of the erosion control structures potentially subjecting them to repeated tidal inundation or washout by waves and tidal action.

Based on the present level of available information concerning the effects of global climate change on the status of sea turtles and their designated critical habitat, the Service acknowledges the potential for changes to occur in the action area, but presently has no basis to evaluate if or how these changes are affecting sea turtles or their designated critical habitat. Nor does our present knowledge allow the Service to project what the future effects from global climate change may be or the magnitude of these potential effects.

EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

This section is an analysis of the beneficial, direct, and indirect effects of the proposed actions on nesting sea turtles, nests, eggs, and hatchling sea turtles within the Action Area. The analysis includes effects interrelated and interdependent of the project activities. An interrelated activity is an activity that is part of a proposed action and depends on the proposed activity. An interdependent activity is an activity that has no independent utility apart from the action.

Factors to be considered

The proposed projects will occur within habitat that is used by sea turtles for nesting and may be constructed during a portion of the sea turtle nesting season. Long-term and permanent impacts could include a change in the nest incubation environment from the sand placement activities. Short-term and temporary impacts to sea turtle nesting activities could result from project work occurring on the nesting beach during the nesting or hatching period, from changes in the physical characteristics of the beach from the placement of the sand including the profile and from sediment-induced changes in the nest incubation environment.

Proximity of action: Sand placement activities would occur within and adjacent to nesting habitat for sea turtles and dune habitats that ensure the stability and integrity of the nesting beach. Specifically, the project would potentially impact loggerhead, green, leatherback, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley nesting females, their nests, nesting habitat, and hatchling sea turtles.

Distribution: Sand placement activities that may impact nesting and hatchling sea turtles and sea turtle nests would occur along Gulf of Mexico and Atlantic Ocean coasts.

Timing: The timing of the sand placement activities could directly and indirectly impact nesting females, their nests, and hatchling sea turtles when conducted between March 1 and November 30.

Nature of the effect: The effects of the sand placement activities may change the nesting behavior of adult female sea turtles, diminish nesting success, and reduce hatching and emerging success. Sand placement can also change the incubation conditions within the nest. Any decrease in productivity and/or survival rates would contribute to the vulnerability of the sea turtles nesting in Florida.

Duration: The sand placement activity may be a one-time activity or a multiple-year activity and each sand placement project may take between three and seven months to complete. Thus, the direct effects would be expected to be short-term in duration. Indirect effects from the activity may continue to impact nesting and hatchling sea turtles and sea turtle nests in subsequent nesting seasons.

Disturbance frequency: Sea turtle populations in Florida may experience decreased nesting success, hatching success, and hatchling emergence success that could result from the sand placement activities being conducted at night during one nesting season, or during the earlier or later parts of two nesting seasons. Disturbance due to alterations of the incubation substrate and beach profile could persist for several years, depending on continued presence of placed sand in the nesting beach.

Disturbance intensity and severity: Depending on the amount (including post-disaster work) and the timing of the sand placement activities during sea turtle nesting season, effects to the sea turtle populations of Florida, and potentially the U.S. populations, could be important.

Analyses for effects of the action

Beneficial Effects

The placement of sand on a beach with reduced dry foredune habitat may increase sea turtle nesting habitat if the placed sand is highly compatible (*i.e.*, grain size, shape, color, etc.) with naturally occurring beach sediments in the area, and compaction and escarpment remediation measures are incorporated into the project. In addition, a nourished beach that is designed and constructed to mimic a natural beach system may benefit sea turtles more than an eroding beach it replaces.

Adverse Effects

Through many years of research, it has been documented that beach nourishment can have adverse effects on nesting female sea turtles and hatchlings and sea turtle nests. Results of monitoring sea turtle nesting and beach nourishment activities provide additional information on how sea turtles respond to nourished beaches, minimization measures, and other factors that influence nesting, hatching, and emerging success. Science-based information on sea turtle nesting biology and review of empirical data on beach nourishment monitoring is used to manage beach nourishment activities to eliminate or reduce impacts to nesting and hatchling sea turtles and sea turtle nests so that beach nourishment can be accomplished. Measures can be incorporated pre-, during, and post-construction to reduce impacts to sea turtles. Because of the long history of sea turtle monitoring in Florida, it is not necessary to require studies on each project beach to document those effects each time.

Direct Effects

Direct effects are those direct or immediate effects of a project on the species or its habitat. Placement of sand on a beach in and of itself may not provide suitable nesting habitat for sea turtles. Although sand placement activities may increase the potential nesting area, significant negative impacts to sea turtles may result if protective measures are not incorporated during project construction. Sand placement activities during the nesting season, particularly on or near high density nesting beaches, can cause increased loss of eggs and hatchlings and, along with other mortality sources, may significantly impact the long-term survival of the species. For instance, projects conducted during the nesting and hatching season could result in the loss of sea turtles through disruption of adult nesting activity and by burial or crushing of nests or hatchlings. While a nest monitoring and egg relocation program would reduce these impacts, nests may be inadvertently missed (when crawls are obscured by rainfall, wind, or tides) or misidentified as false crawls during daily patrols. In addition, nests may be destroyed by operations at night prior to beach patrols being performed. Even under the best of conditions, about seven percent of the nests can be misidentified as false crawls by experienced sea turtle nest surveyors (Schroeder 1994).

Nest relocation

Besides the potential for missing nests during surveys and a nest relocation program, there is a potential for eggs to be damaged by nest movement or relocation, particularly if eggs are not relocated within 12 hours of deposition (Limpus *et al.* 1979). Nest relocation can have adverse impacts on incubation temperature (and hence sex ratios), gas exchange parameters, hydric environment of nests, hatching success, and hatchling emergence (Limpus *et al.* 1979, Ackerman 1980, Parmenter 1980, Spotila *et al.* 1983, McGehee 1990). Relocating nests into sands deficient in oxygen or moisture can result in mortality, morbidity, and reduced behavioral competence of hatchlings. Water availability is known to influence the incubation environment of the embryos and hatchlings of turtles with flexible-shelled eggs, which has been shown to affect nitrogen excretion (Packard *et al.* 1984), mobilization of calcium (Packard and Packard 1986), mobilization of yolk nutrients (Packard *et al.* 1985), hatchling size (Packard *et al.* 1981, McGehee 1990), energy reserves in the yolk at hatching (Packard *et al.* 1988), and locomotory ability of hatchlings (Miller *et al.* 1987).

In a 1994 Florida study comparing loggerhead hatching and emerging success of relocated nests with nests left in their original location, Moody (1998) found that hatching success was lower in relocated nests at nine of 12 beaches evaluated. In addition, emerging success was lower in relocated nests at 10 of 12 beaches surveyed in 1993 and 1994. Many of the direct effects of beach nourishment may persist over time. These direct effects include increased susceptibility of relocated nests to catastrophic events, the consequences of potential increased beachfront development, changes in the physical characteristics of the beach, the formation of escarpments, repair/replacement of groins and jetties and future sand migration.

Equipment

The use of heavy machinery on beaches during a construction project may also have adverse effects on sea turtles. Equipment left on the nesting beach overnight can create barriers to nesting females emerging from the surf and crawling up the beach, causing a higher incidence of false crawls and unnecessary energy expenditure.

The operation of motor vehicles or equipment on the beach to complete the project work at night affects sea turtle nesting by: interrupting or colliding with a female turtle on the beach; headlights disorienting or misorienting emergent hatchlings; vehicles running over nesting females or hatchlings attempting to reach the ocean, and vehicle tracks traversing the beach interfering with hatchlings crawling to the ocean. Apparently, hatchlings become diverted not because they cannot physically climb out of the rut (Hughes and Caine 1994), but because the sides of the track cast a shadow and the hatchlings lose their line of sight to the ocean horizon (Mann 1977). The extended period of travel required to negotiate tire tracks and ruts may increase the susceptibility of hatchlings to dehydration and depredation during migration to the ocean (Hosier *et al*. 1981). Driving directly above or over incubating egg clutches or on the beach can cause sand compaction which may result in adverse impacts on nest site selection, digging behavior, clutch viability, and emergence by hatchlings, decreasing nest success and directly killing preemergent hatchlings (Mann 1977, Nelson and Dickerson 1987, Nelson 1988).

Depending on when the dune project is completed, dune vegetation may have become established in the vicinity of dune restoration sites. The physical changes and loss of plant cover caused by vehicles on vegetated areas or dunes can lead to various degrees of instability and cause dune migration. As vehicles move over the sand, sand is displaced downward, lowering the substrate. Since the vehicles also inhibit plant growth, and open the area to wind erosion, the beach and dunes may become unstable. Vehicular traffic on the beach or through dune breaches or low dunes may cause acceleration of overwash and erosion (Godfrey *et al.* 1978). Driving along the beachfront should be limited to between the low and high tide water lines. To minimize the impacts to the beach and recovering dunes, transport and access to the dune restoration sites should be from the road. However, if the work needs to be conducted from the beach, work areas for the truck transport and bulldozer/bobcat equipment should be designated and marked.

Artificial lighting

Visual cues are the primary sea-finding mechanism for hatchling sea turtles (Mrosovsky and Carr 1967, Mrosovsky and Shettleworth 1968, Dickerson and Nelson 1989, Witherington and Bjorndal 1991). When artificial lighting is present on or near the beach, it can misdirect hatchlings once they emerge from their nests and prevent them from reaching the ocean (Philibosian 1976, Mann 1977, FWC 2007a). In addition, a significant reduction in sea turtle nesting activity has been documented on beaches illuminated with artificial lights (Witherington 1992). Therefore, construction lights along a project beach and on the dredging vessel may deter females from coming ashore to nest, misdirect females trying to return to the surf after a nesting event, and misdirect emergent hatchlings from adjacent non-project beaches.

The newly created wider and flatter beach berm exposes sea turtles and their nests to lights that were less visible, or not visible, from nesting areas before the sand placement activity leading to a higher mortality of hatchlings. Review of over 10 years of empirical information from beach nourishment projects indicates that the number of sea turtles impacted by lights increases on the post-construction berm. A review of selected nourished beaches in Florida (South Brevard, North Brevard, Captiva Island, Ocean Ridge, Boca Raton, Town of Palm Beach, Longboat Key, and Bonita Beach) indicated disorientation reporting increased by approximately 300 percent the first nesting season after project construction and up to 542 percent the second year compared to prenourishment reports (Trindell *et al.* 2005).

Specific examples of increased lighting disorientations after a sand placement project include Brevard and Palm Beach Counties, Florida. A sand placement project in Brevard County, completed in 2002, showed an increase of 130 percent in disorientations in the nourished area. Disorientations on beaches in the County that were not nourished remained constant (Trindell 2007). This same result was also documented in 2003 when another beach in Brevard County was nourished and the disorientations increased by 480 percent (Trindell 2007). Installing appropriate beachfront lighting is the most effective method to decrease the number of disorientations on any developed beach including nourished beaches. A shoreline protection project was constructed at Ocean Ridge in Palm Beach County, Florida, between August 1997 and April 1998. Lighting disorientation events increased after nourishment. In spite of continued aggressive efforts to identify and correct lighting violations in 1998 and 1999, 86 percent of the disorientation reports were in the nourished area in 1998 and 66 percent of the reports were in the nourished area in 1999 (Howard and Davis 1999).

While the effects of artificial lighting have not been specifically studied on each beach that is nourished in Florida, based on the experience of increased artificial lighting disorientations on other Florida beaches, impacts are expected to potentially occur on all nourished beaches statewide.

Changing to sea turtle compatible lighting can be easily accomplished at the local level through voluntary compliance or by adopting appropriate regulations. Of the 27 coastal counties in Florida where sea turtles are known to nest, 21 have passed beachfront lighting ordinances in addition to 58 municipalities (http://myfwc.com/media/418420/seaturtle_lightordmap.pdf). Local governments have realized that adopting a lighting ordinance is the most effective method to address artificial lighting along the beachfront.

Indirect Effects

Indirect effects are those effects that are caused by or result from the proposed action, are later in time, and are reasonably certain to occur. Effects from the proposed project may continue to affect sea turtle nesting on the project beach and adjacent beaches in future years.

Increased susceptibility to catastrophic events

Nest relocation within a nesting season may concentrate eggs in an area making them more susceptible to catastrophic events. Hatchlings released from concentrated areas also may be subject to greater predation rates from both land and marine predators, because the predators learn where to concentrate their efforts (Glenn 1998, Wyneken *et al.* 1998).

Increased beachfront development

Pilkey and Dixon (1996) stated that beach replenishment frequently leads to more development in greater density within shorefront communities that are then left with a future of further replenishment or more drastic stabilization measures. Dean (1999) also noted that the very existence of a beach nourishment project can encourage more development in coastal areas. Following completion of a beach nourishment project in Miami during 1982, investment in new and updated facilities substantially increased tourism there (National Research Council 1995). Increased building density immediately adjacent to the beach often resulted as much larger buildings that accommodated more beach users replaced older buildings. Overall, shoreline management creates an upward spiral of initial protective measures resulting in more expensive development which leads to the need for more and larger protective measures. Increased shoreline development may adversely affect sea turtle nesting success. Greater development may support larger populations of mammalian predators, such as foxes and raccoons, than undeveloped areas (National Research Council 1990a), and can also result in greater adverse effects due to artificial lighting, as discussed above.

Changes in the physical environment

Beach nourishment may result in changes in sand density (compaction), beach shear resistance (hardness), beach moisture content, beach slope, sand color, sand grain size, sand grain shape, and sand grain mineral content if the placed sand is dissimilar from the original beach sand (Nelson and Dickerson 1988a). These changes could result in adverse impacts on nest site selection, digging behavior, clutch viability, and hatchling emergence (Nelson and Dickerson 1987, Nelson 1988).

Beach nourishment projects create an elevated, wider, and unnatural flat slope berm. Sea turtles nest closer to the water the first few years after nourishment because of the altered profile (and perhaps unnatural sediment grain size distribution) (Ernest and Martin 1999, Trindell 2005) (**Figure 6**).



Figure 6. Review of sea turtle nesting site selection following nourishment (Trindell 2005).

Beach compaction and unnatural beach profiles resulting from beach nourishment activities could negatively impact sea turtles regardless of the timing of projects. Very fine sand or the use of heavy machinery can cause sand compaction on nourished beaches (Nelson *et al.* 1987, Nelson and Dickerson 1988a). Significant reductions in nesting success (*i.e.*, false crawls occurred more frequently) have been documented on severely compacted nourished beaches (Fletemeyer 1980, Raymond 1984, Nelson and Dickerson 1987, Nelson *et al.* 1987), and increased false crawls may result in increased physiological stress to nesting females. Sand compaction may increase the length of time required for female sea turtles to excavate nests and cause increased physiological stress to the animals (Nelson and Dickerson 1988b). Nelson and Dickerson (1988c) concluded that, in general, beaches nourished from offshore borrow sites are harder than natural beaches, and while some may soften over time through erosion and accretion of sand, others may remain hard for 10 years or more.

These impacts can be minimized by using suitable sand and by tilling (minimum depth of 36 inches) compacted sand after project completion. The level of compaction of a beach can be assessed by measuring sand compaction using a cone penetrometer (Nelson 1987). Tilling of a nourished beach with a root rake may reduce the sand compaction to levels comparable to unnourished beaches. However, a pilot study by Nelson and Dickerson (1988c) showed that a tilled nourished beach will remain uncompacted for up to one year. Multi-year beach compaction monitoring and, if necessary, tilling would ensure that project impacts on sea turtles are minimized.

A change in sediment color on a beach could change the natural incubation temperatures of nests in an area, which, in turn, could alter natural sex ratios. To provide the most suitable sediment for nesting sea turtles, the color of the nourished sediments should resemble the natural beach sand in the area. Natural reworking of sediments and bleaching from exposure to the sun would help to

lighten dark nourishment sediments; however, the timeframe for sediment mixing and bleaching to occur could be critical to a successful sea turtle nesting season.

Escarpment formation

On nourished beaches, steep escarpments may develop along the water line interface as the beach adjusts from an unnatural construction profile to a more natural beach profile (Coastal Engineering Research Center 1984, Nelson *et al.* 1987). These escarpments can hamper or prevent access to nesting sites (Nelson and Blihovde 1998). Researchers have shown that female sea turtles coming ashore to nest can be discouraged by the formation of an escarpment, leading to situations where they choose marginal or unsuitable nesting areas to deposit eggs (e.g., in front of the escarpments, which often results in failure of nests due to prolonged tidal inundation). This impact can be minimized by leveling any escarpments prior to the nesting season.

Construction of groins and jetties

Groins and jetties are shore-perpendicular structures that are designed to trap sand that would otherwise be transported by longshore currents. Jetties are defined as structures placed to keep sand from flowing into channels (Kaufman and Pilkey 1979, Komar 1983). In preventing normal sand transport, these structures accrete updrift beaches while causing accelerated beach erosion downdrift of the structures (Komar 1983, Pilkey *et al.* 1984, National Research Council 1987), a process that results in degradation of sea turtle nesting habitat. As sand fills the area updrift from the groin or jetty, some littoral drift and sand deposition on adjacent downdrift beaches may occur due to spillover. However, these groins and jetties often force the stream of sand into deeper offshore water where it is lost from the system (Kaufman and Pilkey 1979). The greatest changes in beach profile near groins and jetties are observed close to the structures, but effects eventually may extend many miles along the coast (Komar 1983).

Jetties are placed at ocean inlets to keep transported sand from closing the inlet channel. Together, jetties and inlets are known to have profound effects on adjacent beaches (Kaufman and Pilkey 1979). Witherington *et al.* (2005) found a significant negative relationship between loggerhead nesting density and distance from the nearest of 17 ocean inlets on the Atlantic coast of Florida. The effect of inlets in lowering nesting density was observed both updrift and downdrift of the inlets, leading researchers to propose that beach instability from both erosion and accretion may discourage loggerhead nesting.

Construction or repair of groins and jetties during the nesting season may result in the destruction of nests, disturbance of females attempting to nest, and disorientation of emerging hatchlings from project lighting. Following construction, the presence of groins and jetties may interfere with nesting turtle access to the beach, result in a change in beach profile and width (downdrift erosion, loss of sandy berms, and escarpment formation), trap hatchlings, and concentrate predatory fishes, resulting in higher probabilities of hatchling predation.

Escarpments may develop on beaches between groins as the beaches equilibrate to their final profiles. These escarpments are known to prevent females from nesting on the upper beach and can cause them to choose unsuitable nesting areas, such as seaward of an escarpment. These nest sites commonly receive prolonged tidal inundation and erosion, which results in nest failure (Nelson and Blihovde 1998). As groin structures fail and break apart, they spread debris on the beach, which may further impede nesting females from accessing suitable nesting sites and trap both hatchlings and nesting turtles.

Species' response to a proposed action

The following summary illustrates sea turtle responses to and recovery from a nourishment project comprehensively studied by Ernest and Martin (1999). A significantly larger proportion of turtles emerging on nourished beaches abandoned their nesting attempts than turtles emerging on natural or prenourished beaches. This reduction in nesting success is most pronounced during the first year following project construction and is most likely the result of changes in physical beach characteristics associated with the nourishment project (e.g., beach profile, sediment grain size, beach compaction, frequency and extent of escarpments). During the first post-construction year, the time required for turtles to excavate an egg chamber on untilled, hard-packed sands increases significantly relative to natural conditions. However, tilling (minimum depth of 36 inches) is effective in reducing sediment compaction to levels that did not significantly prolong digging times. As natural processes reduced compaction levels on nourished beaches during the second post-construction year, digging times returned to natural levels (Ernest and Martin 1999).

During the first post-construction year, nests on nourished beaches are deposited significantly seaward of the toe of the dune and significantly landward of the tide line than nests on natural beaches. More nests are washed out on the wide, flat beaches of the nourished treatments than on the narrower steeply sloped natural beaches. This phenomenon may persist through the second post-construction year monitoring and result from the placement of nests near the seaward edge of the beach berm where dramatic profile changes, caused by erosion and scarping, occur as the beach equilibrates to a more natural contour.

The principal effect of beach nourishment on sea turtle reproduction is a reduction in nesting success during the first year following project construction. Although most studies have attributed this phenomenon to an increase in beach compaction and escarpment formation, Ernest and Martin (1999) indicated that changes in beach profile may be more important. Regardless, as a nourished beach is reworked by natural processes in subsequent years and adjusts from an unnatural construction profile to a natural beach profile, beach compaction and the frequency of escarpment formation decline, and nesting and nesting success return to levels found on natural beaches.

BEACH MICE

STATUS OF THE SPECIES/CRITICAL HABITAT

Species/critical habitat description

The formal taxonomic classification of beach mouse subspecies follows the geographic variation in pelage and skeletal measurements documented by Bowen (1968). This peer-reviewed, published classification was also accepted by Hall (1981). Since the listing of the beach mice, further research concerning the taxonomic validity of the subspecific classification of beach mice has been initiated and/or conducted. Preliminary results from these studies support the separation of beach mice from inland forms, and support the currently accepted taxonomy (Bowen 1968) (*i.e.*, each beach mouse group represents a unique and isolated subspecies). Recent research using mitochondrial DNA data illustrates that Gulf Coast beach mouse subspecies form a well-supported and independent evolutionary cluster within the global population of the mainland or inland old field mice (Van Zant and Wooten 2006).

The old-field mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus)* is different in form and structure as well as being genetically diverse throughout its range in the southeastern U.S. (Bowen 1968, Selander *et al.* 1971). Currently there are 16 recognized subspecies of old-field mice (Hall 1981). Eight subspecies occupy coastal rather than inland habitat and are referred to as beach mice (Bowen 1968). Two existing subspecies of beach mouse and one extinct subspecies are known from the Atlantic coast of Florida and five subspecies live along the Gulf coast of Alabama and northwestern Florida.

Rivers and various inlets bisect the Gulf and Atlantic beaches and naturally isolate habitats in which the beach mice live. The outer coastline and barrier islands are typically separated from the mainland by lagoons, swamps, tidal marshes, and flatwood areas with hardpan soil conditions. However, these dispersal barriers are not absolute; sections of sand peninsulas may from time to time be cut off by storms and shift over time due to wind and current action. Human development has also fragmented the ranges of the subspecies. As a consequence of coastal development and the dynamic nature of the coastal environment; beach mouse populations are generally comprised of various disjunct populations.

<u>Atlantic Coast beach mice</u>

The southeastern beach mouse (SEBM) was listed as a threatened species under the Act in 1989 (54 *FR* 20598). Critical habitat was not designated for this subspecies. SEBM is also listed as threatened by the State of Florida. The original distribution of the SEBM was from Ponce Inlet, Volusia County, southward to Hollywood, Broward County, and possibly as far south as Miami in Miami-Dade County. It is currently restricted to Volusia, Brevard, and Indian River Counties. Formerly, this subspecies occurred along about 175 miles of Florida's southeast coast; it now occupies about 50 miles, a significant reduction in range (**Figure 7**).

This subspecies uses both beach dunes and inland areas of scrub vegetation. The most seaward vegetation typically consists of sea oats (*Uniola paniculata*), bitter panicgrass (*Panicum amarum*), railroad vine (*Ipomoea pes-caprae*), beach morning-glory (*Ipomoea stolonifera*), and camphorweed (*Heterotheca subaxillaris*). Further landward, vegetation is more diverse, including beach tea (*Croton punctatus*), pricklypear (*Opuntia humifusa*), saw palmetto (*Serenoa repens)*, wax myrtle (*Myrica cerifera)*, and sea grape (*Coccoloba uvifera*).

Anastasia Island beach mice

The Anastasia Island beach mouse (AIBM), was listed as endangered under the Act in 1989 (54 *FR* 20598). Critical habitat was not designated for the subspecies. AIBM is also listed as an endangered species by the State of Florida. The distribution of the AIBM has declined significantly, particularly in the northern part of its range. AIBM was historically known from the vicinity of the Duval-St. Johns County line southward to Matanzas Inlet, St. Johns County, Florida (Frank and Humphrey 1996). Included in their range, AIBM populations are found along 14.5 miles of Anastasia Island, mainly on 3.5 miles at Anastasia State Park (ASP) and one mile at Fort Matanzas National Monument (FMNM). AIBM have been found at low densities in dunes on the remainder of the island. Beach mice have also been located along sections of the 4.2 miles of dune habitat at Guana Tolomato Matanzas National Estuarine Research Reserve (GTMNERR)-Guana River. Anastasia Island is separated from the mainland of Florida to the west by extensive salt marshes and the Mantazas River, to the north by the St. Augustine Inlet, and to the south by the Matanzas Inlet which are both maintained and open. This has restricted the range of AIBM to 14.5 mile length of Anastasia Island and sections of GTMNERR-Guana River (**Figure 8**).

In 1992 to 1993, the Service funded the reintroduction of AIBM to GTMNERR in St. Johns County where historical habitat for the subspecies existed (Service 1993). GMTNERR-Guana River portion of the Reserve (4.0 miles of undeveloped beach) is nine miles north of the existing population of beach mice at ASP. Fifty-five mice (27 females and 28 males) were trapped at FMNM and ASP from September 24, to November 12, 1992, and placed in soft-release enclosures at the state park on September 27, and November 12, 1992. During follow-up trapping conducted in February 1993, beach mice occupied the entire 4.2-mile length of the park; 34 were captured and it was estimated that the population totaled 220. Quarterly trapping has been conducted since the reintroduction and mice have not been captured since September 2006. This may be a result of habitat loss alteration from storms or habitat conditions. Sneckenberger 2001 indicates that the scrub habitat found in the tertiary dunes provides a more stable level of food resources, which becomes crucial when food is scarce or nonexistent in the primary and secondary dunes. This suggests that access to primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat is essential to beach mice at the individual level, which may be an issue for this population as A1A Highway separates/bisects the primary dune from the secondary dunes and scrub dune habitats.



Figure 7. The distribution of the southeastern beach mouse.



Figure 8. The distribution of the Anastasia Island beach mouse.

Gulf Coast Beach Mice

The CBM and the PKBM were listed with the Alabama beach mouse (ABM) (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*), as endangered species under the Act in 1985 (50 *FR* 23872). The SABM was listed under the Act in 1998 (63 *FR* 70053). CBM, SABM, and PKBM are also listed as endangered species by the State of Florida (FWC 2010). Critical habitat was designated for the CBM, and PKBM at the time of listing; however, critical habitat was revised in 2006 (71 *FR* 60238). Critical habitat was also designated for the SABM in 2006 (71 *FR* 60238).

The historical range of the CBM extended 53 miles between Destin Pass, Choctawhatchee Bay in Okaloosa County and East Pass in St. Andrew Bay, Bay County, Florida. PKBM historically ranged along the entire length of Perdido Key for 16.9 miles between Perdido Bay, Alabama (Perdido Pass) and Pensacola Bay, Florida (Bowen 1968). The historical range of the SABM extended 38 miles between Money Bayou in Gulf County, and Crooked Island at the East Pass of St. Andrews Bay, Bay County, Florida including the St. Joseph peninsula and the coastal mainland adjacent to St. Joseph Bay, Florida (**Figure 9**).

Critical habitat

Since the listing of the PKBM and CBM in 1985, research has refined previous knowledge of Gulf Coast beach mouse habitat requirements and factors that influence their use of habitat. Based on the current knowledge of the life history, biology, and ecology of the subspecies and the requirements of the habitat to sustain the essential life history functions of the subspecies, the primary constituent elements (PCE) of critical habitat for Gulf Coast beach mice consist of:

1. A contiguous mosaic of primary, secondary scrub vegetation, and dune structure, with a balanced level of competition and predation and few or no competitive or predaceous nonnative species present, that collectively provide foraging opportunities, cover, and burrow sites;

2. Primary and secondary dunes, generally dominated by sea oats that despite occasional temporary impacts and reconfiguration from tropical storms and hurricanes provide abundant food resources, burrow sites, and protection from predators;

3. Scrub dunes, generally dominated by scrub oaks, that provide food resources and burrow sites, and provide elevated refugia during and after intense flooding due to rainfall and/or hurricane induced storm surge;.

4. Functional, unobstructed habitat connections that facilitate genetic exchange, dispersal, natural exploratory movements, and recolonization of locally extirpated areas; and

5. A natural light regime within the coastal dune ecosystem, compatible with the nocturnal activity of beach mice, necessary for normal behavior, growth and viability of all life stages.



Figure 9. Historical range of Gulf Coast beach mouse subspecies.

Thirteen coastal dune areas (critical habitat units) in southern Alabama and the panhandle of Florida have been determined to be essential to the conservation of PKBM, CBM, and SABM and are designated as critical habitat (**Figures 10 through 12**). These 13 units include five units for PKBM, five units for CBM, and three units for the SABM. These units total 6,194 acres of coastal dunes, and include 1,300 acres for the PKBM in Escambia County, Florida and Baldwin County, Alabama (**Table 10**); 2,404 acres for the CBM, in Okaloosa, Walton, and Bay Counties, Florida (**Table 11**); and 2,490 acres for the SABM in Bay and Gulf Counties, Florida (**Table 12**).



Figure 10. Critical habitat units designated for the Perdido Key beach mouse.

Table 11. Critical habitat units designated for the Perdido Key beach mouse.

Perdido Key Beach Mouse Critical Habitat Units	Federal Acres	State Acres	Local and Private Acres	Total Acres
1. Gulf State Park Unit	0	115	0	115
2. West Perdido Key Unit	0	0	147	147
3. Perdido Key State Park Unit	0	238	0	238
4. Gulf Beach Unit	0	0	162	162
5. Gulf Islands National Seashore Unit	638	0	0	638
Total	638	353	309	1300

Gulf State Park

The Gulf State Park Unit (PKBM-1) consists of 115 acres of PKBM habitat in southern Baldwin County, Alabama, on the westernmost region of Perdido Key. PKBM were known to inhabit this unit during surveys in 1979 and 1982, and by 1986 this was the only known existing population of the subspecies (Humphrey and Barbour 1981; Holler *et al*. 1989). This population of less than 30 individuals was the donor for the reestablishment of PKBM into Gulf Islands National Seashore in 1986. This project ultimately saved Perdido Key beach mice from extinction as the population at Gulf State Park was considered extirpated in 1998 due to tropical storms and predators (Moyers *et al*. 1999). In 2010, captive bred mice are released at Gulf State Park. This reintroduction was deemed a success and the population has continued to increase. The track tube monitoring was established at GSP in 2010, which began with only a 9 percent occurrence rate and the end of the year yielded an 83 percent occurrence rate, 2011 started with an 85 percent occurrence rate and continued to increase slightly until September 2011 which yielded a 73 percent occurrence rate in the tracking tubes (FWC 2012a and FWC 2014b). A 3-day trapping effort the week of May 7, 2012, continued to find PKBM distributed throughout habitat south of Highway 182. Two reproductively-active male PKBM were found north of Highway 182 (J. Gore pers. comm. 2012). The release appears to have been a success and PKBM are occupying all three public lands for the first time since being listed as endangered. Recent track tube data for 2013 shows an average of 93 percent occurrence of PKBM in the tracking tubes at GSP (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b).

Beach mouse habitat in this unit consists of primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat. Because scrub habitat is separated from the frontal dunes by a highway in some areas, the population inhabiting this unit can be especially vulnerable to hurricane impacts, and therefore further linkage to scrub habitat and/or habitat management would improve connectivity. This unit is managed by the Alabama Department of Conservation and Natural Resources and provides primary constituent elements (PCEs) 2, 3, 4, and 5. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, and/or a decrease in habitat quality. This unit, which contains interior scrub habitat as well as primary and secondary dunes, serves as a re-designation and expansion of the original critical habitat designation (50 *FR* 23872). The original designation did not include scrub habitat which we now know is necessary for the long-term persistence of beach mouse populations.

The West Perdido Key Unit (PKBM-2) consists of 114 acres in southern Escambia County, Florida, and 33 acres in southern Baldwin County, Alabama. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat from approximately 1.0 mile west of where the Alabama-Florida State line bisects Perdido Key east to 2.0 miles east of the State line and areas from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of human development or maritime forest. This unit consists of private lands and ultimately includes essential features of beach mouse habitat between Perdido Key State Park (Unit 3) and GSP (Unit 1). Beach mouse habitat in this unit consists of primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat and provides PCEs 2, 3, and 4.

Habitat fragmentation and other threats specific to this unit are mainly due to development. Consequently, threats to this unit that may require special management considerations include habitat fragmentation and habitat loss, artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, excessive foot traffic and soil compaction, and damage to dune vegetation and structure. This area was not known to be occupied at the time of listing. While no trapping has been conducted on these private lands to determine presence, sign of beach mouse presence was confirmed by the Service in 2013 and 2014 through observations of beach mouse burrows and tracks, and this unit is contiguous with two occupied units. Therefore, we have determined this unit to be currently occupied. This unit provides essential connectivity between two core population areas (PKBM-3 and PKBM-1), provides habitat for expansion, natural movements, and re-colonization, and is therefore essential to the conservation of the species. Specifically, this unit may have historically provided for the re-colonization of GSP (PKBM-1) and/or may facilitate similar re-colonization in the future as the habitat recovers from recent hurricane events.

The Perdido Key State Park Unit (PKBM-3) consists of 238 acres in southern Escambia County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundary of PKSP from approximately 2.0 miles east of the Alabama–Florida State line to 4.0 mile east of the State line and the area from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of the maritime forest. Beach mouse habitat in this unit consists of primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat. This unit provides PCEs 2, 3, 4, and 5 and is essential to the conservation of the species. Improving and/or restoring habitat connections would increase habitat quality and provide more functional connectivity for dispersal, exploratory movements, and population expansion. This unit is managed by the Florida Park Service. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, and/or a decrease in habitat quality. This unit serves as a redesignation and expansion of a zone included in the initial critical habitat designation (50 *FR* 23872); however, the zone did not include scrub habitat, which we now know is necessary for the long-term persistence of beach mouse populations.

Trapping efforts in this area were limited in the past. In 2000, a successful relocation program reestablished mice at PKSP. In 2004 and 2005, hurricane/tropical storm damage to the habitat at PKSP dropped PKBM detection to only 10 percent of the available habitat, indicating low densities (Loggins 2007). In 2005, the FWC started monitoring the presence of PKBM on public lands by tracking tubes. The Service and other land managers have relied on this data as a means of tracking the presence of PKBM in GSP, PKSP, and GINS. Tracking data from June 2006 indicated that about 25 percent of the available habitat was occupied at PKSP (FWC 2007). Trapping at PKSP and GINS in March 2007 was cancelled after one night after the capture of only one mouse (a fatality) and very limited sightings of beach mouse sign (tracks, burrows) (FWC 2007). Trapping conducted in April of 2008 found no mice on PKSP (J. Himes pers. comm. 2008). According to 2009 tracking data, there were no mice occurrences at PKSP until May 2009, then only sporadic occurrences until November 2009 as the occurrence data started to show a slow but steady increase (FWC 2014b). Tracking data from 2010 showed a dramatic increase in PKBM

occurrences within PKSP with 20 percent occurrence at the beginning of the year, and 84 percent occurrence at the end of 2010 (FWC 2010c). Trapping in 2010 on PKSP captured 11 individual beach mice (11 total captures) in February and 36 individuals (106 total captures) in May. At that time, information was insufficient to accurately estimate population size. These captures represent the minimum number of mice in the park for those months. Trapping at GINS and PKSP in spring 2010 generally confirmed the population was increasing with PKBM widely distributed at both public lands.

The number of track tubes visited by mice has increased over the past several years and recent years indicate almost all track tubes contain PKBM tracks. This is likely due to the fact that the storm-impacted coastal habitats have basically recovered and development and predator pressures have decreased. Data from 2011 showed that 96 percent (81 total traps) of track tubes registered beach mouse tracks, indicating that mice were becoming widespread throughout PKSP (J. Gore pers. comm. 2011, FWC 2012a, and FWC 2014b). The 2012 track tube surveys yielded 99 percent of track tubes with beach mouse tracks at PKSP (D. Greene pers. comm. 2012 and FWC 2012a, FWC 2012b, and FWC 2012c). During 2013, the track tube data indicates 97 percent of track tubes contained PKBM tracks (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b).

There were effects to the Unit resulting from the overwash and inundation by storm surge that occurred several times during the 2004 and 2005 storm seasons. Blow outs occurred on the west and east portions of the PKSP. Two sections of the Hwy 292 were washed out. Park facilities were destroyed. Dune vegetation was significantly impacted, but has been restored passively and actively. Park facilities have been reconstructed in accordance with protected species guidelines.

The Gulf Beach Unit (PKBM-4) consists of 162 acres in southern Escambia County, Florida. This unit includes essential features of beach mouse habitat between GINS and Perdido Key State Park from approximately 4.0 miles east of the Alabama–Florida State line to 6.0 miles east of the State line and areas from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of human development or maritime forest. This unit consists of private lands. Beach mouse habitat in this unit consists of primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat. Habitat fragmentation and other threats specific to this unit are mainly due to development. Consequently, threats to this unit that may require special management considerations include habitat fragmentation and habitat loss, artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, excessive foot traffic and soil compaction, and damage to dune vegetation and structure. While not known to be occupied at the time of listing, a single beach mouse was trapped within the unit as a result of trapping efforts in 2004 (Service 2004). There have been no data collected within this unit to confirm either absence or presence since this single trapping event in 2004. However, Service personnel have observed burrows and tracks indicating PKBM are occupying the area. This unit provides PCEs 2, 3, and 4 and is essential to the conservation of the species. This unit includes high-elevation scrub habitat and serves as a refuge during storm events and as an important repopulation source if storms extirpate or greatly reduce local populations. This unit currently provides essential connectivity between two core populations GINS (PKBM-5) and PKSP (PKBM-3) and provides essential habitat for expansion, natural movements, and recolonization (PCE 4).

The Gulf Islands National Seashore Unit (Unit 5) consists of 638 acres in southern Escambia County, Florida, on the easternmost region of Perdido Key. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundary of Gulf Islands National Seashore–Perdido Key Area (also referred to as Johnson Beach) from approximately 6.0 miles east of the Alabama–Florida State line to the eastern tip of Perdido Key at Pensacola Bay and the area from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of the maritime forest. Beach mouse habitat in this unit consists mainly of primary and secondary dune habitat, but provides the longest contiguous expanse of frontal dune habitat within the historic range of the PKBM. PBKM were known to inhabit this unit in 1979. No beach mice were captured during surveys in 1982 and 1986 (Humphrey and Barbour 1981; Holler *et al*. 1989). However the population was impacted by Hurricane Frederic (1979), and considered unoccupied at the time of listing. However, no beach mice were captured during surveys in 1982 and 1986 (Humphrey and Barbour 1981; Holler *et al*. 1989). In 1986, PKBM were re-established to GINS as part of the State of Florida and Service recovery efforts. In 2000 and 2001, PKBM captured from this site served as donors to re-establish beach mice at PKSP. Due to damage from storm surge during the 2004 and 2005 storm seasons, PKBM are detected on approximately 30 percent of the beach mouse habitat available (Loggins 2007). Tracking data from June 2006 indicated that about 32 percent of the available habitat was occupied at GINS (FWC 2007). Trapping at PKSP and GINS in March 2007 was cancelled after one night after the capture of only one mouse (a fatality) and very limited sightings of beach mouse sign (tracks, burrows) (FWC 2007). Trapping conducted in April of 2008 was more encouraging with the capture of 35 mice at GINS (S. Sneckenberger pers. comm. 2008). Through 2008-2010 the population continues to expand from GINS to PKSP and beyond. This is the first natural recolonization of a park without the need for a translocation. From 2010 to 2013, the track tube occurrences have averaged 84 percent, 94 percent, 95 percent, and 94 percent respectively (FWC 2014b, FWC 2012a, FWC 2012b, FWC 2012c, FWC 2013a, and FWC 2013b).

PKBM-5, in its entirety, possesses all five PCEs and is essential to the conservation of the species. However, most of this unit consists of frontal dunes, making the population inhabiting this unit particularly threatened by storm events. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, and/or a decrease in habitat quality. This unit is managed by the National Park Service–Gulf Islands National Seashore. This unit was included in the initial critical habitat designation (50 *FR* 23872) as well as the 2006 revision (71 *FR* 60238). The majority of this unit was overwashed and inundated by storm surge several times during the 2004 and 2005 storm seasons. Park facilities were destroyed and most of the Park road was destroyed. Dune vegetation was washed away or covered with sand. Habitat has since recovered and was comprised of natural and human facilitated dune restoration by GINS staff. Park structures were reconstructed landward of their former locations and in accordance with protected species guidelines.



Figure 11. Critical habitat units designated for the Choctawhatchee beach mouse.

Table 12. Critical habitat units designated for the Choctawhatchee beach mouse.

Choctawhatchee Beach Mouse Critical Habitat Units	Federal Acres	State Acres	Local and Private Acres	Total Acres
1. Henderson Beach Unit	0	96	0	96
2. Topsail Hill Unit	0	277	31	308
3. Grayton Beach Unit	0	162	17	179
4. Deer Lake Unit	0	40	9	49
5. W. Crooked Island/Shell Island Unit	1333	408	30	1771
Total	1333	982	87	2404

The Henderson Beach unit (CBM–1) consists of 96 acres in Okaloosa County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundary of Henderson Beach State Park from 0.5 miles east of the intersection of Highway 98 and Scenic Highway 98 to 0.25 miles west of Matthew Boulevard and the area from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of the

maritime forest. This westernmost unit provides primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat (PCEs 2 and 3). This unit is within the historical range of the subspecies; however, it was not known to be occupied at the time of listing and current occupancy is unknown because no recent efforts have been made to document beach mouse presence or absence. Because this unit includes protected, high-elevation scrub habitat, it may serve as a refuge during storm events and as an important source population if storms extirpate or greatly reduce local populations or populations to the east.

This unit is managed by the Florida Park Service and is essential to the conservation of the species. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include habitat fragmentation, Park development, artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality.

The Topsail Hill Unit (CBM–2) consists of 308 acres in Walton County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundary of Topsail Hill Preserve State Park, as well as adjacent private lands from 0.1 miles east of the Gulf Pines subdivision to 0.6 miles west of the Oyster Lake outlet and the area from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of human development or maritime forest. This unit provides primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat and possesses all five PCEs. Its large, contiguous, high-quality habitat allows for natural movements and population expansion. Choctawhatchee beach mice were confirmed present in the unit in 1979 (Humphrey *et al*. 1987), were present at the time of listing, and are still present.

Beach mice have been captured on Stallworth County Park and Stallworth Preserve subdivision, a private development within the unit, and east of the Park (Service 2003a and Yanchis pers comm 2014). The population of Choctawhatchee beach mice inhabiting this unit appears to harbor unique genetic variation and displays a relatively high degree of genetic divergence considering the close proximity of this population to other populations (Wooten and Holler 1999).

This unit has portions with different ownership, purposes, and mandates. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include Park and residential development, artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality.

Lands containing the features essential to the conservation of the CBM within the area covered under the Habitat Conservation Plan (HCP) for the Stallworth County Preserve (4 acres) are excluded from critical habitat designation under section 4(b)(2) of the Act.

The Grayton Beach Unit (CBM–3) consists of 179 acres in Walton County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundary of Grayton Beach State Park, as well as adjacent private lands and inholdings, from 0.3 mi west of the Alligator Lake outlet east to 0.8 miles west of Seagrove Beach and the area from the MHWL north to the seaward

extent of human development or maritime forest. This unit provides primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat (PCEs 2 and 3), habitat connectivity (PCE 4) and is essential to the conservation of the species. This unit also provides a relatively natural light regime (PCE 5). Beach mice were not detected in the unit in 1979 (Holler 1992a); however, they were found to be present in 1995 after Hurricane Opal (Moyers *et al.* 1999). While it seems likely that beach mice were present at the time of listing (and may have been present, but not detected, in 1979), the Service does not have data to confirm this assumption. Therefore, the Service considered this unit to be unoccupied at the time of listing. A program to strengthen and reestablish the population began in 1989 and yielded a persistent population at Grayton Beach State Park. A recent translocation of 43 CBM from Topsail State Park to Grayton Beach State Park in 2011 has proven successful as the 2013 follow-up trapping data indicated 93 new CBM at Grayton Beach State Park. According to 2013 track tube data, there is a 69 percent occurrence of beach mouse presence (average) at Grayton Beach State Park (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b). Beach mice are also known to currently occupy the private lands immediately east of the park.

This unit has portions with different ownership, purposes, and mandates. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include hurricane impacts that may require dune restoration and revegetation, excessive open, unvegetated habitat due to recreational use or storm impacts that may require revegetation, Park development, artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality.

Lands containing the features essential to the conservation of the Choctawhatchee beach mouse within the area covered under the HCP for the Watercolor development (4 acres) are excluded from critical habitat designation under section 4(b)(2) of the Act.

The Deer Lake Unit (CBM–4) consists of 49 acres in Walton County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundary of Deer Lake State Park as well as adjacent private lands from approximately one mile east of the Camp Creek Lake inlet west to approximately 0.5 miles west of the inlet of Deer Lake and the area from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of maritime forest or human development. This unit provides primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat (PCEs 2 and 3), habitat connectivity to adjacent lands (PCE 4), and is essential to the conservation of the species. This unit also provides a relatively natural light regime (PCE 5). Because live-trapping efforts in this area have been limited to incidental trapping, and beach mice were not detected in 1998 (Moyers *et al*. 1999), the Service considered this unit to be unoccupied at the time of listing. CBM were translocated from Topsail Hill Preserve State Park to private lands adjacent to this unit in 2003 and 2005 (Service 2003b, 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2005d). Tracking within the adjacent State park lands have indicated expansion of the population into the park. Recent track tube data from 2013 indicates Deer Lake State Park had a 73 percent (average) occurrence rate for monthly CBM presence (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b).

This unit has portions with different ownership, purposes, and mandates. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include artificial lighting, presence of

feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality.

Lands containing the features essential to the conservation of the CBM within the area covered under the HCP/Incidental Take Permit (ITP) for Watersound (71 acres) are excluded from critical habitat designation under section 4(b)(2) of the Act (see Application of Section 4(a)(3) and Exclusions Under Section 4(b)(2) of the Act section below). This excluded area is 0.5 miles west of the Camp Creek Lake inlet to 0.5 miles east of the Camp Creek Lake inlet.

The West Crooked Island/ Shell Island Unit (CBM–5) consists of 1,771 acres in Bay County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundaries of St. Andrew State Park mainland from 0.1 miles east of Venture Boulevard east to the entrance channel of St. Andrew Sound, Shell Island east of the entrance of St. Andrew Sound east to East Pass, and West Crooked Island southwest of East Bay and east of the entrance channel of St. Andrew Sound, and areas from the MHWL north to the seaward extent of the maritime forest. Shell Island consists of State lands, Tyndall Air Force Base (AFB) lands, and small private inholdings. Choctawhatchee beach mice were known to inhabit the majority of Shell Island in 1987 (Holler 1992b) and were again confirmed present in 1998 (Moyers *et al*. 1999), 2002, and 2003 (Lynn 2003a). Because beach mice inhabited nearly the entire suitable habitat on the island less than two years prior to listing and were reconfirmed after listing, the Service considered this area to be occupied at the time of listing. The West Crooked Island population is the result of a natural expansion of the Shell Island population after the two islands became connected in 1998 and 1999, a result of Hurricanes Opal and Georges (Service 2003b). Shell Island was connected to the mainland prior to the 1930s when a navigation inlet severed the connection on the western end. Beach mice were documented at St. Andrew State Park mainland as late as the 1960s (Bowen 1968), though no records of survey efforts exist again until Humphrey and Barbour (1981) and Meyers (1983) at which time beach mice were not detected. Therefore, it seems likely that this area was not occupied at the time of listing. Current beach mouse population levels at this site are unknown, and live-trapping to document the absence of mice has not been conducted. Similar to the original designation, this Park was designated as critical habitat because it has features essential to the CBM. It is also within the historical range of the mouse. This unit supports the easternmost population of CBM, with the next known population 22 miles to the west.

This unit provides primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat and possesses all five PCEs. Portions of this unit are managed by the Florida Park Service, while the remaining areas are federally (Tyndall AFB) and privately owned.

Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high residential or recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality.

Figure 12. Critical habitat units designated for the St. Andrew beach mouse.

Table 13. Critical habitat units designated for the St. Andrew beach mouse.

St. Andrew Beach Mouse Critical Habitat Units	Federal Acres	State Acres	Local and Private Acres	Total Acres
1. East Crooked Island Unit	649	0	177	826
2. Palm Point Unit	0	0	162	162
3. St. Joseph Peninsula Unit	0	1280	222	1502
Total	649	1280	561	2490

The East Crooked Island Unit (SABM–1) consists of 826 acres in Bay County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat on East Crooked Island from the entrance of St. Andrew Sound to one mile west of Mexico Beach, and the area from the MHWL to the seaward extent of the maritime forest (not including Raffield Peninsula). Beach mouse habitat in this unit consists of primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat and possesses all five PCEs. SABM were known to inhabit the unit in 1986 and 1989 (James 1992), though the population was

presumably extirpated after 1989 due to impacts from hurricanes. The East Crooked Island population was reestablished with donors from St. Joseph State Park in 1997. This unit was occupied at the time of listing. Live-trapping in 2002 confirmed occupation of mice (Moyers and Shea 2002, Lynn 2002a, Slaby 2005). Recent track tube data indicates mice are still present in this unit (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b). This unit maintains connectivity along the island and this unit is essential to provide a donor population following storm events.

The majority of this unit is federally owned (Tyndall AFB), while the remaining habitat is privately owned. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include artificial lighting, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational and military use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality.

The Palm Point Unit (SABM–2) consists of 162 acres of private lands in Gulf County, Florida. This unit encompasses habitat from Palm Point 1.25 miles northwest of the inlet of the Gulf County Canal to the southeastern boundary of St. Joseph Beach and the area from the MHWL to the seaward extent of the maritime forest. SABM were documented in the area by Bowen (1968) and were considered to have been present in this unit at the time of listing. Since SABM beach mouse habitat is limited to only two other areas, protecting this mainland site located within the species' historical range is needed for the subspecies' long-term persistence. As other viable opportunities are limited or nonexistent, this unit is essential to reduce the threats of stochastic events to this subspecies. Furthermore, as this unit is on the mainland, it is somewhat buffered from the effects of storm events. This area provides frontal and scrub dune habitat (PCEs 2 and 3), but may provide limited connectivity between habitats. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include habitat fragmentation, habitat loss, artificial lighting, presence of free-roaming cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high residential use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality.

The St. Joseph Peninsula Unit (SABM–3) consists of 1,502 acres in Gulf County, Florida. This unit encompasses essential features of beach mouse habitat within the boundary of St. Joseph Peninsula State Park (Park) as well as south of the Park to the peninsula's constriction north of Cape San Blas (also known as the "stumphole" region) and area from the MHWL to the seaward extent of the maritime forest. Beach mouse habitat in this unit consists of primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat, and provides a relatively contiguous expanse of habitat within the historical range of the SABM. This unit possesses all five PCEs and was occupied at the time of listing. SABM were known to inhabit this unit in 1986 and 1987 (James 1987, 1992, 1995, Gore 1994, Moyers *et al.* 1999, Slaby 2005). In addition, recent trapping and tracking efforts suggest that mice continue to occupy private lands south of the Park (K. Yanchis pers comm., FWS 2012). The Park alone does not provide sufficient habitat to allow for population expansion along the peninsula, which may be necessary for a population anchored by the tip of a historically dynamic peninsula. A continuous presence of beach mice along the peninsula is the species' best defense against local and complete extinctions due to storm events. The population of SABM inhabiting

this unit appears to possess unique genetic variation, and displays greater than expected genetic divergence from other populations (Wooten and Holler 1999).

The Florida Park Service manages portions of this unit, while the remaining area is privately owned. Threats specific to this unit that may require special management considerations include artificial lighting, habitat fragmentation and habitat loss, presence of feral cats as well as other predators at unnatural levels, and high recreational use that may result in soil compaction, damage to dunes, or other decrease in habitat quality. The population inhabiting this unit may also be particularly susceptible to hurricanes due to its location within St. Joseph Bay (the peninsula is a thin barrier peninsula with a north–south orientation).

Life history (All subspecies of beach mice)

Beach mice are differentiated from the inland subspecies by the variety of fur (pelage) patterns on the head, shoulders, and rump. The overall dorsal coloration in coastal subspecies is lighter in color and less extensive than on those of the inland subspecies (Sumner 1926, Bowen 1968). Similarly, beach mouse subspecies can be differentiated from each other by pelage pattern and coloration.

The SEBM averages 5.47 inches in total length (average of 10 individuals = 5.07 inches, with a 2.04-inch tail length (Osgood 1909, Stout 1992). Females are slightly larger than males. These beach mice are slightly darker in appearance than some other subspecies of beach mice, but paler than inland populations of *P. polionotus* (Osgood 1909). SEBM have pale, buffy coloration from the back of their head to their tail, and their underparts are white. The white hairs extend up on their flanks, high on their jaw, and within 0.07 to 0.12 inches of their eyes (Stout 1992). There are no white spots above the eyes as with AIBM (Osgood 1909). Their tail is also buffy above and white below. Juvenile SEBM are more grayish in coloration than adults; otherwise they are similar in appearance (Osgood 1909).

The AIBM averages 5.45 inches in total length (average of 10 individuals); with 2.05 inches mean tail length (James 1992). This subspecies has a very pale, buff-colored head and back with extensive white coloration underneath the sides (Howell 1939). Bowen (1968) noted two distinct rump color pigmentations, one tapered and the other a squared pattern, which extended to the thighs.

The SABM has head and body lengths averaging 2.95 inches, and tail mean lengths averaging 2.05 inches (James 1992). This subspecies has a very pale, buff-colored head and back with extensive white coloration underneath and along the sides (Howell 1939). Bowen (1968) noted two distinct rump color pigmentations, one tapered and the other a squared pattern, which extended to the thighs.

The PKBM is slightly smaller than the other Gulf coast beach mouse subspecies (Bowen 1968). Head and body length ranges from 2.7 to 3.3 inches (Holler 1992b). The pigmentation of PKBM

is gray to gray-brown with the underparts white and coloration on the head is less pronounced. The line between pigmented and unpigmented pelage runs dorsally posterior above the eyes and behind the ears. Pigmentation patterns on the rump are either squared or squared superimposed on a tapered pattern (Bowen 1968). There is no tail stripe.

CBM have head and body lengths ranging from 2.7 to 3.5 inches (Holler 1992a). This beach mouse is distinctly more orange-brown to yellow-brown than the other Gulf coast beach mouse subspecies (Bowen 1968). Pigmentation on the head either extends along the dorsal surface of the nose to the tip, or ends posterior to the eyes leaving the cheeks white. A dorsal tail stripe is either present or absent.

Behavior

Peromyscus polionotus is the only member of the genus that digs an extensive burrow. Beach mice are semifossorial, using their complex burrows as a place to rest during the day and between nightly foraging bouts, escape from predators, have and care for young, and hold limited food caches. Burrows of *P. polionotus* generally consist of an entrance tunnel, nest chamber, and escape tunnel. Burrow entrances are usually placed on the sloping side of a dune at the base of a shrub or clump of grass. The nest chamber is formed at the end of the level portion of the entrance tunnel at a depth of 23.6 to 35.4 inches, and the escape tunnel rises from the nest chamber to within 9.8 inches of the surface (Blair 1951). Nests of beach mice are constructed in the nest chamber of their burrows, a spherical cavity about 1.5 to 2.5 inches in diameter. The nest comprises about one-fourth of the size of the cavity and is composed of sea oat roots, stems, leaves and the chaffy parts of the panicles (Ivey 1949). Beach mice have been found to select burrow sites based on a suite of biotic and abiotic features including dune slope, soil compaction, vegetative cover, and height above sea level (Lynn 2000a, Sneckenberger 2001). A shortage of potential burrow sites is considered to be a possible limiting resource.

Reproduction and Demography

Studies on *Peromyscus* species in peninsular Florida suggest that these species may achieve greater densities and undergo more significant population fluctuations than their temperate relatives, partially because of their extended reproductive season (Bigler and Jenkins 1975). Subtropical beach mice can reproduce throughout the year; however, their peak reproductive activity is generally during late summer, fall, and early winter. Extine (1980) reported peak reproductive activity for SEBM on Merritt Island during August and September, based on external characteristics of the adults. This peak in the timing and intensity of reproductive activity was also correlated to the subsequent peak in the proportion of juveniles in the population in early winter (Extine 1980). Peak breeding season for Gulf Coast beach mice is autumn and winter, declining in spring, and falling to low levels in summer (Rave and Holler 1992, Blair 1951). However, pregnant and lactating beach mice have been observed in all seasons (Moyers *et al.* 1999).

Sex ratios in beach mouse populations are generally 1:1 (Extine 1980, Rave and Holler 1992).

Beach mice are believed to be generally monogamous (Smith 1966, Foltz 1981, Lynn 2000a). While a majority of individuals appear to pair for life, paired males may sire extra litters with unpaired females. Beach mice are considered sexually mature at 55 days of age; however some are capable of breeding earlier (Weston 2007). Gestation averages 28 to 30 days (Weston 2007) and the average litter size is four pups (Fleming and Holler 1990). Littering intervals may be as short as 26 days (Bowen 1968).

Apparent survival rate estimates (products of true survival and site fidelity) of beach mice along the Gulf Coasts of Florida and Alabama have demonstrated that their average life span is about nine months (Swilling 2000). Other research indicated that 63 percent of Alabama beach mice lived (or remained in the trapping area) for four months or less, 37 percent lived 5 months or greater and two percent lived 12 to 20 months (Rave and Holler 1992). Less than half (44 percent) of beach mice captured for the first time were recaptured the next season (Holler *et al*. 1997). Greater than 10 percent of mice were recaptured three seasons after first capture; and four to eight percent were recaptured more than one year after initial capture. Beach mice held in captivity have lived three years or more (Blair 1951, Holler 1995).

Habitat and Movement

Beach mice inhabit coastal dune ecosystems on the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts of Florida and the Gulf Coast of Alabama. The dune habitat is generally categorized as: primary dunes (characterized by sea and other grasses), secondary dunes (similar to primary dunes, but also frequently include such plants as woody goldenrod (*Chrysoma pauciflosculosa*), false rosemary (*Conradina canescens*), and interior or scrub dunes (often dominated by scrub oaks and yaupon (*Ilex vomitoria*). Contrary to the early belief that beach mice were restricted to (Howell 1909, 1921, Ivey 1949), or preferred the frontal dunes (Blair 1951, Pournelle and Barrington 1953, Bowen 1968), recent research has shown that scrub habitat serves an invaluable role in the persistence of beach mouse populations (Swilling *et al.* 1998, Sneckenberger 2001). Beach mice occupy scrub dunes on a permanent basis and studies have found no detectable differences between scrub and frontal dunes in beach mouse body mass, home range size, dispersal, reproduction, survival, food quality, and burrow site availability (Swilling *et al.* 1998, Swilling 2000, Sneckenberger 2001). While seasonally abundant, the availability of food resources in the primary and secondary dunes fluctuates (Sneckenberger 2001). In contrast, the scrub habitat provides a more stable level of food resources, which becomes crucial when food is scarce or nonexistent in the primary and secondary dunes. This suggests that access to primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat is essential to beach mice at the individual level.

The sea oat zone of primary dunes is considered essential habitat of beach mice on the Atlantic Coast (Humphrey and Barbour 1981, Humphrey *et al.* 1987, Stout 1992). The SEBM has also been reported from sandy areas of adjoining coastal strand/scrub vegetation (Extine 1980, Extine and Stout 1987), which refers to a transition zone between the fore dune and the inland plant community (Johnson and Barbour 1990). Beach mouse habitat is heterogeneous, and distributed in patches that occur both parallel and perpendicular to the shoreline (Extine and Stout 1987). Because this habitat occurs in a narrow band along Florida's coast, structure and composition of

the vegetative communities that form the habitat can change dramatically over distances of several feet.

Primary dune vegetation described from SEBM habitat includes sea oats, bitter panicgrass, railroad vine, beach morning-glory, saltmeadow cordgrass (*Spartina patens*), lamb'squarters (*Chenopodium album*), saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*), and camphorweed (Extine 1980). Coastal strand and inland vegetation is more diverse, and can include pricklypear, saw palmetto, wax myrtle, Florida rosemary (*Ceratiola ericoides*), sea grape, and sand pine (*Pinus clausa*) (Extine and Stout 1987). Extine (1980) observed this subspecies as far as 0.62 miles inland on Merritt Island; he concluded that the dune scrub communities he found them in represent only marginal habitat for the SEBM. SEBM have been documented in coastal scrub more than a mile from the beach habitat at Kennedy Space Center/Merritt Island National Wildlife Refuge (NWR) and Cape Canaveral Air Force Station (CCAFS) (Stout *et al*. 2006). Extine (1980) and Extine and Stout (1987) reported that the SEBM showed a preference for areas with clumps of palmetto, sea grape, and expanses of open sand.

Essential habitat of the AIBM is characterized by patches of bare, loose, sandy soil (Humphrey and Frank 1992a). Although they are mainly found in the sea oat zone of the primary zone, they will occur in sandy areas with broomsedge (*Andropogon* sp.) (Service 1993). Ivy (1949) reported AIBM to occur in woody vegetation as far as 500 feet inland. Pournelle and Barrington (1953) found this subspecies in scrub as far as 1,800 feet from the dunes. Because this habitat occurs in a narrow band along Florida's coast, structure and composition of the vegetative communities that form the habitat can change dramatically over distances of only a few feet. Much of the habitat within the range of the AIBM has been converted to condominiums and housing developments. The majority of the high quality habitat, densely occupied by beach mice, remains along the length of both ASP and FMNM, at either end of Anastasia Island.

Two main types of movement have been identified for small mammals: within home-range activity and long-range dispersal. Such movements are influenced by a suite of factors, such as availability of mates, predation risk, and habitat quality. Movement and home range studies have been conducted for most beach mouse subspecies, but are limited to natural habitat (*i.e*., research has been conducted on public lands within contiguous beach mouse habitat, not within a development or in a fragmented landscape). Novak's (1997) study of the home range of CBM on Shell Island indicated males had a mean home range of 1.0 $\pm$ 4.1 acres and females had a mean home range of 0.81 $\pm$ 2.18 acres. Lynn (2000a) found male and female radio-tagged ABM had a mean home range of 1.68 $\pm$ 0.27 acres and 1.73 $\pm$ 0.40 acres, respectively. Swilling *et al.* (1998) observed one radio-collared ABM to travel over 328 feet during nightly forays after Hurricane Opal to obtain acorns from the scrub dunes. Using radio telemetry, Lynn (2000a) documented an ABM that traveled one mile within a 30-minute period. Moyers and Shea (2002) trapped a male and female CBM that moved about 637 feet and 2,720 feet in one night, respectively. Gore and Schaefer (1993) documented a marked Santa Rosa beach mouse crossing State Road (SR) 399, a two-lane highway. Lynn and Kovatch (2004) through mark and recapture trapping documented PKBM that crossed SR 292, a two-lane highway and right-of-way (100-feet wide).

Sneckenberger (2001) found significant seasonal differences in the movement of ABM, and suggested that this was a result of seasonal fluctuations in food availability, food quality, and nutritional needs. Smith (2003) found that Santa Rosa beach mice demonstrated an increase in movement as habitat isolation increased suggesting that longer travel distances were needed to obtain necessary resources. Smith also found that Santa Rosa beach mice had a preference for vegetation cover and connectivity, which is likely a behavioral response to increased predation risk in open areas. Thus, while beach mice are able and do travel great distances the travel pathways should have vegetated cover and no large gaps or open areas. Previous connectivity research suggests critical thresholds exist for species persistence in fragmented landscapes (With and Crist 1995). As fragmentation increases and connectivity is lost, species' ability to move through and between habitats is reduced in a nonlinear fashion.

Foraging

Beach mice are nocturnal and forage for food throughout the dune system. Beach mice feed primarily upon seeds and fruits, and appear to forage based on availability and have shown no preferences for particular seeds or fruits (Moyers 1996). Beach mice also eat small invertebrates, especially during late spring and early summer when seeds are scarce (Ehrhart 1978, Moyers 1996). Research suggests that the availability of food resources fluctuates seasonally in Gulf Coast coastal dune habitat, specifically that the frontal dunes appear to have more species of high quality foods, but these sources are primarily grasses and annuals that produce large quantities of small seeds in a short period of time. Foods available in the scrub consist of larger seeds and fruits that are produced throughout a greater length of time and linger in the landscape (Sneckenberger 2001). Nutritional analysis of foods available in each habitat revealed that seeds of plant species in both habitats provide a similar range of nutritional quality.

Population dynamics

Population size

Estimating animal abundance or population size is an important and challenging scientific issue in wildlife biology (Otis *et al.* 1978, Pollock *et al.* 1990). A number of different census methods are available to estimate wildlife populations, each with particular benefits and biases. Beach mouse surveys involve live trapping mark-recapture studies, which is a common method with small mammals. A five-night minimum trapping period has been standard practice since 1987 for Gulf Coast beach mice. As the referenced trapping events were not designed similarly or using a standardized sampling techniques, data should not be compared between subspecies or trapping events, nor should densities (mice per 100 trap nights) be inferred beyond the trapping area during that trapping session.

Population densities of beach mice typically reach peak numbers in the late autumn into spring (Rave and Holler 1992, Holler *et al*. 1997). Peak breeding period occurs in autumn and winter, apparently coinciding with the increased availability of seeds and fruits from the previous growing season. Seasonal and annual variation in size of individual populations may be great (Rave and Holler 1992, Holler *et al.* 1997). Food supplementation studies showed that old field mouse

populations increased when foods were abundant; thus, populations of old field mice appear to be food-limited (Smith 1971, Galindo-Leal and Krebs 1998). Similar studies have not been conducted with beach mouse populations.

Gulf Coast Beach Mice

In 1979, Humphrey and Barbour (1981) estimated about 515 CBM existed on Topsail Hill and Shell Island. That estimate was used during the Federal listing of the CBM in 1985. Population estimates on Shell Island from February 1993 to March 1994, ranged from 105 to 338 CBM on a 23-acre study area (Novak 1997). Just prior to Hurricane Opal in 1995, it was estimated that Shell Island supported 800 to 1,200 CBM (Gore 1999). Three years following Hurricane Opal in June 1998, one trapping effort at six different sites on Shell Island resulted in a cumulative population estimate of 195 CBM (164 CBM captured) (Moyers *et al*. 1999). The east portion of the island has been trapped from 2000 to 2003. Population estimates have ranged between 24 and 67 CBM (Lynn 2004b). At Topsail Hill Preserve State Park, trapping conducted in March 2003 and March 2005 yielded a population estimate of 190 to 250 CBM (Service 2003a, Sneckenberger 2005). From late 2006 through 2007 results of tracking tubes surveys at Topsail Hill Preserve State Park suggested that the CBM population was not densely distributed (FWC 2008b). Trapping of four 100-trap transects yielded population estimates of 190, 250, less than 10 (too few to estimate), and 87 in 2003, 2005, 2006, and 2007, respectively (Service 2007a). The track and trapping data together indicate that Topsail Hill Reserve State Park currently does not support a high population of beach mice. In 2003 and again in 2005, a total of 26 mice were translocated from Topsail Hill Preserve State Park to the WaterSound private development adjacent to Deer Lake State Park. Trapping has been sporadic on WaterSound but has yielded population estimates of 5 to 46 individuals in 2003 to 2007 (Moyers 2007). Deer Lake State Park has not been trapped; however, tracks have been observed as recently as 2006 (FWC 2008b). Population estimates from trapping at Grayton Beach State Park (main unit) from 1995 to 2000, ranged from 25 to 116 CBM (Moyers *et al.* 1999, Van Zant 2000). The central unit was trapped for three nights in August 2002; however, no mice were captured (Lynn 2002b). Limited tracking surveys were accomplished in 2003, 2004 and 2005 and beach mouse tracks were observed (Kovatch 2003, Toothacker 2004, FWC 2008b). The western area, although it provides CBM habitat, has not been documented as occupied by CBM (Moyers *et al.* 1999, Van Zant 2000). The population estimates for the WaterColor development for the two years prior to and one year following development ranged from 3 to 7 CBM (St. Joe Company 1999). CBM were last captured in February of 2001 at WaterSound; quarterly trapping has continued on the site through mid-2008 without CBM being captured (St. Joe/Arvida 2003). Auburn University trapped West Crooked Island in October 2000, and the Service trapped the area in 2001 to 2003. The population estimate ranged from a low of 174 to a high of 244 CBM (Lynn 2000b, 2002d, 2002e, 2002f, 2002g, 2003b). The Service estimated the total population of CBM in 2003, to be about 600 to 1,000 beach mice. A recent translocation of 43 CBM from Topsail State Park to Grayton Beach State Park in 2011 has proven successful as the 2013 follow-up trapping data indicated 93 new CBM at Grayton Beach State Park. According to 2013 track tube data, there is a 69 percent occurrence of beach mouse presence (average) at Grayton Beach State Park (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b). Recent track tube data

from 2013 indicates Deer Lake State Park had a 73 percent (average) occurrence rate for monthly CBM presence (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b).

Since its listing in 1985, PKBM population estimates never reached more than 400 to 500 individuals until 2003. Before Hurricane Ivan (2004) a population estimate of 500 to 800 was divided between two populations - the Johnson Beach Unit of GINS and PKSP (Service 2004). The status of PKBM at Gulf State Park (GSP) is uncertain, likely extirpated in 1999. In October 2005, following the active hurricane seasons of 2004 and 2005, a trapping effort of less than one-third of the habitat available on public lands yielded captures of less than 30 individuals. Tracking data from June 2006 indicated that about 25 and 32 percent of the available habitat was occupied at PKSP and GINS, respectively (Loggins 2007). Trapping at PKSP and GINS in March 2007, was cancelled after one night after the capture of only one mouse (a fatality) and very limited sightings of beach mouse sign (tracks, burrows) (Loggins 2007). With no tracks observed in the tube surveys the PKBM may now be absent from PKSP (FWC 2008b). According to 2009 tracking data, there were no mice occurrences at PKSP until May 2009, then only sporadic occurrences until November 2009 as the occurrence data started to show a slow but steady increase (FWC 2014b). Tracking data from 2010 showed a dramatic increase in PKBM occurrences within PKSP with 20 percent occurrence at the beginning of the year, and 84 percent occurrence at the end of 2010 (FWC 2010c). Trapping in 2010 on PKSP captured 11 individual beach mice (11 total captures) in February and 36 individuals (106 total captures) in May. At that time, information was insufficient to accurately estimate population size. These captures represent the minimum number of mice in the park for those months. Trapping at GINS and PKSP in spring 2010 generally confirmed the population was increasing with PKBM widely distributed at both public lands. Recent data from 2011 showed that 96 percent (81 total traps) of track tubes registered beach mouse tracks, indicating that mice were becoming widespread throughout PKSP (J. Gore pers. comm. 2011, FWC 2012a, and FWC 2014b). The 2012 track tube surveys yielded 99 percent of track tubes with beach mouse tracks at PKSP (D. Greene pers. comm. 2012 and FWC 2012a, FWC 2012b, and FWC 2012c). During 2013, the track tube data indicates 97 percent of track tubes contained PKBM tracks (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b). At GINS, the number of PKBM has not increased since the initial high levels in winter of 2005-2006 (FWC 2008b). However, population estimates indicate there may be a few hundred PKBM at GINS (Gore 2008). Trapping conducted in April of 2008 was more encouraging with the capture of 35 mice at GINS (S. Sneckenberger pers. comm. 2008). Through 2008-2010 the population continues to expand from GINS to PKSP and beyond. This is the first natural recolonization of a park without the need for a translocation. From 2010 to 2013, the track tube occurrences at GINS have averaged 84 percent, 94 percent, 95 percent, and 94 percent respectively (FWC 2014b, FWC 2012a, FWC 2012b, FWC 2012c, FWC 2013a, and FWC 2013b).

The SABM even at its lowest population probably numbered several hundred individuals (Gore as cited in 63 *FR* 70055). James (1992) estimated that the East Crooked Island subpopulation to be about 150. However, by 1996, SABM were no longer found on East Crooked Island. Following Hurricane Opal in 1995, Mitchell *et al.* (1997) estimated the St. Joe Peninsula State Park population to be between 300 and 500 mice. In November 1997 and January 1998, 19 pairs of St. Andrew beach mice were relocated from St. Joseph Peninsula State Park to East Crooked Island,

Tyndall Air Force Base (Moyers *et al.* 1999). Trapping surveys conducted on East Crooked Island in 2000 and 2002 through 2007 indicated that beach mice occupied the entire island (Lynn 2002c, FWC 2008b). Population estimates ranged from 71 to 133 mice (Lynn 2002c). The FWC (2008b) estimates 22 miles of habitat as occupied by SABM throughout the mouse's historical range with population estimates of about 3,000 mice at East Crooked Island and about 1,775 mice in the front dunes at St. Joseph State Park. Data from 2008-2012 on East Crooked Island showed a decrease in SABM, with average track tube occurrences of 97 percent, 97 percent, 96 percent, 87 percent, and 83 percent, respectively (FWC 2014b and FWC 2012a). However, recent data from 2013 indicates 95 percent of track tubes contained SABM tracks (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b). Surveys conducted from 2008-2012 at Rish Park yielded average track tube occurrence that fluctuated between 79 percent, 91 percent, 76 percent, 79 percent, and 83 percent, respectively (FWC 2014b and FWC 2012a). More recent data in 2013 showed an average of 73 percent of track tubes contained SABM tracks (FWC 2013a and FWC 2013b).

Atlantic Coast Beach Mice

Populations of the SEBM have been estimated to be around 5,000 to 6,000 mice. Recent surveys have confirmed that SEBM are found on the beaches of Canaveral National Seashore, Merritt Island NWR, and CCAFS in Brevard County, all on federally protected lands. In April 2002, a population of SEBM was documented at the Smyrna Dunes Park, at the north end of New Smyrna Beach (Sauzo 2004). Prior to 2006, populations of the SEBM were thought extirpated from both sides of the Sebastian Inlet (Bard 2004). However, during surveys in June 2006, a single mouse was located at the very southern end of the Sebastian Inlet State Park. Mice were also found at Jungle Trail on the Pelican Island National Wildlife Refuge, another area where they where thought extirpated. Additional surveys of other areas south of Brevard County have not located any mice and indicate the distribution of this subspecies in the counties south of Brevard, severely fragmented. SEBM are no longer believed to occur at Jupiter Island, Palm Beach, Lake Worth, Hillsboro Inlet or Hollywood Beach (Service 1999).

Although the distribution of the AIBM has declined significantly, particularly in the northern part of its range, the populations at ASP and FMNM have continued to fluctuate seasonally between two and 90 mice per acre. It is thought that populations should be characterized by a range rather than a static value (Frank and Humphrey 1996). Quarterly surveys of these two sites have shown that the populations have remained stable. Due to the limited dune habitat at the ASP, this population has not been able to maintain a stable population and it is unknown how many mice remain.

Population variability

Beach mouse populations fluctuate on a seasonal and annual basis. Attempts to explain population dynamics have revealed an incomplete understanding of the species and its population cycles. It is clear that beach mice, like all rodents, are known for high reproductive rates and experience extreme highs and lows in population numbers. Depressed beach mouse populations may be associated with tropical storms and drought, perhaps resulting from reduced habitat and food

resources. These fluctuations can be a result of reproduction rates, food availability, habitat quality and quantity, catastrophic events, disease, and predation (Blair 1951, Bowen 1968, Smith 1971, Hill 1989, Rave and Holler 1992, Swilling *et al.* 1998, Swilling 2000).

Population stability

Population viability analysis (PVA) is essentially a demographic modeling exercise to predict the likelihood a population will continue to exist over time (Groom and Pascual 1997). The true value in using this analytical approach is not to determine the probability of a species' extinction, but to clarify factors that have the most influence on a species' persistence. From 1996 to 1999, the Service funded Auburn University to develop a PVA for beach mice (Holler *et al*. 1999, Oli *et al.* 2001). Four subpopulations of Gulf Coast beach mice subspecies were modeled. They consisted of two subpopulations of PKBM, one at GINS-Perdido Key Area and one at Florida Point, and two subpopulations of ABM, one at Bon Secour NWR and one at Fort Morgan State Park. They used a stochastic (random) differential equation (Wiener-drift) model, applied to long term demographic data. The model is stochastic because it incorporates the variable effects of the environment upon population change. However, it did not model the effects of hurricanes on the habitat or population of beach mice.

The Oli *et al.* (2001) analyses indicated that all four subpopulations were at risk of extinction, with habitat fragmentation as the most influential factor. The GINS-Perdido Key Area had the highest risk for extinction; the PKBM had a 100 percent chance of reaching one individual (becoming functionally extinct) within 21 (mode) or 45 (median) years. At Florida Point, the PKBM had a low risk of becoming functionally extinct (1.3 percent) within 13 to 20 years. However, following Hurricane Opal in 1995, and subsequent predation pressure, the PKBM population at Florida Point was believed extirpated in 1999. This localized extirpation clearly demonstrates that while PVA's are useful in determining significant factors in species survival, they have limited use in predicting the time to extinction for a given species.

More recently, the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (Traylor-Holzer 2004, 2005, 2006) was contracted by the Service to conduct a population and habitat viability analysis (PHVA) on ABM using the Vortex population simulation model (Lacy 1993). The goal was to develop an ABM population model and use the model to assess the status of the ABM habitat, and populations and projections for continued existence. The PHVA results projects the ABM to have a 26.8 percent $\pm$ 1.0 percent likelihood of extinction over the next 100 years. Much of this risk is due to hurricane impacts on ABM populations and habitat, which can result in population declines. The model suggests that hurricanes are a driving force for ABM populations, both directly and also indirectly as their impacts interact with other factors, including development of higher elevation (scrub) habitat and predation by cats. Due to the similarities in the subspecies and proximal location, it can be inferred that these factors also have a strong influence on the persistence of PKBM populations. When reviewing PHVA results, it is crucial that the actual values for the risk of extinction are not the focus of the interpretation. The true value of a PHVA is the ability to compare management strategies and development scenarios, run sensitivity analyses, and determine the main influence(s) on population persistence.

Similar to the land use arrangement on Perdido Key, the Fort Morgan peninsula (occupied by ABM) consists of three areas of public lands separated by two areas of private lands, which allow for limited (varied) dispersal between the public lands. The current level of dispersal between public lands through private lands is unknown, but is affected by development and habitat degradation. Without dispersal between public lands through private lands, the PHVA results project the ABM to have a 41.2 percent ± 1.1 percent likelihood of extinction. If all privately-owned habitat between the public lands is lost, the likelihood of extinction increases to 46.8 percent ± 1.1 percent. Again, it can be inferred that a similar increase in risk of extinction would occur with the PKBM if dispersal could not occur through private lands.

Despite the similarities in the subspecies, it is important to note that carrying capacity (K), which was found to be a strong influence on the model, would be different in PKBM. For ABM, K was estimated using maximum ABM density estimates (4.5 to 11.6 ABM per acre) and acres of habitat (2,989 acres). As density estimates for PKBM would likely be lower, and remaining PKBM habitat is less than 1,300 acres, the Vortex model for PKBM would likely project a greater likelihood of extinction.

The Service contracted with the Georgia Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit to critique the PVAs for the ABM accomplished by Oli *et al.* (2001) and Conservation Breeding Specialist Group (Traylor-Holzer 2006). Conroy and Runge (2006) indicated that neither PVA provided reliable estimates of extinction probability for ABM. They recommended that future PVA work should incorporate sampling, temporal, and possibly spatial variance for input variables and should clearly and explicitly express uncertainty in extinction output. Until this can be done, reliable estimates of extinction probability for the ABM (and other beach mouse subspecies) cannot be estimated.

Species that are protected across their ranges have lower probabilities of extinction (Soulé and Wilcox 1980). Beach mouse populations persist naturally through local extirpations due to storm events or the harsh, stochastic nature of coastal ecosystems. Historically, these areas would be recolonized as population densities increase and dispersal occurred from adjacent populated areas. In addition, from a genetic perspective, beach mice recover well from population size reductions (Wooten 1994), given sufficient habitat is available for population expansion after the bottleneck occurs. As human development has fragmented the coastal dune landscape, beach mice can no longer recolonize along these areas as they did in the past (Holliman 1983). As a continuous presence of beach mice or suitable habitat along the coastline is no longer possible and any hurricane can impact the entire range of each subspecies, the probability of beach mice persisting would be enhanced by the presence of contiguous tracts of suitable habitat occupied by multiple independent populations (Shaffer and Stein 2000). The history of the PKBM alone illustrates the need for multiple populations (a now potentially extirpated population was the source of the two remaining populations of the subspecies) (Holler *et al.* 1989, 71 *FR* 60238). While maintaining multiple populations of beach mouse subspecies provides protection from total loss (extinction), especially when migration and relocations are possible (Oli *et al.* 2001), conservation of each subspecies necessitates protection of genetic variability throughout their ranges (Ehrlich 1988).

Preservation of natural populations is therefore crucial, as the loss of a population of beach mice can result in a permanent loss of alleles (Wooten and Holler 1999). This loss of genetic variability cannot be regained through translocations or other efforts.

Status and Distribution

The distribution of all the beach mouse subspecies is significantly reduced from their historical ranges due to modification and destruction of the coastal dune ecosystem inhabit. Habitat loss and alteration was likely a primary cause of the extinction of one subspecies, the Pallid beach mouse, which was endemic to barrier beach between Matanzas and Ponce de Leon inlets in Volusia and Flagler Counties (Humphrey and Barbour 1981).

Atlantic Coast Beach Mice

The distribution of the SEBM has declined significantly, particularly in the southern part of its range. Historically, it was reported to occur along about 174 miles of Florida's central and southeast Atlantic coast from Ponce (Mosquito) Inlet, Volusia County, to Hollywood Beach, Broward County (Hall 1981). Bangs (1898) reported it as extremely abundant on all the beaches of the east peninsula from Palm Beach at least to Mosquito (Ponce) Inlet. During the 1990s, the SEBM was reported only from Volusia County (Canaveral National Seashore); in Brevard County (Canaveral National Seashore, Kennedy Space Center/Merritt Island NWR, and CCAFS); a few localities in Indian River County (Sebastian Inlet State Park, Treasure Shores Park, and several private properties), and St. Lucie County (Pepper Beach County Park and Fort Pierce Inlet State Park) (Humphrey *et al*. 1987, Robson 1989, Land Planning Group, Inc. 1991, Humphrey and Frank 1992b, Service 1993). The SEBM is geographically isolated from all other subspecies of beach mice.

Populations of the SEBM are still found on the beaches of Canaveral National Seashore, Merritt Island NWR, and CCAFS in Brevard County, all on federally protected lands. In April 2002, a population of SEBM was documented at the Smyrna Dunes Park, at the north end of New Smyrna Beach (Sauzo 2004). Populations from the north side of Sebastian Inlet appear to be extirpated (Bard 2004). SEBM were documented on the south side of Sebastian Inlet in 2006, although none have been found since then.

The status of the species south of Brevard County is currently unknown. The surveys conducted during the mid-1990s indicated the distribution of this subspecies in the counties south of Brevard County was severely limited and fragmented. There are not enough data available to determine population trends for these populations. These surveys revealed that it occurred only in very small numbers where it was found. In Indian River County, the Treasure Shores Park population experienced a significant decline in the 1990s, and it is uncertain whether populations still exist at Turtle Trail or adjacent to the various private properties (Jennings 2004). Trapping efforts documented a decline from an estimated 300 individuals down to numbers in the single digits. In 2006, a population off Jungle Trail at Pelican Island NWR was discovered (Van Zant 2006). No beach mice were found during surveys in St. Lucie County and it is possible that this species is

extirpated there. The SEBM no longer occurs at Jupiter Island, Palm Beach, Lake Worth, Hillsboro Inlet or Hollywood Beach (Service 1999).

The primary reason for the significant reduction in the range of the SEBM is the loss and alteration of coastal dunes. Large-scale commercial and residential development on the coast of Florida has eliminated SEBM habitat in the southern part of its range. This increased urbanization has also increased the recreational use of dunes, and harmed the vegetation essential for dune maintenance. Loss of dune vegetation results in widespread wind and water erosion and reduces the effectiveness of the dune to protect other beach mouse habitat. In addition to this increased urbanization, coastal erosion is responsible for the loss of the dune environment along the Atlantic coast, particularly during tropical storms and hurricanes. The extremely active 2004 hurricane season had a pronounced affect on Florida's Atlantic coast beaches and beach mouse habitat.

The encroachment of residential housing onto the Atlantic coast also increases the likelihood of predation and harassment by free-roaming cats and dogs. A healthy population of SEBM on the north side of Sebastian Inlet State Park in Brevard County was completely extirpated by 1972, presumably by free-roaming cats (Bard 2004). Urbanization of coastal habitat could also lead to potential competition of beach mice with house mice (*Mus musculus*) and introduced rats.

The distribution of the beach mouse is limited due to modification and destruction of its coastal habitats due mostly to developmental pressures. One additional Atlantic coast subspecies, the pallid beach mouse (*P. p. decoloratus*), was formerly reported from two sites in Volusia County, but extensive surveys provide substantial evidence that this subspecies is extinct (Humphrey and Barbour 1981).

The distribution of the AIBM has declined significantly, particularly in the northern part of its range. Historically, it was reported to occur from the vicinity of the Duval-St. Johns County line southward to Matanzas Inlet, St. Johns County, Florida (Humphrey and Frank 1992a). It currently occurs only on Anastasia Island, primarily at the north (ASP) and south (FMNM) ends of the island, although beach mice still occur at low densities in remnant dunes along the entire length of the island (Service 1993). The original distribution consisted of about 50 miles of beach; current populations occupy about 14 miles of beach with possibly only 3 miles supporting viable populations (Service 1993).

In 1992 to 1993, 55 mice (27 females and 28 males) were reintroduced to GMTNERR-Guana River portion of the Reserve (4.0 miles of undeveloped beach) in St. Johns County. In 1993, the population was estimated at 220 mice. Quarterly trapping has been conducted since the reintroduction and mice have not been captured since September 2006. This may be a result of habitat loss or alteration from storms and or habitat conditions.

The primary reason for the significant reduction in the range of the AIBM is the loss and alteration of coastal dunes. Large-scale commercial and residential development on the coast of Florida has eliminated AIBM habitat in the northern two-thirds of its range. This increased urbanization has also increased the recreational use of dunes, and harmed the vegetation essential for dune

maintenance. Loss of dune vegetation results in widespread wind and water erosion and reduces the effectiveness of the dune to protect other beach mouse habitat. In addition to this increased urbanization, coastal erosion is responsible for the loss of the dune environment along the Atlantic coast, particularly during tropical storms and hurricanes. The extremely active 2004 hurricane season had a severe effect on Florida's Atlantic coast beaches and beach mouse habitat.

The encroachment of residential housing onto the Atlantic coast also increases the likelihood of predation by free-roaming cats and dogs. ASP has successfully reduced feral cat populations at the recreation area and has seen a benefit to the beach mice. Urbanization of coastal habitat could also lead to potential competition of beach mice with house mice and introduced rats.

Gulf Coast Beach Mice

PKBM populations have existed since the late 1970s as isolated populations along its historical range (16.9 miles). The effects of Hurricane Frederic (1979) coupled with increased habitat fragmentation due to human development led to the extirpation of all but one population of PKBM. The less than 30 individuals at Gulf State Park (at the westernmost end of Perdido Key) were once the only known existing population of PKBM (Holler *et al*. 1989). Beach mice from this site were used to reestablish PKBM at Gulf Islands National Seashore (GINS) between 1986 and 1988 (Holler *et al.* 1989). Then in 1999 the population at Gulf State Park was considered extirpated (Moyers *et al.* 1999). In 2000, 10 PKBM (five pairs) was relocated from GINS to PKSP. In February of 2001, this relocation was supplemented with an additional 32 PKBM (16 pairs). The PKBM were released on both north and south sides of SR 292 in suitable habitat. Two years of quarterly survey trapping indicated that the relocations of PKBM to PKSP were successful and this was considered an established population (Lynn and Kovatch 2004). PKBM were also trapped on private land between GINS and PKSP in 2004, increasing documentation of current occurrences of the mouse (Lynn 2004a). Based on the similarity of habitat between these areas and the rest of Perdido Key, as well as the continuity of the habitat, the mouse is believed to inhabit other private properties where suitable habitat exists north and south of SR 292. The PKBM is considered to occur on 42 percent of Perdido Key (1,227 acres of 2,949 acres) (**Table 14**).

Table 14. Perdido Key beach mouse habitat on Perdido Key in Florida and Alabama.

Area	Total in AL & FL		Total in Florida		Total in Alabama	
	Acres	**Percent**	**Acres**	**Percent**	**Acres**	**Percent**
Perdido Key	2,949	100	2,615	89	334	11
PKBM habitat	**1,292**	100	**1,146**	**88**	148	12
Private lands	1,440	49	1,278	43	162	5
PKBM habitat	**302**	**23**	**270**	**24**	33	3
Public lands	1,509	51	1,337	45	172	6
			GINS		GSP	
			1,052		172	
			PKSP			
			285			
PKBM habitat	990	76	876	67	114	9
			GINS		GSP	
			638		114	
			PKSP			
			238			

[1]Data calculated by Service's Panama City, Florida using 2004 Digital Orthophoto Quarter-Quadrangle (DOQQ) aerial photography, 2005 parcel data from Baldwin County, Florida and 2005 parcel data from Escambia County, Florida and revised June 2006.

The listing of PKBM was based on data collected in 1983-84, and at that time the mouse was recovering from the effects of Hurricane Frederick in 1979. Following Hurricane Frederic estimated population numbers based on trapping were 13 PKBM found at one location (Gulf State Park). Just prior to listing, only one PKBM was captured in trapping surveys, this again being at Gulf State Park. Since that time, numbers have fluctuated dramatically based on hurricanes and/or translocation efforts, but were at their highest estimate ever documented just prior to Hurricane Ivan in 2004 at between 500-800 individuals. This was a result of significant partnership efforts and included translocation and habitat restoration on public lands. Even with the destructive hurricanes in 2004 and 2005, current numbers of PKBM, while low (no population estimates are available), are greater than one mouse and mice have been confirmed from two areas (PKSP and GINS). Survey efforts (tracking and trapping) have also been sporadic and inconsistent; therefore, it is difficult to establish long term trend information at this time.

CBM subpopulations currently persist along approximately 15 miles of Gulf of Mexico shoreline consisting of four isolated areas along 11 miles of beachfront within its former range. Another 5 miles outside of the CBM's known historical range has been recently colonized (Lynn, 2000a, 2003a). In the 1950s, the CBM was widespread and abundant at that time according to Bowen (1968). By 1979, Humphrey and Barbour (1981) reported only 40 percent of the original habitat remained undeveloped in noncontiguous areas. They also documented that the CBM had been extirpated from seven of its nine historical localities being restricted to the Topsail Hill area in

Walton County and Shell Island in Bay County. In 1985 when the CBM became federally protected, CBM were still only known from the Topsail Hill area and Shell Island, an area consisting of about 10 miles of coastline (50 *FR* 23872). In 1989, a cooperative interagency effort reintroduced CBM onto the central and west units of Grayton Beach State Park increasing the occupied coastline by another mile (Holler *et al*. 1989). In 1999, with the closing of East Pass and Shell Island connecting to West Crooked Island, CBM increased their range by approximately four miles (Lynn 2000b). CBM are now known to occupy approximately 15 miles of Gulf of Mexico beachfront; 12 of the 15 miles are publicly owned lands.

There are four subpopulations of CBM that exist: 1) Topsail Hill Preserve State Park (and adjacent eastern and western private lands), 2) Shell Island (includes St. Andrew State Park mainland and Shell Island with private inholdings and Tyndall AFB), 3) Grayton Beach (and adjacent eastern private lands), and 4) West Crooked Island. Approximately 96 percent of the lands known to be occupied by CBM are public lands. Translocations to establish a fifth subpopulation of CBM occurred in March of 2003 and 2005. CBM from Topsail Hill Preserve State Park were moved to private lands at Camp Creek/Water Sound in Walton County, Florida (Lynn 2003a, Service 2005a, 2005b, 2005c, 2005d).

Topsail Hill Preserve State Park consists of 1,637 acres of which 262 acres provide CBM habitat; the majority being occupied by CBM. The Florida Park Service prepared a Unit Management Plan for the Preserve that explicitly plans for conservation and protection of CBM habitats (FDEP 2007). Private lands on the east side consist of approximately 9.63 acres. Of that, 7 acres consist of the development known as the Stallworth Preserve. The Service issued an ITP for CBM associated with the Stallworth Preserve HCP in 1995; an amendment to the permit was issued in 1999. The remaining 2.63 acres has been purchased by Walton County with a grant from the Service. Private lands on the west side of the Preserve consist of 24 acres and include Four-Mile Village, a low density single family development, and the Coffeen Nature Preserve managed by the Sierra Club.

Shell Island consists of lands within the St. Andrew State Park, Tyndall AFB, and private lands. The Unit Management Plan for the State Park was completed in 1999. The plan identifies the need for protection and management of the CBM. Tyndall AFB manages their portion of Shell Island under the installation's Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan. The Service has joined with the State Park and Tyndall AFB since 1995 by providing funding to protect and restore CBM habitats on Shell Island.

The St. Andrew State Park mainland consists of 1,260 acres of which 123 acres are beach mouse habitat. Several tracking efforts looking for signs of CBM on the mainland were made between 1995 and 1998; no evidence was found that indicated the presence of the beach mouse (Moyers 1996, Moyers *et al.* 1999). However, live-trapping to document the absence of the mouse has not been conducted. Reintroduction of this area is considered an action to support recovery of CBM.

The Grayton Beach subpopulation consists of two units in Grayton Beach State Park. The Park is divided into a central and western unit and is currently connected by a narrow band of primary

dunes. Total acreage of the Park is 2,236 acres with 153 acres providing suitable CBM habitat. The Unit Management Plan for the Park identified the protection of the CBM as an important component. The Park has requested and received funds from the Service to implement CBM habitat restoration and protection. Portions of private lands (WaterColor and Seaside developments) on the east side of the central unit are occupied by CBM or provide suitable habitat.

West Crooked Island consists of 1,558 acres of which 730 acres provide CBM habitat and remains occupied by CBM (Lynn 2004b). The West Crooked Island subpopulation resulted from its connection to Shell Island in 1998-1999. The construction of the St. Andrew Pass navigation inlet in the early 1930s severed Shell Island from the mainland on its western end. Since then, the original pass, East Pass (or Old Pass) began to close. After passage of Hurricane Opal in 1995, East Pass temporarily closed and reopened; however, after passage of hurricanes Earl and Georges in 1998, the pass closed (Coastal Tech 1999, Middlemas 1999). CBM dispersed onto West Crooked Island from Shell Island colonizing most of the island within two years (Lynn 2004b). East Pass was reopened as a joint venture between Tyndall AFB and Bay County in December of 2001 but has since closed again.

SABM is now known to consist of two subpopulations, East Crooked Island and St. Joseph Peninsula State Park. The majority of the East Crooked Island subpopulation is located on Tyndall AFB and the other on the St. Joseph Peninsula State Park. Other important public lands for the conservation of the mouse would include Eglin Air Force Base lands at Cape San Blas and Billy Joe Rish Park. Private lands adjacent to Tyndall AFB and the State Park are either known to be occupied by SABM or contain habitat. Trapping by St Joe/Arvida on about 111 acres of SABM habitat at East Crooked Island was conducted in 2000, 2001, and 2003. The trapping confirmed existence of SABM on the property (Moyers and Shea 2002). However, trapping their property in St. Joseph Beach did not result in capture of any beach mice (Moyers and Shea 2002). Although SABM is thought to continue to occupy habitat south of St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, only tracking has been conducted to confirm its presence on private lands since the late 1990s. Private lands adjacent to public lands are available for population dispersal and food source during periods of high population and after severe weather events. However, subpopulations on large tracts of private land within the historical range of the subspecies are needed for conservation of the SABM.

Land development has been primarily responsible for the permanent loss of SABM habitat along its approximately 40-mile long historical range. In addition, construction of U.S. highway 98 accelerated the habitat loss from associated development. By the mid 1990's about 12 linear miles were known to be occupied (Gore 1994, 1995), indicating a 68 percent reduction in it historical distribution (63 *FR* 70053). An effort to re-establish the SABM back into its historical range was initiated around the time of listing (Moyers *et al.* 1999); however, the range reduction described above did not take this into account since the success of the reintroduction was not known at the time (63 *FR* 70053). Similar analyses have not been conducted since.

Our best documentation of the species' decline can be seen from trapping or tracking surveys conducted at various times throughout its range. By the mid to late 1980's concerns were raised

when trapping efforts failed to result in captures at West Crooked Island (Gore 1987). By 1990 the SABM appeared to only inhabit a small portion (approximately 11 linear miles) of its original range: west end of East Crooked Island and within St. Joseph Peninsula State Park (Gore 1990). SABM's apparent decline continued into the mid-1990's when in 1994, the population on East Crooked Island was "presumed to be extinct" (Wooten and Holler 1999), leaving only one known population on St. Joseph Peninsula (Moyers *et al.* 1999). Subsequent reintroduction efforts in 1997-1998 appeared to have re-established the population on East Crooked Island (Moyers *et al.* 1999).

Recovery Criteria

The Recovery Plan for the SEBM identifies the primary recovery objectives for the subspecies (Service 1993). The SEBM can be considered for delisting if 10 viable, self-sustaining populations can be established throughout a significant portion of its historical range. More specifically, delisting can be considered if the following conditions are met:

1. Viable populations are maintained on the five public land areas where the subspecies currently occurs. Each population should not fluctuate below an effective breeding size of 500 individuals;

2. Five additional viable populations are established throughout the historical range of the subspecies; and

3. These populations should be monitored for at least five years.

The Recovery Plan for the AIBM identifies the primary recovery objectives for the subspecies (Service 1993). The AIBM can be considered for reclassification from endangered to threatened status if five viable, self-sustaining populations can be established. Because the majority of this subspecies' historical range has been permanently destroyed, it is not likely that it can be fully recovered or delisted. For the AIBM to be considered for downlisting to threatened, it is required that those populations at the northern and southern end of Anastasia Island continue to be viable. Each population should support a breeding population of 500 individuals. Two additional viable populations shall be established within the mainland portion of the historical range. All of these populations should be monitored for five years.

The Recovery Plan for the PKBM, CBM, and ABM identifies the primary recovery objectives to be the stabilization of present populations by preventing further habitat deterioration, and the reestablishment of populations in areas where they were extirpated (Service 1987). For each of the subspecies to be considered for downlisting to threatened, it is required that there be a minimum of at least three distinct self-sustaining populations in designated critical habitat with at least 50 percent of the critical habitat being protected and occupied by beach mice (Service 1987).

While this is the currently approved Recovery Plan for the three beach mouse subspecies, studies and research since the Recovery Plan publication provided additional information concerning

recovery needs for the subspecies. Protection and enhancement of existing populations and their habitat, plus reestablishment of populations in suitable areas within their historical ranges, are necessary for the subspecies survival and recovery. Core beach mouse populations remain isolated and are vulnerable to natural and anthropogenic factors that may further reduce or degrade habitat and/or directly reduce beach mouse population sizes. Maximizing the number of independent populations is critical to species survival. Protection of a single, isolated, minimally viable population risks the extirpation or extinction of a species as a result of harsh environmental conditions, catastrophic events, or genetic deterioration over several generations (Kautz and Cox 2001). To reduce the risk of extinction through these processes, it is important to establish multiple protected populations across the landscape (Soulé and Simberloff 1986, Wiens 1996). Through the critical habitat designation process we are addressing this by designating five independent units for the subspecies spaced throughout its historical range, depending on the relative fragmentation, size, and health of habitat, as well as availability of areas with beach mouse PCEs.

The Service completed a five-year status review of the CBM and PKBM in August 2007 (Service 2007a, 2007b). For both subspecies the following was recommended: designate a beach mouse recovery coordinator; revise the recovery plan; accomplish viable populations, monitor habitat improvement, corridor persistence and hurricane response; conduct genetic studies and translocations as necessary; participate in education and outreach and complete an emergency response plan.

A Recovery Plan for the SABM was finalized in 2010 and the recovery objectives are to reestablish additional populations, threat minimization or removal, habitat protection and/or restoration, and outreach/education to the public. This recovery plan is up to date and includes current threats to SABM.

In accordance with the Act, Federal agencies (including the Service) consult with the Service for actions that may adversely affect beach mice and their designated habitat. In Florida, consultations have included military missions and operations, beach nourishment and other shoreline protection, and actions related to protection of coastal development (**Table 14**).

Table 15. Previous biological opinions within Florida that have been issued for projects that had adverse impact to the nesting beach mice.

PROJECT	YEAR	IMPACT (Habitat/critical habitat/individuals)
GINS Dune Protection (PKBM)	2000	0.01 acre (CH)
Translocation to PKSP (PKBM)	2000	≤ 3 beach mice (source mice from CH; relocation to CH and non-CH in PKSP)
Supplemental translocation to PKSP (PKBM)	2003	≤ 3 beach mice (source mice from CH; relocation to CH and non-CH in PKSP)

PROJECT	YEAR	IMPACT (Habitat/critical habitat/individuals)
FEMA Berm Orange Beach, AL (PKBM)	2003	0.14 acre non-CH
Service scientific collecting permit program (PKBM)	2004-2005	1 beach mouse per 400 trap-nights per area (partial CH)
Florencia Development (within Action Area) (PKBM)	2005	3.5 acres (non-CH)
PKSP Re-build (PKBM)	2005	1.99 acres (CH)
FEMA Berm Emergency consultation (within Action Area) (PKBM)	2005	Consultation not complete (non-CH)
GINS road rebuild (PKBM)	2005	1.7 acres (CH)
Magnolia West Development (within Action Area) (PKBM)	2006	5.2 acres (not CH at time of construction, presently CH)
Palazzo Development (PKBM)	2006	0.58 acre (not CH at time of construction, presently CH)
Searinity Development (PKBM)	2006	0.32 acre (not CH at time of construction, presently CH)
Retreat Development (PKBM)	2006	0.21 acre (not CH at time of construction, presently CH)
Bond Residence (PKBM)	2006	0.17 acre (CH)
Three-batch condo (Island Club, Marquesas, Lorelei) (PKBM)	2007	0.95 acres (CH)
Naval Air Station Pensacola Pensacola Pass navigation channel dredging (PKBM)	2007	6.3 miles (CH)
Paradise Island development (PKBM)	2007	0.91 acres (CH)
Calabria condo development (PKBM)	2008	0.33 acres (non-CH)
Escambia County beach nourishment (PKBM)	2008	0.16 acres (partial CH)
Seabreeze Condominiums (PKBM)	2009	0.39 acres
Spanish Key Parking Lot (PKBM)	2009	0.28 acres

PROJECT	YEAR	IMPACT (Habitat/critical habitat/individuals)
Perdido Key Fire Station (PKBM)	2010	0.43 acres (CH)
Evans Residence	2012	0.21 acre
Stern Residence	2012	0.07 acre
Whalen Residence	2012	0.18 acre
Carbone Residence	2012	0.74 acre
Lost Key	2012	26.1 acre
Stallworth Preserve Development (CBM)	1995	7 acres (CH)
Navy Panama City Beach site 4 construction (CBM)	2000	0.01 acre (CH)
East Pass Re-opening (CBM)	2001	Temporary, indirect take (CH)
WaterColor and WaterSound Developments (CBM)	2000	7.6 acres (non-CH)
Service scientific collecting permit (CBM)	2004-2005	1 beach mouse per 400 trap-nights per area (partial CH)
FEMA beach berms post hurricane Ivan emergency consultation (CBM)	2005	Consultation not complete (partial CH)
Western Lake Reopening consultation (CBM)	2006	2.7 acres annually for 5 years (CH)
FEMA Statewide post-disaster berm programmatic BO (PKBM, CBM, SABM, AIBM, and SEBM)	2007	75 miles for eroded shoreline(partial CH)
Angelos Development (CBM)	2009	0.42 acres
Bonfire Beach (SABM)	2008	38 acres
Ovation (SABM)	2010	5.41 acres (CH)
Sea Colony Development (AIBM)	1998	0.7 acres (non-CH)
Anastasia State Park beach nourishment (AIBM)	2005	50 linear feet (non-CH)

PROJECT	YEAR	IMPACT (Habitat/critical habitat/individuals)
Service scientific collecting permit program (AIBM)	2004-2005	1 beach mouse per 400 trap-nights per area (non-CH)
Rodent Control Program on CCAFS (SEBM)	2002	50 beach mice
Cape Canaveral Air Force borrow source (SEBM)	2007	300 linear feet (non-CH)
Service scientific collecting permit program (SEBM)	2004-2005	1 beach mouse per 400 trap-nights per area (non-CH)
CCAFS Routine Maintenance Programmatic (SEBM)	2008	Temporary loss of habitat during trenching/digging for pipeline installation and repair, roadside mowing, soil remediation, pole placement, wells, soil boring, lines of sight, scrub restoration

Common Threats to Beach Mice in Florida

Habitat Loss or Degradation

Coastal dune ecosystems are continually responding to inlets, tides, waves, erosion and deposition, longshore sediment transport and depletion, and fluctuations in sea level. The location and shape of barrier island beaches perpetually adjusts to these physical forces. Winds move sediment across the dry beach forming dunes and the island interior landscape. The natural communities contain plants and animals that are subject to shoreline erosion and deposition, salt spray, wind, drought conditions, and sandy soils. Vegetative communities include foredunes, primary and secondary dunes, interdunal swales, sand pine scrub, and maritime forests. During storm events, overwash is common and may breach the island at dune gaps or other weak spots, depositing sediments on the interior and backsides of islands, increasing island elevation and accreting the sound shoreline. Breaches may result in new inlets through the island.

The quality of the dune habitat (primary, secondary, and scrub) is an important factor in maintaining and facilitating beach mouse recovery. Habitat manipulation is an old and widely used tool in wildlife management. It is especially useful in improving habitat suitability to increase local populations of a species. For beach mice, improving habitat can enhance the abundance and diversity of food resources, increase the chances of meeting a mate, and reduce competition for food and burrow sites.

Long term trapping data has shown that beach mouse densities are cyclic and fluctuate by order of magnitude on a seasonal and annual basis. These fluctuations can be a result of reproduction rates, food availability, habitat quality and quantity, catastrophic events, disease, and predation (Blair 1951, Bowen 1968, Smith 1971, Hill 1989, Rave and Holler 1992, Swilling *et al.* 1998, Swilling

2000, Sneckenberger 2001). Without suitable habitat sufficient in size to support the natural cyclic nature of beach mouse populations, subspecies are at risk from local extirpation and extinction, and may not attain the densities necessary to persist through storm events and seasonal fluctuations of resources.

Habitat loss and fragmentation associated with residential and commercial real estate development is the primary threat contributing to the endangered status of beach mice (Holler 1992a, 1992b, Humphrey and Frank 1992a). Coastal commercial and residential development has fragmented all the subspecies into disjunct populations. Isolation of habitats by imposing barriers to species movement is an effect of fragmentation that equates to reduction in total habitat (Noss and Csuti 1997). Furthermore, isolation of small populations of beach mice reduces or precludes gene flow between populations and can result in the loss of genetic diversity. Demographic factors such as predation (especially by cats), diseases, and competition with house mice, are intensified in small, isolated populations, which may be rapidly extirpated by these pressures. Especially when coupled with events such as storms, reduced food availability, and/or reduced reproductive success, isolated populations may experience severe declines or extirpation (Caughley and Gunn 1996). The influence these factors have on populations or individuals is largely dependent on the degree of isolation.

The conservation of multiple large, contiguous tracts of habitat is essential to the persistence of beach mice. At present, large parcels of land exist mainly on public lands. Protection, management, and recovery of beach mice on public areas have been complicated by increased recreational use as public lands are rapidly becoming the only natural areas left on the coast. Public lands and their staff are now under pressure to manage for both the recovery of endangered species and recreational use. Where protection of large contiguous tracts of beach mouse habitat along the coast is not possible, establishing multiple independent populations is the best defense against local and complete extinctions due to storms and other stochastic events (Danielson 2005). Protecting multiple populations increases the chance that at least one population within the range of a subspecies will survive episodic storm events and persist while vegetation and dune structure recover.

Habitat connectivity also becomes essential where mice occupy fragmented areas lacking one or more habitat types. If scrub habitat is lacking from a particular tract, adjacent or connected tracts with scrub habitat are necessary for food and burrow sites when resources are scarce in the frontal dunes, and are essential to beach mouse populations during and immediately after hurricanes. Trapping data suggests that beach mice occupying the scrub following hurricanes recolonize the foredune once vegetation and some dune structure have recovered (Swilling *et al*. 1998, Sneckenberger 2001). Similarly, when frontal dune habitat is lacking from a tract and a functional pathway to frontal dune habitat does not exist, beach mice may not be able to attain the resources necessary to expand the population and reach the densities necessary to persist through the harsh summer season or the next storm. Functional pathways may allow for natural behavior such as dispersal and exploratory movements, as well as gene flow to maintain genetic variability of the population within fragmented or isolated areas. To that end, contiguous tracts or functionally connected patches of suitable habitat are essential to the long-term conservation of beach mice.

A lack of suitable burrow sites may be a consequence of habitat degradation. Beach mice use burrows to avoid predators, protect young, store food, and serve as refugia between foraging bouts and during periods of rest. Beach mice have been shown to select burrow sites based on a suite of abiotic and biotic factors. A limitation in one or more factors may result in a shortage of suitable sites and the availability of potential burrow sites in each habitat may vary seasonally. Beach mice tend to construct burrows in areas with greater plant cover, less soil compaction, steep slopes, and higher elevations above sea level (Lynn 2000a, Sneckenberger 2001). These factors are likely important in minimizing energy costs of burrow construction and maintenance while maximizing the benefits of burrow use by making a safe and physiologically efficient refuge. Similar to food resources, this fluctuation in availability of burrow sites suggests that a combination of primary, secondary, and scrub dune habitat is essential to beach mice at the individual level.

Predation

Beach mice have a number of natural predators including coachwhip (*Masticophis flagellum*) corn snakes (*Elaphe guttata guttata*), pygmy rattlesnake (*Sistrurus miliarius*), eastern diamondback rattlesnake (*Crotalus adamanteus*), short-eared owl (*Asio flammeus*), great-horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*), great blue heron (*Ardea herodias*), northern harrier (*Circus cyaneus*), red fox, gray fox, skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), weasel (*Shallela frenata*), and raccoon (Blair 1951, Bowen 1968, Holler 1992a, Novak 1997, Moyers *et al.* 1999, Van Zant and Wooten 2003). Predation of beach mouse populations that have sufficient recruitment and habitat availability is natural and not a concern. However, predation pressure from natural and non-native predators may result in the extirpation of small, local populations of beach mice.

Free-roaming cats are believed to have a devastating effect on beach mouse persistence (Bowen 1968, Linzey 1978) and are considered to be the main cause of the loss of at least one population of beach mice (Holliman 1983). Cat tracks have been observed in areas of low trapping success for beach mice (Moyers *et al.* 1999). The PHVA for the ABM indicated that if each population had as few as one cat, which ate one mouse a day, rapid extinction would occur in over 99 percent of all iterations (Traylor-Holzer 2005).

In response to increasing depredation of sea turtle nests by coyote, fox, hogs, and raccoon, multi-agency cooperative effort have been initiated and are ongoing throughout Florida, in particular on public lands. These programs also benefit beach mice.

Hurricanes

Hurricanes can severely affect beach mice and their habitat, as tidal surge and wave action overwash habitat, leaving a flat sand surface denuded of vegetation; sand is deposited inland, completely or partially covering vegetation; blowouts between the ocean and bays and lagoons leave patchy landscapes of bare sand; primary dunes are sheared or eroded; and habitat is completely breached, creating channels from the ocean to bays and lagoons. Other effects include direct mortality of individuals, relocation/dispersal, and subsequent effects of habitat alterations

(that impact such factors as forage abundance/production and substrate elevation). Habitat impacts can be widespread, encompassing the range of the subspecies.

Until frontal dune topography and vegetation redevelop, scrub habitat maintains beach mice populations and provides the majority of food resources and potential burrow sites (Lynn 2000a, Sneckenberger 2001). While storms temporarily reduce population densities (often severely), this disturbance regime maintains open habitat and retards plant succession, yielding a habitat more suitable for beach mice than one lacking disturbance. The low-nutrient soil of the coastal dune ecosystem often receives a pulse of nutrients from the deposition of vegetative debris along the coastline (Lomascolo and Aide 2001). Therefore, as the primary and secondary dunes recover, beach mice recolonize this habitat readily as food plants develop to take advantage of the newly available nutrients. Recovery times vary depending upon factors such as hurricane characteristics (*i.e.*, severity, amount of associated rain, directional movement of the storm eye, storm speed), successional stage of habitat prior to hurricane, elevation, and restorative actions post hurricane. Depending on these factors, recovery of habitat may take from one to over 40 years.

The impact of hurricanes on plant communities temporarily affects food availability, and hence can limit population densities in impacted habitats soon after storms. Observations indicate that Hurricane Opal (a Category 3 storm in November 1995) caused a decrease in one population of ABM by 30 percent (Swilling *et al.* 1998). However, population densities in scrub habitat typically increased following hurricanes (Swilling *et al.* 1998). Sneckenberger (2001) also found atypical numbers of ABM in scrub following a hurricane. Five months post-storm, "densities (individuals/km) were up to 7.5 times greater in scrub areas than in frontal dune grids." Impacts of the storm may have been apparent as long as 17 months after the storm when scrub densities remained triple those of frontal dunes (Sneckenberger 2001). Moyers *et al.* (1999) found similar results for CBM at Grayton Beach State Park. When frontal and primary dunes sustained extensive damage during Hurricane Opal in 1995, beach mice were captured behind what remained of primary dune habitat. By 1998, however, primary dunes and the immediate habitat inland appeared to support higher numbers of beach mice.

In addition to the overall change in post Hurricane Opal distribution of ABM, Swilling *et al*. (1998) found the mean percent of newly marked individuals increased from 14 percent for the three trapping periods before the storm to an average of 26.7 percent for the same interval post hurricane. The average for the three trapping periods immediately following was even higher, at 42.7 percent of the individuals captured. Swilling *et al.* (1998) concluded that this increased presence of new individuals reflected increased reproduction. A statistical analysis of the data indicated that the number of females exhibiting signs of reproduction was significantly higher than normal (18.9 percent higher). Moyers *et al.* (1999) also found similar results at Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. Four to five months following Hurricane Opal, all female CBM captured were pregnant or lactating. Trapping six months after the hurricane, Moyers *et al.* (1999) noted that 51.5 percent of captured CBM were new unmarked beach mice.

Although hurricanes can significantly alter beach mouse habitat and population densities in certain habitats, some physical effects may benefit the subspecies. Hurricanes are probably responsible

for maintaining coastal dune habitat upon which beach mice depend through repeated cycles of destruction, alteration, and recovery of dune habitat. Holler *et al.* (1999) suggested that hurricanes could function to break up population subgroups and force population mixing. The resultant breeding between members of formerly isolated subgroups increases genetic heterogeneity and could decrease the probability of genetic drift and bottlenecks.

Beachfront Lighting

Artificial lighting increases the risk of predation and influences beach mouse foraging patterns and natural movements as it increases their perceived risk of predation. Foraging activities and other natural behaviors are influenced by many factors. Artificial lighting alters behavior patterns causing beach mice to avoid otherwise suitable habitat and decreases the amount of time they are active (Bird *et al.* 2004).

The presence of vegetative cover reduces predation risk and perceived predation risk of foraging beach mice, and allows for normal movements, activity, and foraging patterns. Foraging in sites with vegetative cover is greater and more efficient than in sites without cover (Bird 2002). Beach mice have also been found to select habitat for increased percent cover of vegetation, and decreased distance between vegetated patches (Smith 2003).

Genetic variability

Selander *et al.* (1971) conducted an electrophoretic study on 30 populations of *P. polionotus*, including populations of beach mouse subspecies. Based on 30 allozyme loci, they estimated that the level of allozyme variation found in beach mouse populations was at least 40 percent lower than the level of variation in nearby inland populations. This work indicates that beach mouse populations already have lower genetic variability before inbreeding, bottleneck events, or founder effects that may occur in a reintroduced population. Lower levels of heterozygosity has been linked to less efficient feeding, fewer demonstrations of social dominance and exploratory behavior, and smaller body size (Smith *et al.* 1975, Garten 1976, Teska *et al.* 1990). Research focused on inbreeding depression in old-field mice (including one beach mouse subspecies), determined that the effects of inbreeding negatively influenced factors such as litter size, number of litters, and juvenile survivorship (Lacy *et al.* 1995).

In 1995, the Service contracted with Auburn to conduct genetic analysis of: 1) post-reestablishment gene structure in PKBM and CBM; 2) microgeographic patterning and its relevance to alternate management approaches for ABM on the Bon Secour NWR; and 3) if feasible, the historical relationship of SABM from Crooked Island relative to CBM from Shell Island and SABM from St. Joseph Peninsula.

Results of the work for CBM found: 1) founder effects were observed in the Grayton Beach State Park population (fixation of alleles common to the donor population and allele frequency shifts); 2) incongruity in number and size of several alleles was observed between Grayton Beach State Park and Shell Island; 3) overall genetic divergence between the donor and reestablished

population was moderate; 4) genetic differences between Topsail Hill Preserve State Park and other CBM sites were higher than expected given the spatial proximity; 5) Topsail Hill Preserve State Park appears to be a reservoir for unique variation within the remaining populations of CBM; and 6) the overall relatedness estimated for Grayton Beach State Park suggested that any mating would involve close relatives (Wooten and Holler 1999).

Wooten and Holler (1999) recommended strategies for management of CBM based on genetics. Management of the Grayton Beach State Park population for genetic characteristics appears to be needed; however, additional genetic analyses will be needed. Relocation of CBM to Grayton Beach State Park from Shell Island should be continued.

Results of the work for PKBM found that: 1) founder effect (from Florida Point to GINS) did impact the GINS-Perdido Key Area subpopulation. Loss of rare alleles and allele frequency shifts were noted; 2) a low to moderate level of overall genetic divergence was observed; 3) data suggests that some effects of genetic drift were mediated by continued transfer of individuals; 4) levels of heterozygosity were unexpected given recent history; 5) average levels of relatedness among individuals is high which may portend future inbreeding related problems (however, no evidence of existing inbreeding was observed in the data); and 6) the overall level of microsatellite variation retained in the GINS-Perdido Key Area subpopulation was higher than anticipated. Wooten and Holler (1999) recommended management of PKBM based on genetics by: 1) preserving the natural population to the maximum extent possible since the loss of the Florida Point subpopulation resulted in the permanent loss of alleles; 2) using the GINS-Perdido Key Area subpopulation as a donor for reestablishment of other populations because of the retention of a substantial amount of genetic variation; and 3) reestablishment plans should include transfers between donor and reestablished subpopulations. In addition, translocations should be accomplished in pairs.

Analysis of genetic work focused on SABM indicated that there are two possible genetic histories for Crooked Island beach mice: 1) the last known beach mice from Crooked Island were derived from CBM or 2) the last known beach mouse from Crooked Island were unique from both CBM found on Shell Island or SABM found on St. Joseph peninsula (Van Zant 2003).

Climate Change (refer to page 49)

Analysis of the Species/Critical Habitat Likely to be Affected

Beach mice are currently federally protected because of their low numbers caused by habitat loss with continuing threats to their habitat (including critical habitat for CBM, PKBM, and SABM) and resulting affects from storm and post-storm events. The primary reason for the significant reduction in their range is the loss and alteration of coastal dunes. Large-scale commercial and residential development on the coast of Florida has eliminated beach mouse habitat. Coastal urbanization has also increased the recreational use of beachfront areas. Dune habitat maintenance is an important component of beach mouse conservation. Providing a healthy and continuous dune system assures mouse population stability. Integral to this is keeping visitors to the beach off the

dunes and replanting as necessary when impacts occur or are observed. The extremely active 2004 and 2005 hurricane seasons also had a severe effect on Florida's beaches and beach mouse habitat.

Critical habitat for three (PKBM, CBM, and SABM) of the five subspecies of beach mice has been designated and will be discussed. No critical habitat has been designated for the other two subspecies (SEBM and AIBM). Therefore, the proposed action would have no effect on designated critical habitat for these two subspecies because none is designated.

Generally, sand placement activities or dredged navigation channel material is not placed on existing beach mouse habitat consisting of vegetated dunes. Typical effects from these activities to beach mice and their habitats consist of the staging and storage of equipment, work vehicles, or materials and beach access for sand placement activities or dredged material placement. These effects may result in the permanent and temporary loss, degradation, or fragmentation of beach mouse habitat and changes in essential life history behaviors (dispersal and movement, foraging, seeking mates, breeding, and care of young). Beach mice spend their entire lives within the dune ecosystem and are nocturnal. Sand placement projects may occur at anytime of the year depending on their location and are usually conducted on a 24/7 schedule. The quality of the placed sand could affect the suitability of the beach and dunes to support beach mouse burrow construction and food sources. The effect of the activities covered under the consultation with incorporation of the proposed conservation measures on beach mice overall survival and recovery are considered in this SPBO.

ENVIRONMENTAL BASELINE

Status of the species/Critical Habitat within the Action Area (all subspecies of beach mice)

The action area encompasses the entire range of five subspecies of beach mice, and designated critical habitats of three beach mouse subspecies. Therefore, the previous discussion in "Status of the Species" applies here. The known distribution of the five subspecies of beach mice is a result of cursory surveys and intermittent trapping involving different projects. There has not been a systematic trapping study done in order to determine the status of each subspecies throughout their ranges.

Factors affecting the species environment within the action area

<u>Coastal development</u>

Beach mice were listed as endangered and threatened species primarily because of the fragmentation, adverse alteration, and loss of habitat due to coastal development. The threat of development-related habitat loss continues to increase. Other contributing factors include low population numbers, habitat loss from a variety of reasons (including hurricanes), predation or competition by animals related to human development (cats and house mice), and the existing strength or lack of regulations regarding coastal development.

Hurricanes

Hurricanes were probably responsible for maintaining coastal beach habitat upon which beach mice depend through repeated cycles of destruction, alteration, and recovery of dune habitat. Hurricanes generally produce damaging winds, storm tides and surges, and rain and can result in severe erosion of the beach and dune systems. Overwash and blowouts are common on barrier islands. Hurricanes can impact beach mice either directly (e.g., drowning) or indirectly (e.g., loss of habitat). Depending on their frequency, storms can affect beach mice on either a short-term basis (e.g., temporary loss of habitat) or long term (e.g., loss of food, which in turn may lead to increased juvenile mortality, resulting in a depressed breeding season). How hurricanes affect beach mice also depends on the characteristics (winds, storm surge, rainfall), the time of year (within or outside of the nesting season), and where the northeast edge of the hurricane crosses land.

Because of the limited remaining habitat, frequent or successive severe weather events could compromise the ability of certain populations of beach mice to survive and recover. Beach mice evolved under natural coastal environmental events such as hurricanes. The extensive amount of predevelopment coastal beach and dune habitat allowed beach mice to survive even the most severe hurricane events. It is only within the last 20 to 30 years that the combination of habitat loss to beachfront development and destruction of remaining habitat by hurricanes has increased the threat to beach mice survival and recovery. On developed beaches, typically little space remains for sandy beaches to become re-established after periodic storms. While the beach itself moves landward during such storms, reconstruction or persistence of structures at their prestorm locations can result in a major loss of habitat for beach mice.

The 2004 hurricane season was the most active storm season in Florida since weather records began in 1851. Hurricanes Charley, Frances, Ivan, and Jeanne, along with Tropical Storm Bonnie, damaged the beach and dune system, upland structures and properties, and infrastructure in the majority of Florida's coastal counties. The cumulative impact of these storms exacerbated erosion conditions throughout the state.

The 2005 hurricane season was a record-breaking season with 27 named storms. Hurricanes Dennis, Katrina, Ophelia, Rita, and Wilma, and Tropical Storms Arlene and Tammy impacted Florida. The cumulative impact of these storms exacerbated erosion conditions in south and northwest Florida.

Beachfront Lighting

Artificial lighting along developed areas of both coastlines continues to cause increase susceptibility to predators, altered foraging and breeding habits which impact beach mouse recovery. While a majority of coastal local governments and counties have adopted beachfront lighting ordinances compliance and enforcement is lacking in some areas. Further, the lighting in areas outside the beachfront ordinance coverage areas continues to be unregulated resulting in

urban glow. Even the darker areas of conservation managed lands are subject to surrounding sky glow.

Predation

A major continuing threat to beach mice is predation by free-roaming cats and other nonnative species. The domestic cat is not native to North America and is considered a separate species from its wild ancestral species, *Felis silvestris*. Cats are hunters, retaining this behavior from their ancestors. However, wildlife in the western Hemisphere did not evolve in the presence of a small, abundant predator like the domestic cat, and thus did not develop defenses against them. Cats were introduced to North America a few hundred years ago.

Free-roaming pets prey on small mammals, birds, and other native wildlife. In the U.S., on a nationwide basis, cats kill over a billion small mammals and hundreds of millions of birds each year. Worldwide, cats are second only to habitat destruction in contributing to the extinction of birds. Cats have been documented to take beach mice, sea turtle hatchlings, shorebirds, and migratory birds. A significant issue in the recovery of beach mice is predation by free-ranging pet and feral cats. Beach mice have a number of natural predators including snakes, owls, herons, and raccoons. Predation is part of the natural world. However, predation pressure from both natural and nonnative predators may result in the extirpation of small, local populations of beach mice in a very short time (Bowen 1968, Linzey 1978).

Climate Change

Based on the present level of available information concerning the effects of global climate change on the status of beach mice and its designated critical habitat, the Service acknowledges the potential for changes to occur in the action area, but presently has no basis to evaluate if or how these changes are affecting beach mice or its designated critical habitat nor does our present knowledge allow the Service to project what the future effects from global climate change may be or the magnitude of these potential effects.

EFFECTS OF THE ACTION

Factors to be considered

Aspects of the sand placement and dredged material placement activities will occur within habitat that is used by beach mice year round. The activities include the storage of equipment, work vehicles, or materials and creation, expansion, or use of beach access points for sand placement activities or dredged material placement. The work, depending on the location, may be conducted any time of the year. Most effects would be expected to be temporary. These short-term and temporary impacts could include loss of foraging habitat, altered beach mouse movement and dispersal activities. Long-term and permanent impacts from the sand placement activities such as excavation of dune habitat and degradation could impact beach mice by fragmentation of their habitat including critical habitat for the PKBM, CBM, and SABM.

There are typically different "levels" of access sites needed for a project. The primary access is a "lay-down" yard, where pipe is delivered and stored, and storage trailers, and other equipment and materials are stored. These are typically big paved parking lots, so that the Corps's trucks can access the area to drop off and pick up equipment. There's typically a beach access at that point to get the pipe and equipment onto the beach and that access is usually at least 50-ft wide (pipe sections are typically 40 to 50 feet long). In NW Florida and Alabama, these yards have been approximately eight miles apart.

“Intermediate areas" are used at about the quarter points of the project length. These are used for the fuel tank, welding equipment, and other items or systems that get used a couple of times a day. These locations can vary from two to three miles apart. In addition, there are access points to allow project vehicles and trucks on and off the beach. Based on previous projects it would be expected to have single-vehicle entry points at one-half to one-mile intervals.

Protective, avoidance, and minimization measures have been incorporated into the project plan to avoid or minimize the potential impacts from the sand placement and dredged material placement activities. However, even with these measures, impacts to beach mice are expected to occur from some aspects of the project activities. The activities are expected to directly or indirectly adversely affect beach mice and/or their habitat including designated critical habitat for the PKBM, CBM, and SABM. The work may occur on public and/or private lands.

Proximity of Action: Some aspects of the sand placement and dredged material placement activities would occur directly in beach mouse habitat. The storage or staging of pipe and other equipment, and vehicles, use or creation of beach access points, and placement of pipe, nourishment or dredged material could occur in habitat occupied or used by SEBM, AIBM, PKBM, CBM, and SABM. Beach mice spend their entire life cycle within the coastal dune system.

Distribution: The storage or staging of pipe and other equipment and vehicles and use of beach access points that could occur in habitat occupied or used by SEBM, AIBM, PKBM, CBM, and SABM may vary depending on the individual project length and existing beach accesses and non-beach mouse habitat that can be used for storage and staging.

Timing: The timing of the activities would directly and indirectly impact beach mice and their habitat depending on the season. Beach mice reproduce year-round with more mice being produced in the late winter and early spring. Impacts could include but would not be limited to disrupting mice seeking mates, constructing nest burrows, foraging for food, caring for their young, and young mice leaving the nest burrow dispersing into new habitat.

Nature of the Effect: The effects of the activities may include the temporary loss of habitat including the loss of a few beach mice from excavation of habitat for beach access and reduction of beach mouse activity including feeding, reproduction, and movement from loss or alteration of habitat. Activities that decrease the amount or quality of dune habitat or movement could affect beach mice by reducing the amount of available habitat and fragmenting the habitat.

Duration: Time to complete the project construction may vary depending on the project length, weather, and other factors (equipment mobilization and break downs, availability of fuel, lawsuits, etc.). Project work could take as little as a month and as long as a one or two years. Beach mouse habitats would remain disturbed until the project is completed and the habitats are restored. Dune restoration could be complete from 6 to 12 months after the project has been completed. The short generation time of beach mice combined with the time frames provided in this document (projects from 1 month to 2 years, dune restoration 6 to 12 months following project completion) will impact multiple generations of beach mice. The time to complete a project and restore the habitat can be a complete loss of habitat availability and use for multiple generations of beach mice.

Disturbance frequency: Depending on the sand placement activity and dredging project frequency, this could result in impacts to beach mice and their habitats at any time during the year on a minimum cycle of every 2 years. Following initial sand placement, activities could occur every year depending on the project location and erosion events. The actual number of times the sand placement would occur is unknown. Following initial sand placement or dredge material placement, maintenance activities could occur every two to 10 years depending on the project location and situation (erosion, long shore sand transportation, upstream activities, and weather events). Thus, impacts related to the subject activities would be expected to occur no more often than every two to three years. However, while not anticipated, work could occur annually in response to emergency events. The actual number of times the nourishment and dredging material disposal activities is unknown but can be based on previous work.

Disturbance intensity and severity: Depending on the frequency needed to conduct the nourishment and dredged material work and the existence of staging areas and beach access points, effects to the recovery of beach mouse may vary. However, the action area encompasses entire range of each subspecies and the overall intensity of the disturbance is expected to be minimal. The severity is also likely to be slight as few if any mice would be lost and dune habitats can be restored quickly if protected from other impacts (pedestrians and vehicles).

The staging and storage of equipment and materials and beach access points could occur within habitat occupied or used by SEBM, AIBM, PKBM, CBM, and SABM and could be adjacent to designated critical habitat for the PKBM, CBM, and SABM. Beach mice are permanent inhabitants of the coastal ecosystem conducting all their life cycles in this environment. While the current status of individual beach mouse subspecies is unknown, their general distribution is known.

Analysis for effects of the action

The action area consists of the Atlantic or Gulf beachfront including the wet and dry unvegetated beach, developing foredunes and interdunal swales, and areas that were formerly primary or secondary dunes. Sand placement or dredged material placement work would not occur on existing vegetated primary or secondary dunes. However, construction of or expansion of an existing beach access could be located through scrub, secondary, or primary dunes. Beach mice

would generally be found inhabiting stable primary, secondary, and scrub dunes on a permanent basis with other habitats being used periodically on a daily or seasonal basis for feeding and movement. Some of these areas also include critical habitat.

Direct and Indirect Impacts

Direct impacts are effects of the action on the species occurring during project implementation and construction (sand placement or dredged material placement). Direct loss of individual beach mice may occur during the creation or expansion of beach access points when heavy equipment clears the habitat and packs the sand. In general the length of time between project maintenance work is expected to be sufficient for beach mouse habitat to be restored. Thus, it is not anticipated that the nourishment and dredged material placement activities would result in permanent beach mouse habitat destruction (including critical habitat). However, habitat for all the beach mouse subspecies and critical habitat for the PKBM, CBM, and SABM that provides food or cover may be temporarily destroyed or altered from the activities.

Indirect effects are a result of a proposed action that occur later in time and are reasonably certain to occur. The indirect effect of the sand placement and dredged material placement activities would be newly created or expanded existing beach access points that act as barriers to beach mouse movement for foraging, or population expansion or dispersal. Maintaining the connectivity among habitats is vital to persistence of beach mice recovery. Recovery actions needed to assure the connectivity include restoration and maintenance of the dune system following project completion.

For the Service to determine if the project impacts on designated critical habitat would be an adverse modification, the Service shall determine if the impact on the habitat appreciably diminishes the capability of the critical habitat to satisfy essential requirements of beach mice. The long-term maintenance of the beach mouse populations in the project areas could be compromised if the sand placement and dredged material placement activities occur too frequently resulting in a long-term barrier to mice movement. However, our evaluation indicates the impacts to critical habitat should be temporary in nature based on past history of nourishment projects. In addition, the area to be directly affected within the individual subspecies would be a small percentage of the overall critical habitat and would not be expected to reduce the carrying capacity of the recovery unit or appreciably diminish the ability of the PCE's to provide for the essential functions of the critical habitat units.

Species' response to a proposed action

This SPBO is based on effects that are anticipated to beach mice (all life stages) as a result of the temporary physical disturbance of beach mice habitat from beach nourishment or dredged material placement and associated activities. Some individual beach mice (all life stages) may be lost during the initial construction or expansion of beach accesses where heavy equipment destroys dune habitat and compacts the sand within the access corridor. Any mice that survive the initial construction may move outside of the disturbed area and construct burrows elsewhere in the vicinity. This will result in increased exposure to predation due to the removal of their burrows.

Following access construction, a bare gap of sand could form a barrier to limit beach mouse movement within the area altering regular movement patterns. The bare areas could not be used for foraging, breeding or sheltering. These impacts are expected to be limited to the construction phase of the project (one month to two years). As the life span of a beach mouse is estimated to be approximately nine months, the loss of individual mice or the temporary loss of habitat could affect several generations of beach mice, but because beach mice can reproduce rapidly with adequate resources, colonization or recolonization of the restored habitat would be expected.

Beach mice have evolved to adapt to catastrophic weather events. Additional factors such as surrounding development pressure and nonnative predators may affect the species' ability to recover from the loss of individuals. However, the temporary loss of the habitat itself is not expected to permanently impact the populations as all beach mouse habitat within the project areas not permanently destroyed would be restored or maintained as part of the conservation measures committed to by the Corps or the Applicant. The temporary nature of the impacts to dune habitats is not expected to alter the function and conservation role of the remaining beach mouse habitat including designated critical habitat.

CUMULATIVE EFFECTS

Cumulative effects include the effects of future State, tribal, local, or private actions that are reasonably certain to occur in the action area considered in this SPBO. Future Federal actions that are unrelated to the proposed project are not considered in this opinion and require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the Act.

It is reasonably certain to expect that coastal development, human occupancy and recreational use along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of Florida will increase in the future. Redevelopment along with new developments following the hurricane seasons of 2004 and 2005 are occurring as allowed by local zoning standards. It is unknown how much influence a nourished beach would contribute to the development and recreational use of the shoreline. Any projects that are within endangered or threatened species habitat will require section 7 consultation or section 10(a) (1)(B) permitting from the Service.

In recognizing the importance of coastal barrier islands along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, Congress passed the Coastal Barrier Resources Act (CBRA) of 1982 and Coastal Barrier Improvement Act in 1991. The purpose of CBRA is "…to minimize the loss of human life, wasteful expenditure of Federal revenues, and the damage to fish, wildlife, and other natural resources associated with the coastal barriers along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts by restricting future Federal expenditures and financial assistance which have the effect of encouraging development of coastal barriers." Congress established the Coastal Barrier Resources System units that apply to the CBRA.

Escambia County is currently in the final permitting stages of a beach nourishment project for Perdido Key. The project would cover approximately 4 miles of beachfront along county and private lands, not including state and Federal lands. The Service completed an endangered species

consultation for the project in 2008. The project construction is expected to begin in late 2009-2010. The beach nourishment project is likely to enhance beach mouse habitat by providing an additional buffer to the dune habitats from storm events.

The Pensacola Naval Air Station has proposed to dredge their navigation channel resulting in the need to place eight million cubic yards of dredged material that is beach compatible. Because of cost, Perdido Key is the closest area to receive the material. Receiving areas include the Perdido Key Gulf beachfront (in lieu of the County implementing their project described above), PKSP, and GINS, Escambia County. The project could result in the placement of dredged material on 16 miles of beachfront including private, county, state, and Federal lands. The Navy has received their permits to complete the project. The Service completed an endangered species consultation for the project in 2007. The full project is on hold due to funding. However, the Federal navigation channel in the lower portion of the project area is expected to be maintenance dredged in 2009-2010.

Gulf County is currently completing a beach restoration project on St. Joseph peninsula and St. Joseph Peninsula State Park. The project will cover approximately 7.5 miles of Gulf of Mexico beachfront. The Service completed an endangered species consultation for the project. The project was completed in 2008.

CONCLUSION

Sea Turtles

After reviewing the current status of the loggerhead, green, leatherback, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley sea turtles, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the proposed activities, the "Conservation Measures," and the cumulative effects, it is the Service's biological opinion that work conducted under the Statewide Programmatic action, as proposed, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the loggerhead, green, leatherback, hawksbill or Kemp's ridley sea turtles. Critical habitat has been designated for the NWAO DPS of the loggerhead sea turtle. **Table 4** has the list of the critical habitat units within the project area.

The conservation of the five loggerhead recovery units in the Northwest Atlantic is essential to the recovery of the loggerhead sea turtle. Each individual recovery unit is necessary to conserve genetic and demographic robustness, or other features necessary for long-term sustainability of the entire population. Thus, maintenance of viable nesting in each recovery unit contributes to the overall population. Three of the five loggerhead recovery units in the Northwest Atlantic occur within the action area, the PFRU, the DTRU, and the NGMRU. Sand placement is not expected to occur within the DTRU. The NGMRU averages about 1,000 nests per year. Northwest Florida accounts for 92 percent of this recovery unit in nest numbers (920 nests) and consists of approximately 234 miles of nesting shoreline. Of the available nesting habitat within the NGMRU, with most sand placement projects have a project life of five to seven years and channel maintenance activities occurring every two to three years, on average, sand placement impacts will

occur on 8.8 miles of sea turtle nesting shoreline per year. This is based on the average linear feet of beach on which sand placement occurred during nonemergency years from 2001 to 2008.

The PFRU averages 64,513 nests per year. The entire recovery unit occurs within Florida and consists of approximately 595 miles of sandy shoreline (http://www.dep.state.fl.us/beaches/publications/pdf/fl_beach.pdf). Of the available nesting habitat within the PFRU, sand placement activities will occur on 18.9 miles of nesting shoreline per year during nonemergency years. This is based on the average linear feet of beach on which sand placement occurred during non-emergency years from 2001 to 2008.

Generally, green, leatherback, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley nesting overlaps with or occurs within the beaches where loggerhead sea turtles nest on both the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico beaches. Thus, for green, leatherback, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley sea turtles, sand placement activities will affect an average of 27.7 miles of shoreline per year. This is based on the average linear feet of beach on which sand placement occurred during nonemergency years from 2001 to 2008.

For all species of sea turtles, post-hurricane sand placement activities occurred on approximately 205 miles of shoreline for the 2004-2005 period following the emergency events (declared disasters and Congressional Orders). These activities are within the approximately 1,400 miles of available sea turtle nesting habitat in the southeastern U.S.

Research has shown that the principal effect of sand placement on sea turtle reproduction is a reduction in nesting success, and this reduction is most often limited to the first year following project construction. Research has also shown that the impacts of a nourishment project on sea turtle nesting habitat are typically short-term because a nourished beach will be reworked by natural processes in subsequent years, and beach compaction and the frequency of escarpment formation will decline. Although a variety of factors, including some that cannot be controlled, can influence how a nourishment project will perform from an engineering perspective, measures can be implemented to minimize impacts to sea turtles.

Beach Mice

The PKBM, CBM, and SABM occur on both public and private lands throughout their historical ranges. Both the SEBM and the AIBM are located completely on county, state, or federally protected lands, except for a small area in St. Johns County in which the AIBM are found on private lands along the Florida coast.

After reviewing the current status of the species of the SEBM, AIBM, PKBM, CBM, and SABM, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of beach nourishment and dredged material placement and associated activities, the "Conservation Measures," and the cumulative effects, it is the Service's biological opinion that the Statewide Programmatic action for these projects, as proposed, is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any of the above subspecies of beach mice and is not likely to destroy or adversely modify designated critical habitat for the PKBM, CBM, or SABM.

As discussed in the Effects of the Action section of this SPBO, we would not expect the carrying capacity of beach mouse habitat within the action area to be reduced. Beach mouse habitat will continue to provide for the biological needs of the subspecies as demonstrated below:

1. No permanent loss of beach mouse habitat will occur within the action area from the project construction or maintenance;

2. Temporary impacts to beach mouse habitat will be restored within the action area after project completion; and

3. A full complement of beach mouse habitat will remain within the action area after project completion.

Temporary impacts are expected to be limited to the construction/maintenance phase of the project and habitat restoration period following the project, which could be completed between one month and two years.

While a few beach mice may be lost, beach mice recover well from population size reductions (Wooten 1994) given sufficient habitat is available for population expansion after the bottleneck occurs. Therefore, we do not consider the potential loss of individuals to be significant.

Also, 50 feet of beach mouse critical habitat for each subspecies (PKBM, CBM, and SABM) could be temporarily affected each time a project is completed as a result of the sand placement activities. We would not anticipate that the loss of the critical habitat would alter or affect the remaining critical habitat in the action area for each subspecies (PKBM, CBM, and SABM) to the extent that it would appreciably diminish the habitat's capability to provide the intended conservation role for the subspecies in the wild.

INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Section 9 of the Act and Federal regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the Act prohibit the take of endangered or threatened species, respectively, without special exemption. Take is defined as to harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, capture or collect, or to attempt to engage in any such conduct. Harm is further defined by the Service to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results in death or injury to listed species by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns, including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Harass is defined by the Service as intentional or negligent actions that create the likelihood of injury to listed species to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavior patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Incidental take is defined as take that is incidental to, and not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity. Under the terms of section 7(b)(4) and section 7(o)(2), taking that is incidental to and not intended as part of the

agency action is not considered to be prohibited under the Act provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this incidental take statement.

The measures described below are non-discretionary and shall be implemented by the Corps so that they become binding conditions of any grant or permit issued to the Applicant, as appropriate, for the exemption in section 7(o)(2) to apply. The Corps has a continuing duty to regulate the activity covered by this incidental take statement. If the Corps (1) fails to assume and implement the terms and conditions or (2) fails to adhere to the terms and conditions of the incidental take statement through enforceable terms that are added to the permit or grant document, the protective coverage of section 7(o)(2) may lapse. In order to monitor the impact of incidental take, the Corps shall report the progress of the action and its impacts on the species to the Service as specified in the incidental take statement [50 CFR §402.14(i)(3)].

AMOUNT OR EXTENT OF ANTICIPATED TAKE

Sea Turtles

The Service anticipates that no more than 27.7 miles of highly eroded shoreline along the Florida coastline (no more than 8.8 miles within the NGMRU and no more than 18.9 miles within the PFRU) would receive sand placement per year during nonemergency calendar years with a maximum of 102 miles of shoreline (38 miles within the NGMRU and 64 miles of shoreline within the PFRU) receiving sand during or following an emergency event (declared disaster or Congressional Order) as a result of the Statewide Programmatic action. This represents two percent of the entire shoreline per year during a nonemergency year and seven percent of the entire shoreline during an emergency year. Over the last 10 years, one Congressional Order occurred due to emergency events in the 2004-2005 period. The increased sand placement on 102 miles of shoreline is expected to occur once in a 10-year period due to emergency events. Incidental take of sea turtles will be difficult to detect for the following reasons:

1. Turtles nest primarily at night and all nests are not located because
    a. Natural factors, such as rainfall, wind, and tides may obscure crawls; and
    b. Human-caused factors, such as pedestrian and vehicular traffic, may obscure crawls, and result in nests being destroyed because they were missed during a nesting survey and egg relocation program;

2. The total number of hatchlings per undiscovered nest is unknown;

3. The reduction in percent hatching and emerging success per relocated nest over the natural nest site is unknown;

4. An unknown number of females may avoid the project beach and be forced to nest in a less than optimal area;

5. Lights may misdirect an unknown number of hatchlings and cause death; and

6. Escarpments may form and prevent an unknown number of females from accessing a suitable nesting site.

However, the level of take of these species due to disturbance and sand placement on suitable turtle nesting beach habitat can be anticipated because (1) turtles will continue to nest within the project site during and following sand placement; (2) sand placement activities will likely occur during a portion of the nesting season; (3) sand placement activities will modify the incubation substrate, beach slope, and sand compaction; and (4) artificial lighting will deter or misdirect nesting females and hatchlings during and following sand placement.

Take is expected to be in the form of: (1) destruction of all nests that may be constructed and eggs that may be deposited and missed by a nest survey and egg relocation program within the boundaries of the project areas; (2) destruction of all nests deposited during the period when a nest survey and egg relocation program is not required to be in place within the boundaries of the projects; (3) reduced hatching success due to egg mortality during relocation and adverse conditions at the relocation site; (4) harassment in the form of disturbing or interfering with female turtles attempting to nest within the sand placement areas or on adjacent beaches during sand placement or construction activities; (5) misdirection of nesting and hatchling turtles on beaches adjacent to the sand placement or construction area as a result of project lighting including the ambient lighting from dredges; (6) behavior modification of nesting females due to escarpment formation within the project area during a nesting season, resulting in false crawls or situations where they choose marginal or unsuitable nesting areas to deposit eggs; and (7) destruction of nests from escarpment leveling within a nesting season when such leveling has been approved by the Service.

According to Schroeder (1994), there is an average survey error of seven percent; therefore, there is the possibility that some nests within the Action Area may be misidentified as false crawls and missed. However, due to implementation of the sea turtle protection measures, we anticipate that the take will not exceed seven percent of the nesting average in the action area. This number is not the level of take anticipated because the exact number cannot be predicted nor can the level of incidental take be monitored.

Beach Mouse

The Service has reviewed the biological information and other information relevant to this action. Based on this review, incidental take is anticipated from the sand placement activities may occur any time of the year within a ten-year period. The Service anticipates incidental take of beach mice would be difficult to detect for the following reasons: (1) an unknown number of beach mice may be injured, crushed or buried during beach access construction work and remain entombed in the sand; (2) beach mice are nocturnal, are small, and finding a dead or injured body is unlikely because of predation, and (3) changes in beach mouse essential life behaviors may not be detectable in standardized monitoring surveys.

For projects that occur within beach mouse habitat it is anticipated that no more than 50 linear feet of beach mouse habitat could be affected per sand placement activity for beach access within a subspecies range statewide as a result of the sand placement activities.

The incidental take is expected to be in the form of: (1) harm or harassment to all beach mice occupying the created or expanded beach access points; (2) harassment of beach mice from disturbance of foraging opportunities within the access areas during the construction period; (3) harassment of beach mice from temporary loss of foraging and burrow habitat; and (4) harassment of beach mice from temporary restriction of movement across access areas.

EFFECT OF THE TAKE

Sea Turtles

In the SPBO, the Service determined that the level of anticipated take is not likely to result in jeopardy to the loggerhead, green, leatherback, hawksbill or Kemp's ridley sea turtles. Loggerhead critical habitat has been designated in the project area. Based on the Corps incorporation of the conservation measures into the project, the Service concurs that the project may affect but is not likely to adversely affect nor adversely modify NWAO loggerhead critical habitat in the terrestrial environment. The Corps will consult with the NMFS on any impacts to critical habitat in the marine environment.

Incidental take of loggerhead nesting and hatchling sea turtles and sea turtle nests is anticipated to occur during project construction and during the life of the project. Take will occur on nesting habitat consisting of the length of the beach where the material will be placed or where jetty or groin maintenance is located but is not expected to exceed 8.8 miles of shoreline per year within the northwest portion of Florida for the NGMRU and 18.9 miles of shoreline per year within the PFRU during a nonemergency year. Take will occur on nesting habitat consisting of the length of the beach where the material will be placed or where groin maintenance is located but is not expected to exceed 102 miles of shoreline (38 miles of shoreline per year within the northwest portion of Florida for the NGMRU and 64 miles of shoreline per year within the PFRU) during an emergency (declared disasters or Congressional Orders) year. The increased sand placement of 102 miles of shoreline is expected to occur once in a 10-year period due to emergency events.

Incidental take of green, leatherback, hawksbill and Kemp's ridley nesting and hatchling sea turtles and sea turtle nests is anticipated to occur during project construction and during the life of the project or while placed sand remains on the beach. Take will occur on nesting habitat consisting of the length of the beach where the material will be placed or where jetty or groin maintenance is located but is not expected to exceed 27.7 miles (8.8 miles within the northwest portion of Florida and 18.9 miles within the northeast, south and west portion of Florida) of shoreline per year during a nonemergency year. Take will occur on nesting habitat consisting of the length of the beach where the material will be placed or where jetty or groin maintenance is located but is not expected to exceed 102 miles of shoreline (38 miles of shoreline per year within the northwest portion of

Florida for the NGMRU and 64 miles of shoreline per year within the PFRU) during an emergency (declared disasters or Congressional Orders) year.

Beach Mouse

In the SPBO, the Service determined that this level of anticipated take is not likely to result in jeopardy to AIBM, SEBM, PKBM, CBM, and SABM or in adverse modification or destruction of designated critical habitat for the PKBM, CBM, or SABM. Critical habitat for the SEBM and AIBM has not been designated; therefore, the project will not result in destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat for these subspecies.

Incidental take of SEBM, AIBM, PKBM, CBM, and SABM is anticipated to occur at beach access locations for the sand placement activities. Take will occur during project construction where beach access points are expanded or created and where equipment is staged or stored within beach mouse habitat along approximately 50 feet of vegetated dunes for beach access.

REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES

The Service has determined that the following reasonable and prudent measures are necessary and appropriate to minimize take of the loggerhead, green, leatherback, hawksbill, and Kemp's ridley sea turtles; SEBM, AIBM, CBM, PKBM, and SABM in the action area for the following activities:

A. Sand placement from beach nourishment, sand bypass, and sand back pass activities;

B. Sand placement from navigation channel maintenance; and

C. Groin and jetty repair or replacement.

If the Corps is unable to comply with the Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions, the Corps as the construction agent or regulatory authority may:

1. Inform the Service why the term and condition is not reasonable and prudent for the specific project or activity and request exception under the SPBO or
2. Initiate consultation with the Service for the specific project or activity. The Service may respond by either of the following:
    a. Allowing an exception to the terms and conditions under the SPBO or
    b. Recommending or accepting initiation of consultation (if initiated by the Corps) for the specific project or activity.

Post construction requirements are listed in Reasonable and Prudent measures, A11, A12, A13, and A14. These post construction requirements may besubject to congressional authorization and the allocation of funds. Florida State statutes apply. If the Corps or Applicant cannot fulfill these Reasonable and Prudent Measures, the Corps must reinitiate consultation.

REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES for:

A. Projects that include sand placement from beach nourishment, sand bypass, and sand back pass activities primarily for shore protection (these projects are usually larger scaled) shall include the following measures:

A1. Conservation Measures included in the Corps' PBA that address protection of nesting sea turtles and beach mice shall be implemented in the Corps federally authorized project or regulated activity.

A2. Beach quality sand suitable for sea turtle nesting, successful incubation, and hatchling emergence and beach mouse burrow construction shall be used for sand placement.

A3. Sand placement shall not occur during the period of peak sea turtle egg laying and egg hatching, to reduce the possibility of sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation. In Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward counties, sand placement shall not occur from May 1 through October 31. In St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape San Blas in Gulf County, St. George Island in Franklin County, and Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte counties, sand placement shall not occur from June 1 through September 30. This time frame does not include Venice Beach and which has low density nesting. In Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte (except Manasota Key), Sarasota (except Manasota Key), Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin (except St. George Island), Gulf (except St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape San Blas), Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, and Escambia counties, Florida, sand placement may occur during the sea turtle nesting season.

A4. All derelict material or other debris shall be removed from the beach prior to any sand placement.

A5. The beach profile template for the sand placement project shall be designed to mimic, the native beach berm elevation and beach slopes landward and seaward of the equilibrated berm crest.

A6. If a dune system is already part of the project design, the placement and design of the dune shall emulate the natural dune system to the maximum extent possible, including the dune configuration and shape.

A7. Predator-proof trash receptacles shall be installed and maintained at all beach access points used for the project construction to minimize the potential for attracting predators of sea turtles and beach mice.

A8. A meeting between representatives of the Applicant's or Corps, Service, FWC, the permitted sea turtle surveyor, and other species surveyors, as appropriate, shall be held prior to the commencement of work on this project.

A9. If the beach nourishment project will be conducted during the sea turtle nesting season, surveys for nesting sea turtles must be conducted by the FWC-authorized Marine Turtle Permit Holder. Surveys for early and late nesting sea turtles shall be conducted where appropriate.

A10. If nests are constructed in the area of proposed sand placement, the eggs shall be relocated to minimize sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation.

A11. A post construction survey(s) of all artificial lighting visible from the project beach shall be completed by the Applicant or Corps.

A12. The Applicant or Corps shall ensure that daily nesting surveys are conducted by the FWC Marine Turtle Permit Holder for two nesting seasons following construction if the new sand still remains on the beach.

A13. Sand compaction shall be monitored and tilling shall be conducted if needed to reduce the likelihood of impacting sea turtle nesting and hatching activities.

A14. Escarpment formation shall be monitored and leveling shall be conducted if needed to reduce the likelihood of impacting nesting and hatchling sea turtles.

A15. Construction equipment and materials including pipes shall be stored off the beach in a manner that will minimize impacts to nesting and hatchling sea turtles and beach mice.

A16. Lighting associated with the project construction including on the dredge shall be minimized to reduce the possibility of disrupting and disorienting nesting and hatchling sea turtles and nocturnal activities of beach mice.

A17. During the sea turtle nesting season, the Corps shall not extend the beach fill more than 500 feet (or other agreed upon length if a FWC permit holder is present) between dusk and the time of completion the following day's nesting survey to reduce the impact to emerging sea turtles and burial of new nests.

A18. All vegetation planting shall be designed and conducted to minimize impacts to sea turtles and beach mice.

A19. Beach mouse habitat shall be avoided to the maximum extent possible when selecting sites for access corridors, storage and staging of equipment.

A20. Equipment and construction materials shall not be stored near the seaward dune toe in areas of occupied beach mouse habitat. This area is highly utilized by beach mice.

A21. Existing vegetated habitat at beach access points and travel corridors shall be protected to the maximum extent possible to ensure vehicles and equipment transport stay within the access corridor.

A22. Expanded or newly created beach access points shall be restored following construction.

A23. A report describing the actions taken shall be submitted to the Service following completion of the proposed work.

A24. The Service and the FWC shall be notified if a sea turtle adult, hatchling, or egg, or beach mouse is harmed or destroyed as a direct or indirect result of the project.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS

All conservation measures described in the Corps' Programmatic Biological Assessment are hereby incorporated by reference as Terms and Conditions within this document pursuant to 50 CFR §402.14(I) with the addition of the following Terms and Conditions. In order to be exempt from the prohibitions of section 9 of the Act, the Corps shall comply with the following Terms and Conditions, which implement the Reasonable and Prudent Measures, described above and outline reporting/monitoring requirements.

These Terms and Conditions are nondiscretionary.

Post construction requirements are listed in Terms and Conditions A11, A12, A13, and A14. These post construction requirements may be subject to congressional authorization and the allocation of funds. If the Corps or Applicant cannot fulfill these Terms and Conditions, the Corps must reinitiate consultation.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS for:

A. Projects that include sand placement from beach nourishment, sand bypass, and sand back pass activities primarily for shore protection shall include the following conditions:

All beaches

A1. Conservation Measures included in the Corps' PBA that address protection of nesting sea turtles and beach mice listed on pages 9 and 10 of the SPBO shall be implemented in the Corps federally authorized project or regulated activity.

A2. Beach-compatible fill shall be placed on the beach or in any associated dune system. Beach compatible fill must be sand that is similar to a native beach in the vicinity of the site that has not been affected by prior sand placement activity. The fill material must be similar in both coloration and grain size distribution to that native beach. Beach compatible fill is material that maintains the general character and functionality of the material occurring on the beach and in the adjacent dune and coastal system. Fill material shall comply with FDEP requirements pursuant to the Florida Administrative Code (FAC) subsection 62B-41.005(15). If a variance is requested from FDEP, the Service must be contacted to discuss whether the project falls outside of the SPBO. A Quality Control Plan shall be implemented pursuant to FAC Rule 62B-41.008(1)(k)4.b.

A3. Sand placement shall not occur during the period of peak sea turtle egg laying and egg hatching to reduce the possibility of sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation.

a. Sand placement projects in Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward counties shall be started after October 31 and be completed before May 1. During the May 1 through October 31 period, no construction equipment or pipes may be placed and/or stored on the beach.

b. Sand placement projects in Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa and Escambia Counties may occur during the sea turtle nesting season except on publicly owned conservation lands such as state parks and areas where such work is prohibited by the managing agency or under applicable local land use codes (see exceptions in A3.c below).

c. For higher density nesting beaches in Gulf and Franklin counties sand placement shall not occur during the main part of the nesting season (June 1 through September 30). On Manasota Key located in Sarasota and Charlotte counties (excluding Venice Beach), sand placement shall not occur during the main part of the nesting season (May 1 through October 31). These beaches include St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape San Blas in Gulf County, and St. George Island in Franklin County.

The Service shall be contacted for coordination, on a project-by-project basis, if sand placement is needed on publicly owned conservation lands and in these higher density nesting beaches in Gulf and Franklin Counties and on Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte counties during the above exclusionary period. The Service will determine whether work (1) may proceed in accordance with the Terms and Conditions; (2) may proceed in accordance with the Terms and Conditions and other requirements as developed by the Service; or (3) would require an individual emergency consultation.

Land managers on publicly owned conservation lands must be involved in the project coordination.

A4. All derelict concrete, metal, and coastal armoring geotextile material and other debris shall be removed from the beach to the maximum extent possible prior to any sand placement in accordance with the dates in A3. If debris removal activities take place during shorebird breeding or peak sea turtle nesting season (**Tables 17 and 18**), the work shall be conducted during daylight hours only and shall not commence until completion of daily seabird, shorebird or marine turtle surveys each day.

A5. The beach profile template for the sand placement project shall be designed to mimic, the native beach berm elevation and beach slopes landward and seaward of the equilibrated berm crest. Prior to drafting the plans and specifications for a beach nourishment project, the Corps must meet with the Service, FWC, and FDEP to discuss the beach profile surveys, dune formation (specifically on high density green turtle nesting beaches), and the sea turtle monitoring reports from previous placement events. The meeting will be used to discuss modifications to the beach profile based on the post-construction monitoring data.

Beach profile may vary depending on location, shoreline dynamics, nature of the fill material, and other factors. If a native beach berm elevation is not possible, due to the beach width, impacts to nearshore hardbottom, or other considerations, as discussed during the meeting, the alternative template shall include features to minimize impacts to sea turtle nesting success and the potential for ponding and escarpment formation for that beach. For all high density green turtle nesting beaches (http://ocean.floridamarine.org/SeaTurtleNesting/), the formation of a dune, either through direct creation or natural accretion, will be included in the project design. Dunes and other construction features must be within the scope of the Congressionally-authorized project, if it is a civil works project, and constructible without impacting other resources. If a recommended dune is not possible, the Corps will contact the Service to see if consultation needs to be reinitiated or discuss features incorporated with the profile that will enhance the existing dune. Dune features included in the profile design (or project) shall have a slope of 1.5:1 followed by a gradual slope of 4:1 for approximately 20 feet seaward on a high erosion beach (**Figure 13)** or a 4:1 slope (**Figure 14**) on a low erosion beach. The Corps must explore options to include a dune system in the project design for existing authorized projects and new non-Federal projects. If another slope is proposed for use, the Corps shall consult the Service. The seaward toe of the dune should be at least 20 feet from the waterline.



Figure 13. Recommended slope on a high erosion beach for sand placement projects that include the creation of a dune.



Figure 14. Recommended slope on a low erosion beach for sand placement projects that include the creation of a dune.

A6. Predator-proof trash receptacles shall be installed and maintained during construction at all beach access points used for the project construction to minimize the potential for attracting predators of sea turtles and beach mice (**Appendix F**). The Corps shall provide predator-proof trash receptacles for the construction workers. The Corps shall brief workers on the importance of not littering and keeping the project area trash and debris free.

A7. A meeting between representatives of the Corps (including the Corps project manager and/or the managing contractor), the Service, the FWC, the FWC Marine Turtle Permit Holder, and other species surveyors, as appropriate, shall be held prior to the commencement of work on projects. At least 10 business days advance notice shall be provided prior to conducting this meeting. The meeting will provide an opportunity for explanation and/or clarification of the sea turtle and beach mouse protection measures as well as additional guidelines when construction occurs during the sea turtle nesting season, and will include the following

a. Staging locations, storing equipment including fuel stations
b. Coordination with the Marine Turtle Permit Holder on nesting surveys and any nighttime work
c. Pipeline placement (between 5 to 10 feet from dune)
d. Minimizing driving
e. Egg relocation- permit holder and location (must be approved by FWC)
f. Free-roaming cat observation (for projects in or near beach mouse habitat)
g. Follow up lighting surveys - dates and inspector
h. Follow up coordination during construction and post construction
i. Coordination on construction lighting including dredge lighting and travel within and adjacent to the work area
j. Direction of the project including progression of sand placement along the beach
k. Late season nests present in project area (if any)
l. Plans for compaction monitoring or tilling
m. Plans for escarpment surveys

At the preconstruction meeting, the Corps shall also provide the Service with specific anticipated shoreline lengths and anticipated duration using the form on the following web link: http://www.fws.gov/northflorida/SeaTurtles/Docs/Corp%20of%20Engineers%20Sea%20Turtle%20Permit%20Information.pdf. Only the following information should be filled out: Corps Permit Number, FWS Log Number, Project Location, Construction Activity, Duration of Protect, and Actual Take (linear feet of beach). This form shall be emailed to the Service at seaturtle@fws.gov. This form is in addition to the annual report listed below.

Sea Turtle Protection

A8. Daily early morning surveys for sea turtle nests shall be required and continue throughout the season as outlined in **Tables 16 and 17 (Nesting Season Monitoring)** if construction

occurs during the nesting and hatching season. Any known nests recorded just prior to the beginning of Nesting Season Monitoring must be relocated if it will be impacted by the construction activity or marked and avoided if feasible.

Table 16. Beach Sand Placement and Sea Turtle Nest Monitoring/Relocation Windows, Brevard through Broward Counties, Coast of Florida.

Region	Nest Laying Season	Hatching Season Ends (Last day requiring prior monitoring/relocation)	Beach Placement Window	Early Season Relocation*	Late Season Relocation**	Nesting Season Monitoring (monitoring throughout season)
Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, and Broward Counties	25 Feb - 11 Nov	15 Jan	1 Nov - 30 Apr	1 Mar - 30 Apr In Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, & Broward counties nighttime surveys for leatherback sea turtles shall begin when the first leatherback crawl is recorded	65 days prior to Jan 15 (11 Nov) (or 65 days prior to start of construction **)	1 Mar - 11 Nov ***
Martin and Palm Beach Counties	12 Feb – 17 Nov	21 Jan	1 Nov - 30 Apr	1 Mar - 30 Apr In Martin and Palm Beach Counties, nighttime surveys for leatherback sea turtles shall begin when the first leatherback crawl is recorded	65 days prior to 21 Jan (17 Nov) (or 65 days prior to start of construction**)	1 Mar - 17 Nov***

** Relocation can only begin after FWC authorizes nest relocation in accordance with Florida Statute 379.2431 (1).
*** (For late season monitoring: 7 days without a nest, can stop monitoring once electronic mail concurrence is received from FWS or FWC).

Table 17. Beach Sand Placement and Sea Turtle Nest Monitoring/Relocation Windows, Outside of Brevard through Broward Counties, Coast of Florida.

Region	Nest Laying Season	Hatching Season Ends (Last day requiring prior monitoring/ relocation)	Beach Placement Window	Nesting Season Monitoring and Relocation (monitoring throughout season)
Nassau, Duval, Flagler, St. Johns, and Volusia Counties	2 Apr. – 24 Oct	28 Dec	All Year	15 Apr – 24 Oct ***
Miami-Dade County	11 Feb – 25 Sep	29 Nov	All Year	1 Mar – 25 Sep***
Gulf County (St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, Cape San Blas) & Franklin County (St. George Isl)	1 May - 4 Sep	13 Nov	1 Oct - 31 May	1 May – 4 Sep***
All other beaches in Gulf and Franklin Counties, and Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, and Bay Counties	2 May – 16 Sep	24 Nov	All Year	1 May - 16 Sep***
Sarasota and Charlotte Counties (Manasota Key)	24 Apr – 7 Sep	11 Nov	1 Nov - 30 Apr (except Venice beach)	15 Apr – 7 Sep***
All other beaches in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties	24 Apr – 12 Sep	16 Nov	All Year	15 Apr – 12 Sep***
Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee, Lee, Collier, and Monroe Counties	20 Apr – 19 Sep	23 Nov	All Year	15 Apr – 19 Sep***

*** (For late season monitoring: 7 days without a nest, can stop monitoring once electronic mail concurrence is received from FWS or FWC).

A9. If nests are constructed in the area of anticipated sand placement, the eggs shall be relocated to minimize sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation as outlined in a through f. If nests are laid on the dune outside of the immediate sand placement area, the Corps must contact the Service to discuss whether relocation or mark and avoidance is required. Any known nests recorded just prior to the beginning of Nesting Season Monitoring must be relocated if it will be impacted by the construction activity or marked and avoided if feasible.

a. For sand placement projects in Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties that occur during the earlier part of the nesting season (see Table 14) through April 30, daily early morning surveys shall begin March 1 and continue through the end of the beach placement window, with egg relocation continuing only until completion of fill placement. Eggs shall be relocated per the following requirements (i through iii below). For sand placement projects that occur during the period from November 1 through the end of hatching season (see Table 16), daily early morning sea turtle nesting surveys shall be conducted 65 days prior to project initiation and continue through November 11, and eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii. The Corps must contact the Service if there are any nests still incubating after November 30.

i. Nesting surveys and egg relocations will only be conducted by persons with prior experience and training in these activities and who are duly authorized to conduct such activities through a valid permit issued by FWC, pursuant to FAC 68E-1. Please contact FWC's Imperiled Species Management Section in Tequesta at mtp@myfwc.com for information on the permit holder in the project area. Relocation cannot begin until the Corps has a copy of the FWC permit authorizing relocation for construction purposes at that particular sand placement project. Nesting surveys shall be conducted daily between sunrise and 9 a.m. (this is for all time zones).

ii. Only those nests that may be affected by sand placement activities will be relocated. Nest relocation shall not occur upon completion of the project. Nests requiring relocation shall be moved no later than 9 a.m. the morning following deposition to a nearby self-release beach site in a secure setting where artificial lighting will not interfere with hatchling orientation. Relocated nests shall not be placed in organized groupings. Relocated nests shall be randomly staggered along the length and width of the beach in settings that are not expected to experience daily inundation by high tides or known to routinely experience severe erosion and egg loss, predation, or be subject to artificial lighting. Nest relocations in association with construction activities shall cease when construction activities no longer threaten nests.

iii. Nests deposited within areas where construction activities have ceased or will not occur for 65 days or nests laid in the nourished berm prior to tilling shall be marked and left in situ unless other factors threaten the success of the nest. The turtle permit holder shall install an on-beach marker at the nest site and a secondary marker at a point as far landward as possible to assure that future location of the nest will be possible should the on-beach marker be lost. No activity will occur within this area nor will any activities occur that could result in impacts to the nest. Nest sites shall be inspected daily to assure nest markers remain in place and the nest has not been disturbed by the project activity.

Daytime surveys shall be conducted for leatherback sea turtle nests beginning March 1. Nighttime surveys for leatherback sea turtles shall begin when the first leatherback crawl is recorded within the project area through April 30 or until completion of the project (whichever is earliest). Nightly nesting surveys shall be conducted from 9 p.m. until 6 a.m. The project area shall be surveyed at 1-hour intervals (since leatherbacks require at least 1.5 hours to complete nesting, this will ensure all nesting leatherbacks are encountered) and eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii.

b. For sand placement projects in Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa and Escambia Counties that occur during the period of sea turtle nest laying (**see Table 17**), daily early morning (before 9 a.m.) surveys and egg relocation shall be conducted. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii (see nest relocation exceptions for Franklin, Gulf, Sarasota, and Charlotte Counties in A10.d. below).

c. For Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, and Escambia Counties, nesting surveys shall be initiated 70 days prior to sand placement activities (incubation periods are longer in these counties) or by nesting season monitoring (see Table 17) whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through the end of nesting season monitoring (see Table 17) with relocation only through the end of fill placement. Hatching and emerging success monitoring will involve checking nests beyond the completion date of the daily early morning nesting surveys. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii (see nest relocation exceptions for Franklin and Gulf Counties in A10.d. below).

d. For St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape San Blas in Gulf County, St. George Island in Franklin County, and Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties, sand placement activities shall occur only during the Beach Placement Window indicated in Table 17 (except on Venice Beach), outside the period of peak sea turtle egg laying and egg hatching for this area. If nests are laid

in the early part of the nesting season monitoring during the beach placement window in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii.

e. For Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee, Sarasota, Charlotte, Lee, Collier, and Monroe Counties, nesting surveys shall be initiated 65 days prior to nourishment or dredged channel material placement activities or by the beginning of the nesting season monitoring indicated in Table 17 whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through the end of nesting season monitoring (see Table 17), with egg relocation continuing only through the end of fill placement. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii (see nest relocation exceptions for Sarasota and Charlotte Counties in A10.d. above).

f. For Miami-Dade County, nesting surveys shall be initiated 65 days prior to nourishment or dredged channel material placement activities or by the beginning of the nesting season monitoring indicated in Table 17, whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through the end of the nesting season monitoring and egg relocation shall continue through the end of sand placement. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii

g. For Volusia, Flagler, St. Johns, Duval, and Nassau Counties, nesting surveys shall be initiated 65 days prior to sand placement activities or by the beginning of the nesting season monitoring indicated in Table 17, whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through the end of nesting season monitoring indicated in Table 17 and egg relocation shall continue through the end of sand placement. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii.

A10. Two surveys shall be conducted of all lighting visible from the beach placement area by the Applicant or Corps, using standard techniques for such a survey (**Appendix C**), in the year following construction. The first survey shall be conducted between May 1 and May 15 and a fill out FWS Sea Turtle Lighting Survey Form (**Appendix D**) and send electronically to seaturtle@fws.gov. The second survey shall be conducted between July 15 and August 1. A summary report of the surveys, including any actions taken, shall be submitted to the Service by December 31 of the year in which surveys are conducted. After the annual report is completed, a meeting shall be set up with the Applicant, county or municipality, FWC, Corps, and the Service to discuss the survey report, as well as any documented sea turtle disorientations in or adjacent to the project area. If the project is completed during the nesting season and prior to May 1, the Corps may conduct the lighting surveys during the year of construction.

A11. Daily nesting surveys shall be conducted for two nesting seasons following construction in accordance with **Table 18** and reported in accordance with **Table 20** by the Corps or the Applicant if placed material still remains on the beach. Post construction year-one surveys shall record the number of nests, nesting success, reproductive success, disorientations, and lost nests due to erosion and/or inundation. Post construction year-two surveys shall only need to record nest numbers, nesting success, and disorientations (**Table 20**). This information will be used to periodically assess the cumulative effects of these projects on sea turtle nesting and hatchling production and monitor suitability of post construction beaches for nesting.

Table 18. Post-Construction Sea Turtle Monitoring.

Region	Nest Laying Season	Years 1 and 2 Post-Construction Monitoring
Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, and Broward Counties Martin and Palm Beach Counties	25 Feb – 11 Nov 12 Feb – 17 Nov	Daily surveys: 1 Mar - 31 Oct (for late season: 15 days without a nests, can stop monitoring-email FWS and FWC to stop
Nassau, Duval, and St. Johns, Counties	2 Apr. – 24 Oct.	Daily surveys: 1 May – 30 Sep
Flagler and Volusia Counties	2 Apr. – 24 Oct.	Daily surveys: 15 Apr- 15 Oct
Miami-Dade County	11 Feb – 25 Sep	Daily surveys: 1 Apr – 30 Sep
Gulf County (St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, Cape San Blas) and Franklin County (St. George Island) All other beaches in Gulf and Franklin Counties, and Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, and Bay Counties	1 May – 4 Sep 2 May – 16 Sep	Daily surveys: 1 May – 31 Aug
Sarasota and Charlotte Counties (Manasota Key) All other beaches in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee, Lee, Collier, and Monroe Counties	24 Apr – 7 Sep 24 Apr – 12 Sep 20 Apr – 19 Sep	Daily surveys: 15 Apr –15 Sep

A12. Sand compaction shall be monitored in the area of sand placement immediately after completion of the project and prior to the dates in **Table 19** for 3 subsequent years.

Table 19. Dates for Compaction Monitoring and Escarpment Surveys by County.

County where project occurs	Date
Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, Broward, Miami-Dade, and Monroe	Work must be completed by Mar 1
Miami-Dade, Monroe	Work must be completed by April 1
Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, Bay, Gulf, Franklin, Volusia, Flagler, St. Johns, Duval, Nassau, Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee, Sarasota, Charlotte, Lee, Collier	Work must be completed by Apr 15

If tilling is needed, the area shall be tilled to a depth of 36 inches. Each pass of the tilling equipment shall be overlapped to allow more thorough and even tilling. All tilling activity shall be completed at least once prior to the nesting season. An electronic copy of the results of the compaction monitoring shall be submitted electronically to seaturtle@fws.gov prior to any tilling actions being taken or if a request not to till is made based on compaction results. The requirement for compaction monitoring can be eliminated if the decision is made to till regardless of post construction compaction levels. Additionally, out-year compaction monitoring and remediation are not required if placed material no longer remains on the dry beach.

(NOTE: If tilling occurs during shorebird nesting season (February 15-August 31), shorebirds surveys prior to tilling are required per the Migratory Bird Treaty Act. See Appendix E for shorebird conditions recommended by FWC.

a. Compaction sampling stations shall be located at 500-foot intervals along the sand placement template. One station shall be at the seaward edge of the dune/bulkhead line (when material is placed in this area), and one station shall be midway between the dune line and the high water line (normal wrack line).

b. At each station, the cone penetrometer shall be pushed to a depth of 6, 12, and 18 inches three times (three replicates at each depth). Material may be removed from the hole if necessary to ensure accurate readings of successive levels of sediment. The penetrometer may need to be reset between pushes, especially if sediment layering exists. Layers of highly compact material may lie over less compact layers. Replicates shall be located as close to each other as possible, without interacting with the previous hole or disturbed sediments. The three replicate compaction values for each depth shall be averaged to produce final values for each

depth at each station. Reports will include all 18 values for each transect line, and the final six averaged compaction values.

c. If the average value for any depth exceeds 500 pounds per square inch (psi) for any two or more adjacent stations, then that area shall be tilled immediately prior to the appropriate date listed in **Table 19**.

d. If values exceeding 500 psi are distributed throughout the project area but in no case do those values exist at two adjacent stations at the same depth, then consultation with the Service will be required to determine if tilling is required. If a few values exceeding 500 psi are present randomly within the project area, tilling will not be required.

e. Tilling shall occur landward of the wrack line and avoid all vegetated areas 3 square feet or greater with a 3 square foot buffer around the vegetated areas.

A13. Visual weekly surveys for escarpments along the project area shall be made immediately after completion of the sand placement and within 30 days prior to the start dates for Nesting Season Monitoring in **Table 19** for 3 subsequent years if sand in the project area still remains on the dry beach.

Escarpments that interfere with sea turtle nesting or that exceed 18 inches in height for a distance of 100 feet shall be leveled and the beach profile shall be reconfigured to minimize scarp formation by the dates listed in **Table 19**. Any escarpment removal shall be reported by location in the annual report. If the project is completed during the early part of the sea turtle nesting and hatching season (March 1 through April 30), escarpments may be required to be leveled immediately, while protecting nests that have been relocated or left in place. If during weekly escarpment surveys, it is found that subsequent reformation of escarpments interferes with sea turtle nesting or that they exceed 18 inches in height for a distance of 100 feet during the nesting and hatching season, the Service shall be contacted immediately to determine the appropriate action to be taken. If it is determined by the Service or FWC that that escarpment leveling is required during the nesting or hatching season the Service, in coordination with the FWC, will provide a brief written authorization within 5 days that describes methods to be used to reduce the likelihood of impacting existing nests. An annual summary of escarpment surveys and actions taken shall be sent electronically to seaturtle@fws.gov. A summary is required even when no action has been taken (**Table 3**).

A14. Staging areas for construction equipment shall be located off the beach during early (before April 30) and late (after November 1) nesting season for Brevard through Broward counties (see table 14) and peak nesting season (May 1 through October 31) for the remaining counties. Nighttime storage of construction equipment not in use shall be off the beach to minimize disturbance to sea turtle nesting and hatching activities. In addition, all construction pipes placed on the beach shall be located as far landward as

possible without compromising the integrity of the dune system. Pipes placed parallel to the dune shall be 5 to 10 feet away from the toe of the dune if the width of the beach allows. Temporary storage of pipes shall be off the beach to the maximum extent possible. If the pipes are stored on the beach, they shall be placed in a manner that will minimize the impact to nesting habitat and shall not compromise the integrity of the dune systems. If the pipes placed parallel to the dune cannot be placed between 5 to 10 feet away from the toe of the dune during nesting and hatching season, the Corps must reinitiate consultation with the Service as this represents adverse effects not addressed in this SPBO. If it will be necessary to extend construction pipes past a known shorebird nesting site or over-wintering area for piping plovers, then whenever possible those pipes shall be placed landward of the site before birds are active in that area. No pipe or sand shall be placed seaward of a shorebird nesting site during the shorebird nesting season.

A15. Direct lighting of the beach and nearshore waters shall be limited to the immediate construction area during early (before April 30) and late (after November 1) nesting season for Brevard through Broward counties (see Table 14) and peak nesting season (May 1 through October 31) for the remaining counties, and shall comply with safety requirements. A light management plan for the dredge and the work site shall be submitted for approval by the Service and FWC prior to the pre-construction meeting. In accordance with this plan, lighting on all equipment shall be minimized through reduction, shielding, lowering, and appropriate placement to avoid excessive illumination of the water's surface and nesting beach while meeting all Coast Guard, Corps EM 385-1-1, and OSHA requirements. Light intensity of lighting equipment shall be reduced to the minimum standard required by OSHA for General Construction areas, in order not to misdirect sea turtles. Shields shall be affixed to the light housing on dredge and land-based lights and be large enough to block light from all lamps from being transmitted outside the construction area or to the adjacent sea turtle nesting beach in line-of-sight of the dredge (**Figure 15**).



Figure 15. Beach lighting schematic.

A16. During the early (before April 30) and late (after November 1) nesting season for Brevard through Broward counties (see Table 14) and peak nesting season (May 1 through October 31) for the remaining counties, the Corps shall not extend the beach fill more than 500 feet (or other agreed upon length) along the shoreline between dusk and dawn of the following day until the daily nesting survey has been completed and the beach cleared for fill advancement. An exception to this may occur if there is a permitted sea turtle surveyor present on-site to ensure no nesting and hatching sea turtles are present within the extended work area. If the 500 feet is not feasible for the project, an agreed upon distance will be decided on during the preconstruction meeting. Once the beach has been cleared and the necessary nest relocations have been completed, the Corps will be allowed to proceed with the placement of fill during daylight hours until dusk at which time the 500-foot length (or other agreed upon length) limitation shall apply. If any nesting turtles are sighted on the beach within the immediate construction area, activities shall cease immediately until the turtle has returned to the water and the sea turtle permit holder responsible for nest monitoring has relocated the nest.

Dune Planting

A17. All vegetation planting shall be designed and conducted to minimize impacts to sea turtles and beach mice. Dune vegetation planting may occur during the sea turtle nesting season under the following conditions.

a. Daily early morning sea turtle nesting surveys (before 9 a.m.) shall be conducted during the Nest Laying period for all counties in Florida where sea turtle nesting occurs (see Tables 16 and 17). Nesting surveys shall only be conducted by personnel with prior experience and training in nesting surveys. Surveyors shall have a valid FWC permit. Nesting surveys shall be conducted daily between sunrise and 9 a.m. (all times). No dune planting activity shall occur until after the daily turtle survey and nest conservation and protection efforts have been completed. Hatching and emerging success monitoring will involve checking nests beyond the completion date of the daily early morning nesting surveys;

b. Any nests deposited in the dune planting area not requiring relocation for conservation purposes shall be left in place. The turtle permit holder shall install an on-beach marker at the nest site and a secondary marker at a point as far landward as possible to assure that future location of the nest will be possible should the on-beach marker be lost. A series of stakes and highly visible survey ribbon or string shall be installed to establish a 3-foot radius around the nest. No planting or other activity shall occur within this area nor will any activities be allowed that could result in impacts to the nest. Nest sites shall be inspected daily to assure nest markers remain in place and the nest has not been disturbed by the planting activity;

c. If a nest is disturbed or uncovered during planting activity, the Corps, or the Applicant shall cease all work and immediately contact the project turtle permit holder. If a nest(s) cannot be safely avoided during planting, all activity within 10 feet of a nest shall be delayed until hatching and emerging success monitoring of the nest is completed;

d. All dune planting activities shall be conducted by hand and only during daylight hours;

e. All dune vegetation shall consist of coastal dune species native to the local area; (*i.e.*, native to coastal dunes in the respective county and grown from plant stock from that region of Florida). Vegetation shall be planted with an appropriate amount of fertilizer and antidesiccant material for the plant size;

f. No use of heavy equipment shall occur on the dunes or seaward for planting purposes. A lightweight (all-terrain type) vehicle, with tire pressures of 10 psi or less may be used for this purpose; and

g. Irrigation equipment, if needed, shall be authorized under a FDEP permit.

<u>Beach Mouse Protection</u>

A18. Beach mouse habitat shall be avoided when selecting sites for equipment, pipes, vehicle storage and staging to the maximum extent possible. Suitable beach mouse habitat

constitutes the primary dunes (characterized by sea oats and other grasses), secondary dunes (similar to primary dunes, but also frequently includes such plants as woody goldenrod, false rosemary), and interior or scrub dunes.

A19. Equipment placement or storage shall be excluded in the area between 5 to 10 feet seaward of the existing dune toe or 10 percent of the beach width (for projects occurring on narrow eroded beach segments) seaward of the dune toe in areas of occupied beach mouse habitat (**Figure 16**). The toe of the dune is where the slope breaks at the seaward foot of the dune. If the pipes placed parallel to the dune cannot be placed between 5 to 10 feet away from the toe of the dune as required during sea turtle nesting and hatching season, the Corps must reinitiate consultation with the Service as this represents adverse effects not addressed in this SPBO.



Figure 16. Equipment placement for projects occurring in beach mouse occupied habitat.

A20. Existing beach access points shall be used for vehicle and equipment beach access to the maximum extent possible. These access points shall be delineated by post and rope or other suitable material to ensure vehicles and equipment transport stay within the access corridor. The access corridors shall be fully restored to the preconstruction conditions following project completion. Parking areas for construction crews shall be located as close as possible to the work sites, but outside of vegetated dune areas to minimize impacts to existing habitat and transporting workers along the beachfront.

A21. The location of new or expanded existing beach access corridors for vehicles and equipment within beach mouse habitat consisting of vegetated dunes shall be spaced no closer than every four miles. The distribution of access areas will result in the least

number of access areas within beach mouse habitat as possible and delineated by post and rope or other suitable material to ensure vehicles and equipment transport stay within the access corridor. The access corridors shall be (1) no more than 25 feet wide for vehicles and (2) no more than 50 feet wide for equipment. Expanded or new beach access points that impact vegetated dunes shall be restored within 3 months following project completion. Habitat restoration shall consist of restoring the dune to preconstruction conditions with planting of at least three species of appropriate native dune vegetation (*i.e.*, native to coastal dunes in the respective county and grown from plant stock from that region of Florida). Seedlings shall be at least one inch square with a 2.5-inch pot. Planting shall be on 18-inch centers throughout the created dune; however, 24-inch centers may be acceptable depending on the area to be planted. Vegetation shall be planted with an appropriate amount of fertilizer and antidesiccant material, as appropriate, for the plant size. No sand stabilizer material (coconut matting or other material) shall be used in the dune restoration. The plants may be watered without installing an irrigation system. In order for the restoration to be considered successful, 80 percent of the total planted vegetation shall be documented to survive six months following planting of vegetation. If the habitat restoration is unsuccessful, the area shall be replanted following coordination with the Service.

Reporting

A22. A report with the following shall be submitted to the Service electronically (seaturtle@fws.gov) by December 31 after completion of construction.

i. A summary of the information listed in Table 20 for construction

ii. A summary of the information listed in Table 21 for post-construction

Table 20. Information to include in the report following the project completion.

All projects	**Project location (include Florida DEP R-monuments and latitude and longitude coordinates)**
	Project description (include linear feet of beach, actual fill template, access points, and borrow areas)
	Dates of actual construction activities
	Names and qualifications of personnel involved in sea turtle nesting surveys and relocation activities (separate the nests surveys for nourished and non-nourished areas)
	Descriptions and locations of sites where nests were relocated
Beach mice	**Acreage of new or widened access areas affected in beach mouse habitat**
	Vegetation completed for new or widened access areas
	Success rate of vegetation of restoration

Table 21. Sea turtle monitoring following sand placement activity.

Date	Duration	Variable	Criterion
Nesting Success	Year of in season construction, two years post construction if placed sand remains on beach and variable does not meet criterion based on previous year	Number of nests and non-nesting events	40 percent or greater
Hatching success	Year of in season construction and one year post construction if placed sand remains on beach and variable does not meet success criterion based on previous year	Number of hatchlings by species to hatch from egg	60 percent or greater (a statistically valid number of loggerhead and green nests, and all leatherback nests)
Emergence Success	Year of in season construction and one year post construction if placed sand remains on beach and variable does not meet success criterion based on previous year	Number of hatchlings by species to emerge from nest onto beach	80 percent or greater (a statistically valid number of loggerhead and green nests, and all leatherback nests)
Disorientations	Year of in season construction and two years post construction if placed sand remains on the beach	Number of nests and individuals that misorient or disorient	http://myfwc.com/media/418153/Seaturtle_Guidelines_A_LDIR_Directions.pdf
Lighting Surveys	Two surveys the year following construction, one survey between May 1 and May 15 and second survey between July 15 and August 1	Number, location and photographs of lights visible from nourished berm, corrective actions and notifications made	Lighting survey and meeting resulting with plan for reduction in lights visible from nourished berm within one to two month period
Compaction	Three seasons following construction. Not required if the beach is tilled prior to nesting season each year placed sand remains on beach	Shear resistance	Less than 500 psi
Escarpment Surveys	Weekly during nesting season for three years each year placed sand remains on the beach	Number of scarps 18 inches or greater extending for more than 100 feet that persist for more than 2 weeks	Successful remediation of all persistent scarps as needed

If nesting and reproductive (hatching and emergence) success is less than the criteria in the table above, the Corps and the Service must discuss during the annual meeting to review additional conditions prior to the next sand placement on this beach.

A23. In the event a sea turtle nest is excavated during construction activities, the project turtle permit holder responsible for egg relocation for the project shall be notified immediately so the eggs can be moved to a suitable relocation site.

Upon locating a dead or injured sea turtle adult, hatchling, egg, or beach mouse that may have been harmed or destroyed as a direct or indirect result of the project, the Corps, Applicant shall be responsible for notifying FWC Wildlife Alert at 1-888-404-FWCC (3922) and the appropriate Service Field Office immediately (**Table 3**).

Care shall be taken in handling injured sea turtles, eggs or beach mice to ensure effective treatment or disposition, and in handling dead specimens to preserve biological materials in the best possible state for later analysis.

REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES for:

B. Projects that are navigation maintenance dredging with beach placement, swash zone placement, and submerged littoral zone placement (not including near shore placement for shore protection) shall include the following measures:

Historically, these sand placement events as a result of a navigation maintenance dredging project with no local sponsor are smaller scaled, conducted at closer time intervals, and the sand often does not remain on the beach for an extended period of time.

Post construction requirements are listed in Reasonable and Prudent Measures B10 and B11. These post construction requirements may be subject to congressional authorization and the allocation of funds. If the Corps or Applicant cannot fulfill these Reasonable and Prudent Measures, the Corps must reinitiate consultation.

B1. Conservation Measures included in the Corps' PBA that address protection of nesting sea turtles and beach mice shall be implemented in the Corps federally authorized project or regulated activity.

B2. Beach quality sand suitable for sea turtle nesting, successful incubation, and hatchling emergence and beach mouse burrow construction shall be used for sand placement.

B3. For dredged material placement on the beach, sand placement shall not occur during the period of peak sea turtle egg laying and egg hatching to reduce the possibility of sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation. In Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties, dredged material placement shall not occur from May 1 through October 31. In St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape San Blas in Gulf County, St. George Island in Franklin County dredged material placement shall not occur from June 1 through September 30. On Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties, dredged material placement shall

not occur from May 1 through October 31 (except Venice Beach). In Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte (except Manasota Key), Sarasota (except Manasota Key), Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin (except St. George Island), Gulf (except St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape Sand Blas), Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, and Escambia Counties, sand placement may occur during the sea turtle nesting season (**Table 16 and Table 17**).

B4. For dredged material placement in the swash zone or submerged littoral zone during the nesting season, sand placement will be conducted at or below MLLW line.

B5. All derelict concrete, metal, and coastal armoring geotextile material and other debris shall be removed from the beach prior to any dredged material placement to the maximum extent possible.

B6. The Corps shall continue to work with FDEP, FWC, and the Service to create a sea turtle friendly beach profile for placement of material during construction.

B7. Predator-proof trash receptacles shall be installed and maintained at all beach access points used for the project construction to minimize the potential for attracting predators of sea turtles and beach mice (**Appendix F**).

B8. A meeting between representatives of the Corps, Service, FWC, the permitted sea turtle surveyor, and other species surveyors, as appropriate, shall be held prior to the commencement of work on this project.

B9. If the beach nourishment project will be conducted during the sea turtle nesting season, surveys for nesting sea turtles must be conducted. Surveys for early and late nesting sea turtles shall be conducted where appropriate. If nests are constructed in the proposed area of sand placement, the eggs shall be relocated to minimize sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation.

B10. Sand compaction shall be monitored and tilling shall be conducted if needed to reduce the likelihood of impacting sea turtle nesting and hatching activities. Not required for dredged material placement in the swash and littoral zone.

B11. Escarpment formation shall be monitored and leveling shall be conducted if needed to reduce the likelihood of impacting nesting and hatchling sea turtles. Not required for dredged material placement in the swash and littoral zone.

B12. Construction equipment and materials shall be stored in a manner that will minimize impacts to nesting and hatchling sea turtles and beach mice.

B13. Lighting associated with the project construction shall be minimized to reduce the possibility of disrupting and disorienting nesting and hatchling sea turtles and nocturnal activities of beach mice.

B14. During the sea turtle nesting season, the Corps shall not extend the beach fill more than 500 feet (or other agreed upon length if a FWC sea turtle permit holder is present) between dusk and the time of completion of the following day's nesting survey to reduce the impact to emerging sea turtles and burial of new nests.

B15. Beach mouse habitat shall be avoided when selecting sites for storage and staging of equipment to the maximum extent possible.

B16. Equipment and construction materials shall not be stored near the seaward dune toe in areas of occupied beach mouse habitat. This area is highly utilized by beach mice.

B17. Existing vegetated habitat at beach access points and along shoreline travel corridors shall be protected to the maximum extent possible to ensure vehicles and equipment transport stay within the access and travel corridors.

B18. Expanded or newly created beach access points shall be restored.

B19. A report describing the actions taken shall be submitted to the Service work for each year when the activity has occurred.

B20. The Service and the FWC shall be notified if a sea turtle adult, hatchling, or egg, or beach mouse is harmed or destroyed as a direct or indirect result of the project.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS for:

B. Projects that are navigation maintenance dredging with beach placement, swash zone placement, and submerged littoral zone placement of Corps civil works project shall include the following measures:

Historically, these sand placement events as a result of a navigation maintenance dredging project with no local sponsor are smaller scaled, conducted at closer time intervals, and the sand often does not remain on the beach for an extended period of time.

Post construction requirements are listed in Terms and Conditions B10 and B11. These post construction requirements may be subject to congressional authorization and the allocation of funds. If the Corps or Applicant cannot fulfill these Terms and Conditions, the Corps must reinitiate consultation.

All beaches

B1. Conservation Measures included in the Corps' PBA that address protection of nesting sea turtles and beach mice listed on pages 9 and 10 of the SPBO shall be implemented in the Corps federally authorized project or regulated activity.

B2. Beach compatible fill shall be placed on the beach or in any associated dune system. Beach compatible fill must be sand that is similar to a native beach in the vicinity of the site that has not been affected by prior sand placement activity. The fill material must be similar in both coloration and grain size distribution to that native beach. Beach compatible fill is material that maintains the general character and functionality of the material occurring on the beach and in the adjacent dune and coastal system. Fill material shall comply with FDEP requirements pursuant to the Florida Administrative Code (FAC) subsection 62B-41.005(15). A Quality Control Plan shall be implemented pursuant to FAC Rule 62B-41.008(1)(k)4.b.

B3. Dredged material placement shall not occur during the period of peak sea turtle egg laying and egg hatching to reduce the possibility of sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation.

a. Dredged material placement in Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties shall occur only during the beach placement window indicated in Table 16. construction equipment or pipes may be placed and/or stored on the beach only during the beach placement window indicated in Table 16.

b. Dredged material placement projects in Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa and Escambia Counties may occur during the sea turtle nesting season except on publicly owned conservation lands such as state parks and areas where such work is prohibited by the managing agency or under applicable local land use codes (see exceptions in B3.c. below).

c. For higher density nesting beaches in Gulf and Franklin counties dredged material placement shall not occur during the main part of the nesting season June 1 through September 31. On Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties, dredged material placement shall not occur during the main part of the nesting season (May 1 through October 31). This timeframe does not include Venice Beach due to the low density nesting. These beaches include St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape San Blas in Gulf County, St. George Island in Franklin County, and Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties. See Table 17 for the Beach Placement Windows.

d. For dredged material placement in the swash zone (at or below the MHWL) or submerged littoral zone during the sea turtle nesting season (**Tables 16and 17**), the Corps shall contact the Service for coordination.

The Service shall be contacted for coordination, on a project-by-project basis, if sand placement is needed on publicly owned conservation lands and in these higher density nesting beaches in Gulf and Franklin Counties and on Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties during the above exclusionary period. The Service will determine whether work (1) may proceed in accordance with the Terms and Conditions; (2) proceed in accordance with the Terms and Conditions and other requirements as developed by the Service; or (3) would require that an individual emergency consultation be conducted.

B4. For dredged material placement in the swash zone or submerged littoral zone during the nesting and hatching season, sand placement will be conducted at or below the MLLW line. The swash zone is that region between the upper limit of wave run-up (approximately one-foot above MHW) and the lower limit of wave run-out (approximately one-foot below MLW). Material will not be placed so that it is exposed above the water during low tide during the nesting and hatching season. The Corps must consult with NMFS on impacts to hatchlings that emerge from those nests adjacent to the inwater construction area. The Service will discuss with the Corps and NMFS additional measures that could include caging nests close to the emergence date.

B5. All derelict concrete, metal, and coastal armoring geotextile material and other debris shall be removed from the beach prior to any dredged material placement to the maximum extent possible. If debris removal activities take place during the peak sea turtle nesting season (**Tables 16 and 17**), the work shall be conducted during daylight hours only and shall not commence until completion of the sea turtle nesting survey each day.

B6. The Corps shall continue to work with FDEP, FWC and the Service in conducting the second phase of testing on the sea turtle friendly profile during project construction. This includes exploring options to include a dune system in the project design for existing authorized projects and new non-federal projects and how the existing sand placement template may be modified.

B7. Predator-proof trash receptacles shall be installed and maintained during construction at all beach access points used for the project construction to minimize the potential for attracting predators of sea turtles and beach mice (**Appendix F**). The Corps shall provide predator-proof trash receptacles for the construction workers. All workers shall be briefed on the importance of not littering and keeping the project area trash and debris free.

B8. A meeting between representatives of the Corps, the Service, the FWC, the permitted sea turtle surveyor, and other species surveyors, as appropriate, shall be held prior to the commencement of work on projects. At least 10 business days advance notice shall be provided prior to conducting this meeting. The meeting will provide an opportunity for explanation and/or clarification of the sea turtle and beach mouse protection measures as well as additional guidelines when construction occurs during the sea turtle nesting season, such as storing equipment, minimizing driving, free-roaming cat observation, and reporting within the work area, as well as follow up meetings during construction (**Table 3**).

Sea Turtle Protection

B9. Daily early morning surveys for sea turtle nests shall be required as outlined in a through f. If nests are constructed in the area of sand proposed placement, the eggs shall be relocated to minimize sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation (**Tables 614 and 17**).

a. For sand placement projects in Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties that occur during earlier part of the nest laying season through April 30, daily early morning surveys shall be conducted for sea turtle nests shall begin with the start of the nesting season monitoring (see Table 16) and continue through the end of the beach placement window, with egg relocation continuing only until completion of fill placement. Eggs shall be relocated per the following requirements. For sand placement projects that occur during the period from November 1 through the end of hatching season (see Table 16), daily early morning sea turtle nesting surveys shall be conducted 65 days prior to project initiation and continue through the end of the nest laying season indicated in Table 16, and eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii.

i. Nesting surveys and egg relocations will only be conducted by persons with prior experience and training in these activities and who are duly authorized to conduct such activities through a valid permit issued by FWC, pursuant to FAC 68E-1. Please contact FWC's Imperiled Species Management Section in Tequesta at (561) 575-5407 for information on the permit holder in the project area. Nesting surveys shall be conducted daily between sunrise and 9 a.m. (this is for all time zones).

ii. Only those nests that may be affected by sand placement activities will be relocated. Nest relocation shall not occur upon completion of the project. Nests requiring relocation shall be moved no later than 9 a.m. the morning following deposition to a nearby self-release beach site in a secure setting where artificial lighting will not interfere with hatchling orientation. Relocated nests shall not be placed in organized groupings. Relocated nests shall be randomly staggered along the length and width of the beach in settings that are not expected to

experience daily inundation by high tides or known to routinely experience severe erosion and egg loss, or subject to artificial lighting. Nest relocations in association with construction activities shall cease when construction activities no longer threaten nests.

iii. Nests deposited within areas where construction activities have ceased or will not occur for 65 days or nests laid in the nourished area prior to tilling shall be marked and left in situ unless other factors threaten the success of the nest. The turtle permit holder shall install an on-beach marker at the nest site and a secondary marker at a point as far landward as possible to assure that future location of the nest will be possible should the on-beach marker be lost. No activity will occur within this area nor will any activities occur that could result in impacts to the nest. Nest sites shall be inspected daily to assure nest markers remain in place and the nest has not been disturbed by the project activity.

During the period from March 1 through April 30, daytime surveys shall be conducted for leatherback sea turtle nests beginning March 1. Nighttime surveys for leatherback sea turtles shall begin when the first leatherback crawl is recorded within the project or adjacent beach area through April 30 or until completion of the project (whichever is earliest). Nightly nesting surveys shall be conducted from 9 p.m. until 6 a.m. The project area shall be surveyed at 1-hour intervals (since leatherbacks require at least 1.5 hours to complete nesting, this will ensure all nesting leatherbacks are encountered) and eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii.

b. For sand placement projects in Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa and Escambia Counties that occur during the nest laying period (**Table 17**), daily early morning (before 9 a.m.) surveys shall be conducted. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii (see nest relocation exceptions for Franklin, Gulf, Sarasota, and Charlotte Counties in B9.d. below).

c. For Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, and Escambia Counties, nesting surveys shall be initiated 70 days prior to sand placement activities (incubation periods are longer in these counties) or at the beginning of nesting season monitoring (see Table 17) whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through the end of the nest laying season (see Table 17). Hatching and emerging success monitoring will involve checking nests beyond the completion date of the daily early morning nesting surveys. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii (see nest relocation exceptions for Franklin and Gulf Counties in B9.d. below).

d. For St. Joseph Peninsula State Park, St. Joseph peninsula, and Cape San Blas in Gulf County, St. George Island in Franklin County sand placement activities shall occur only during the Beach Placement Window indicated in Table 17. For Manasota Key in Sarasota and Charlotte Counties (except Venice Beach), sand placement activities shall during the Beach Placement Window indicted in Table 15, the period of peak sea turtle egg laying and egg hatching for this area. If nests laid in the early part of the nest laying season during the beach placement window in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii below.

e. For Pinellas, Hillsborough, Manatee, Sarasota, Charlotte, Lee, Collier, and Monroe Counties, nesting surveys shall be initiated 65 days prior to nourishment or dredged channel material placement activities or by April 15, whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through September 15. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii (see nest relocation exceptions for Sarasota and Charlotte Counties in B9.d. above).

f. For Miami-Dade County, nesting surveys shall be initiated 65 days prior to dredged material placement activities or by the beginning of the nesting season monitoring indicated in Table 17, whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through the end of the nest laying season or the end of sand placement whichever comes first. If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii.

g. For Volusia, Flagler, St. Johns, Duval, and Nassau Counties, nesting surveys shall be initiated 65 days prior to dredged material placement activities or by the beginning of nest laying season (**Table 17**) whichever is later. Nesting surveys shall continue through the nesting season monitoring period (**Table 15).** If nests are laid in areas where they may be affected by construction activities, eggs shall be relocated per the requirements listed in (a)i through (a)iii.

B10. Sand compaction shall be monitored in the area of dredged material placement immediately after completion of the project and prior to the dates in **Table 19** for 3 subsequent years. Not required for dredged material placement in the swash and littoral zone.

If tilling is needed, the area shall be tilled to a depth of 36 inches. Each pass of the tilling equipment shall be overlapped to allow more thorough and even tilling. All tilling activity shall be completed at least once prior to the nesting season. An electronic copy of the results of the compaction monitoring shall be submitted seaturtle@fws.gov prior to any tilling actions being taken. The requirement for compaction monitoring can be eliminated if the decision is made to till regardless of post construction compaction

levels. Additionally, out-year compaction monitoring and remediation are not required if placed material no longer remains on the dry beach.(NOTE: If tilling occurs during shorebird nesting season (February 15-August 31), shorebirds surveys prior to tilling are required per the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (http://myfwc.com/docs/Conservation/FBCI_BNB_SeaTurtleMonitors.pdf)

a. Compaction sampling stations shall be located at 500-foot intervals along the sand placement template. One station shall be at the seaward edge of the dune/bulkhead line (when material is placed in this area), and one station shall be midway between the dune line and the high water line (normal wrack line).

b. At each station, the cone penetrometer shall be pushed to a depth of 6, 12, and 18 inches three times (three replicates). Material may be removed from the hole if necessary to ensure accurate readings of successive levels of sediment. The penetrometer may need to be reset between pushes, especially if sediment layering exists. Layers of highly compact material may lie over less compact layers. Replicates shall be located as close to each other as possible, without interacting with the previous hole or disturbed sediments. The three replicate compaction values for each depth shall be averaged to produce final values for each depth at each station. Reports will include all 18 values for each transect line, and the final six averaged compaction values.

c. If the average value for any depth exceeds 500 pounds per square inch (psi) for any two or more adjacent stations, then that area shall be tilled immediately prior to the appropriate date listed in **Table 19**.

d. If values exceeding 500 psi are distributed throughout the project area but in no case do those values exist at two adjacent stations at the same depth, then consultation with the Service will be required to determine if tilling is required. If a few values exceeding 500 psi are present randomly within the project area, tilling will not be required.

e. Tilling shall occur landward of the wrack line and avoid all vegetated areas 3 square feet or greater with a 3 square foot buffer around the vegetated areas.

B11. Visual weekly surveys for escarpments along the project area shall be made immediately after completion of the dredged material placement and within 30 days prior to the start dates for Nesting Season Monitoring in **Table 19** for 3 subsequent years if sand in the project area still remains on the dry beach. Not required for dredged material placement in the swash and littoral zone.

Escarpments that interfere with sea turtle nesting or that exceed 18 inches in height for a distance of 100 feet shall be leveled and the beach profile shall be reconfigured to minimize scarp formation by the dates listed above. Any escarpment removal shall be

reported by location. If the project is completed during the early part of the sea turtle nesting and hatching season (March 1 through April 30), escarpments may be required to be leveled immediately, while protecting nests that have been relocated or left in place. The Service shall be contacted immediately if subsequent reformation of escarpments that interfere with sea turtle nesting or that exceed 18 inches in height for a distance of 100 feet occurs during the nesting and hatching season to determine the appropriate action to be taken. If it is determined by the Service, in coordination with the FWC, that escarpment leveling is required during the nesting or hatching season, the Service will provide a brief written authorization within 30 days that describes methods to be used to reduce the likelihood of impacting existing nests. An annual summary of escarpment surveys and actions taken shall be submitted electronic to seaturtle@fws.gov.

B12. If available, staging areas for construction equipment shall be located off the beach during early (before April 30) and late (after November 1) nesting season for Brevard through Broward counties (see Table 16) and peak nesting season (May 1 through October 31) for the remaining counties. Nighttime storage of construction equipment not in use shall be off the beach to minimize disturbance to sea turtle nesting and hatching activities. In addition, all construction pipes placed on the beach shall be located as far landward as possible without compromising the integrity of the dune system. Pipes placed parallel to the dune shall be 5 to 10 feet away from the toe of the dune if the width of the beach allows. Temporary storage of pipes shall be off the beach to the maximum extent possible. If the pipes are stored on the beach, they shall be placed in a manner that will minimize the impact to nesting habitat and shall not compromise the integrity of the dune systems. If the pipes that are placed parallel to the dune cannot be placed between 5 to 10 feet away from the toe of the dune during nesting and hatching season, the Corps must reinitiate consultation with the Service as this represents take that was not considered in the SPBO. If it will be necessary to extend construction pipes past a known shorebird nesting site or over-wintering area for piping plovers, then whenever possible those pipes shall be placed landward of the site before birds are active in that area. No pipe or sand shall be placed seaward of a shorebird nesting site during the shorebird nesting season.

B13. Direct lighting of the beach and nearshore waters shall be limited to the immediate construction area during early (before April 30) and late (after November 1) nesting season for Brevard through Broward counties (see Table 14) and peak nesting season (May 1 through October 31) for the remaining counties, and shall comply with safety requirements. Lighting on all equipment shall be minimized through reduction, shielding, lowering, and appropriate placement to avoid excessive illumination of the water's surface and nesting beach while meeting all Coast Guard, Corps EM 385-1-1, and OSHA requirements. Light intensity of lighting equipment shall be reduced to the minimum standard required by OSHA for General Construction areas, in order not to misdirect sea turtles. Shields shall be affixed to the light housing and be large enough to

block light from all lamps from being transmitted outside the construction area and to the adjacent sea turtle nesting beach in line-of-sight of the dredge (**Figure 15**).

B14. During the period during early (before April 30) and late (after November 1) nesting season for Brevard through Broward counties (see Table 16) and peak nesting season (May 1 through October 31) for the remaining counties, the Corps shall not extend the beach fill more than 500 feet (or other agreed upon length if FWC sea turtle permit holder is present) along the shoreline between dusk and dawn of the following day until the daily nesting survey has been completed and the beach cleared for fill advancement. An exception to this may occur if there is a permitted sea turtle surveyor present on-site to ensure no nesting and hatching sea turtles are present within the extended work area. If the 500 feet is not feasible for the project, an agreed upon distance will be decided on during the preconstruction meeting. Once the beach has been cleared and the necessary nest relocations have been completed, the Corps will be allowed to proceed with the placement of fill during daylight hours until dusk at which time the 500-foot length (or other agreed upon length) limitation shall apply. If any nesting turtles are sighted on the beach within the immediate construction area, activities shall cease immediately until the turtle has returned to the water and the sea turtle permit holder responsible for nest monitoring has relocated the nest.

Beach Mouse Protection

B15. Beach mouse habitat shall be avoided when selecting sites for equipment, pipes, vehicle storage and staging, and beach travel corridors to the maximum extent possible. Suitable beach mouse habitat constitutes the primary dunes (characterized by sea oats and other grasses), secondary dunes (similar to primary dunes, but also frequently includes such plants as woody goldenrod, false rosemary), and interior or scrub dunes.

B16. Equipment placement or storage shall be excluded in the area between 5 to 10 feet seaward of the existing dune toe or 10 percent of the beach width (for projects occurring on narrow eroded beach segments) seaward of the dune toe in areas of occupied beach mouse habitat (**Figure 16**). The toe of the dune is where the slope breaks at the seaward foot of the dune.

B17. Existing beach access points shall be used for vehicle and equipment beach access to the maximum extent possible. These access points shall be delineated by post and rope or other suitable material to ensure vehicles and equipment transport stay within the access corridor. The topography at the access points shall be fully restored to preconstruction conditions following project completion. Parking areas for construction crews shall be located as close as possible to the work sites, but outside of vegetated dune areas to minimize impacts to existing habitat and transporting workers along the beachfront.

B18. The location of new or expanded existing beach access corridors for vehicles and equipment within beach mouse habitat consisting of vegetated dunes shall be no closer

than every four miles. The distribution of access areas will result in the least number of access areas within beach mouse habitat as possible and delineated by post and rope or other suitable material to ensure vehicles and equipment transport stay within the access corridor. The access corridors shall be (1) no more than 25 feet wide for vehicles and (2) no more than 50 feet wide for equipment. Expanded or new beach access points that impact vegetated dunes shall be restored within 3 months following project completion. Habitat restoration shall consist of restoring the dune to preconstruction conditions with planting of at least three species of appropriate native dune vegetation (*i.e.*, native to coastal dunes in the respective county and grown from plant stock from that region of Florida). Seedlings shall be at least 1 inch square with a 2.5-inch pot. Planting shall be on 18-inch centers throughout the created dune; however, 24-inch centers may be acceptable depending on the area to be planted. Vegetation shall be planted with an appropriate amount of fertilizer and antidesiccant material, as appropriate, for the plant size. No sand stabilizer material (coconut matting or other material) shall be used in the dune restoration. The plants may be watered without installing an irrigation system. In order for the restoration to be considered successful, 80 percent of the total planted vegetation shall be documented to survive six months following planting of vegetation. If the habitat restoration is unsuccessful, the area shall be replanted following coordination with the Service.

Reporting

B19. An excel sheet with the information listed in **Table 20** shall be submitted to the Service electronically seaturtle@fws.gov by December 31 of the year following construction. A report with the information from Terms and Conditions B10 and B11 shall be submitted to the Service by December 31 of the year for 3 years following construction.

B20. In the event a sea turtle nest is excavated during construction activities, the project turtle permit holder responsible for egg relocation for the project shall be notified immediately so the eggs can be moved to a suitable relocation site.

Upon locating a dead or injured sea turtle adult, hatchling, egg, or beach mouse that may have been harmed or destroyed as a direct or indirect result of the project, the Corps, Applicant shall be responsible for notifying FWC Wildlife Alert at 1-888-404-FWCC (3922) and the appropriate Service Field Office immediately (**Table 3**).

Care shall be taken in handling injured sea turtles, eggs or beach mice to ensure effective treatment or disposition, and in handling dead specimens to preserve biological materials in the best possible state for later analysis.

REASONABLE AND PRUDENT MEASURES for:

C. Projects that include groin or jetty repair or replacement within the existing footprint shall include the following measures:

In Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties:

C1. Groin or jetty repair or replacement projects shall not occur during the period of peak sea turtle egg laying and egg hatching (May 1 through October 31), to reduce the possibility of sea turtle nest burial, crushing of eggs, or nest excavation.

C2. Maintenance of groin or jetty projects conducted during the early (February 1 through April 30) and late sea turtle nesting season (November 1 through November 30) shall adhere to the following conditions:

a. Install a barrier around the perimeter of the groin or jetty repair or replacement work area sufficient to prevent adult and hatchling sea turtles from accessing the project site.

b. For projects conducted during the early and late sea turtle nesting season, construction equipment and materials shall be stored in a manner that will minimize impacts to sea turtles to the maximum extent possible.

c. For projects conducted during the early and late sea turtle nesting season, no work may occur at night.

In Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, and Escambia Counties:

C3. For maintenance of groin or jetty projects, conducted during the sea turtle nesting season.

a. Daily surveys shall be conducted by sea turtle permit holders. Nests laid adjacent to the work area shall be marked by flag and rope for avoidance.

b. A barrier shall be installed around the perimeter of the groin or jetty maintenance work area sufficient to prevent adult and hatchling sea turtles from accessing the project site.

c. Construction equipment and materials shall be stored in a manner that will minimize impacts to sea turtles and beach mice to the maximum extent possible.

d. No work shall occur at night.

In All Counties:

C4. If any safety lighting associated with the project is required, the Corps must coordinate with the Service. All safety lighting must be minimized to reduce the possibility of disrupting and disorienting nesting or hatchling sea turtles and nocturnal activities of beach mice. All lights shall be downward directed, full cut-off and fully shielded, and shall utilize long wavelength (greater than 590 nm) light sources.

C5. If entrapment of sea turtle hatchlings occurs in the groin or jetty system, the Corps shall meet with the Service to discuss a possible solution prior to the next nesting season.

C6. A report describing the projects conducted during the year and actions taken to implement the Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions of this incidental take statement shall be submitted to the Service.

TERMS AND CONDITIONS for:

C. Projects that include groin or jetty repair or replacement within the existing footprint shall include the following conditions:

In Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, and Broward Counties:

C1. Groin or jetty repair or replacement projects shall be started after October 31 and be completed before May 1.

C2. For groin or jetty repair or replacement projects conducted during the early (before April 30) and/or late (after November 1) sea turtle nesting season (see Table 16):

a. A barrier (e.g., hay bales, silt screens) sufficient to prevent adult and hatchling sea turtles from accessing the project site shall be installed in a 100-foot buffer around the perimeter of the project site. The barrier shall be placed parallel to shore, at mean high water (MHW), as close to the groin or jetty as feasible, particularly during the period from sunset to sunrise. The Corps must contact the Service if there are any existing nests within the 100-foot buffer area.

b. On-beach access to the construction site shall be restricted to the wet sand below MHW to the maximum extent possible. Travel corridors on the beach to the MHWL shall be delineated. If the project is conducted during the early (before April 30) and/or late (after November 1) sea turtle nesting season (see Table 16), daily morning surveys shall be conducted within the travel corridor. If nests are laid within the travel corridor, the travel corridor must be re-routed to avoid the nest. If re-routing is not possible, these nests shall be relocated per the requirements listed in A9 (a)i through (a)iii.

c. Staging areas for construction equipment shall be located off the beach to the maximum extent possible.

d. No construction shall be conducted at night.

e. Daily early morning surveys for sea turtle nests shall be required as outlined in e(i) and e (ii). All nests laid in the vicinity of the project area shall be marked for avoidance per the requirements specified below:

   i. Nesting surveys and nest marking will only be conducted by persons with prior experience and training in these activities and who are authorized to conduct such activities through a valid permit issued by FWC, pursuant to FAC 68E-1. Please contact FWC's Imperiled Species Management Section in Tequesta at mtp@myfwc.com for information on the permit holder in the project area. Nesting surveys shall be conducted daily between sunrise and 9 a.m. (this is for all time zones). The Corps shall not initiate work until daily notice has been received from the sea turtle permit holder that the morning survey has been completed. Surveys shall be performed in such a manner so as to ensure that construction activity does not occur in any location prior to completion of the necessary sea turtle protection measures.

   ii. Nests deposited within the project area and access areas shall be left in place and marked for avoidance unless other factors threaten the success of the nest (nest laid below debris line marking the typical high tide, erosion). The turtle permit holder shall install an on-beach marker at the nest site and a secondary marker at a point as far landward as possible to assure that future location of the nest will be possible should the on-beach marker be lost. The actual location of the clutch will be determined and nests will be marked. A series of stakes and highly visible survey ribbon or string shall be installed to establish a 10-foot radius around the nest. No activity shall occur within this area nor will any activity occur that could result in impacts to the nest. Nest sites shall be inspected daily to assure nest markers remain in place and that the nest has not been disturbed by the project activity. Nest relocation is only allowed if nests laid within the travel corridor (beach access to MHWL) cannot be rerouted to avoid the nest.

In Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, and Escambia Counties:

C3. For groin or jetty repair or replacement projects conducted during the sea turtle nesting season (see Table 17):

   a. Daily early morning surveys shall be conducted within the travel corridor.

b. A barrier (e.g., hay bales, silt screens) sufficient to prevent adult and hatchling sea turtles from accessing the project site shall be installed in a 100-foot buffer around the perimeter of the project site. The barrier shall be placed parallel to shore, at MHW, as close to the groin or jetty as feasible during the period from sunset to sunrise.

c. On-beach access to the construction site shall be restricted to the wet sand below MHW to the maximum extent possible. Travel corridors on the beach to the MHWL will be delineated. Nests laid within the travel corridor that would impede traffic will be relocated per the requirements listed in A9(a)i through (a)iii.. Nests laid in adjacent areas will be marked and avoided per the requirements listed in C(2)(e) i through iii. Staging areas for construction equipment shall be located off the beach to the maximum extent possible.

d. No nighttime construction may occur during the nesting season.

e. Material stockpiled on the beach shall only occur within the 200-foot barrier (100-foot area on either side). Construction activities shall not occur in any location prior to completion of the necessary sea turtle protection measures outlined below. If any nesting turtles are sighted on the beach, construction activities shall cease immediately until the turtle has returned to the water and the sea turtle permit holder responsible for nest monitoring has marked the nest. All activities shall avoid the marked nest areas.

C4. All nests laid adjacent to the project area shall be marked for avoidance per the following requirements:

a. Nesting surveys and nest marking will only be conducted by persons with prior experience and training in these activities and who are authorized to conduct such activities through a valid permit issued by FWC, pursuant to FAC 68E-1. Please contact FWC's Imperiled Species Management Section in Tequesta at mtp@myfwc.com for information on the permit holder in the project area. Nesting surveys shall be conducted daily between sunrise and 9 a.m. (this is for all time zones). The Corps shall not initiate work until daily notice has been received from the sea turtle permit holder that the morning survey has been completed. Surveys shall be performed in such a manner so as to ensure that construction activity does not occur in any location prior to completion of the necessary sea turtle protection measures.

i. Nests deposited within the project area and access areas shall be left in place and marked for avoidance unless other factors threaten the success of the nest (nest laid below debris line marking the typical high tide, erosion). The turtle permit holder shall install an on-beach marker at the nest site and a secondary marker at

a point as far landward as possible to assure that future location of the nest will be possible should the on-beach marker be lost. The actual location of the clutch will be determined and nests will be marked. A series of stakes and highly visible survey ribbon or string shall be installed to establish a 10-foot radius around the nest. No activity shall occur within this area nor will any activity occur that could result in impacts to the nest. Nest sites shall be inspected daily to assure nest markers remain in place and that the nest has not been disturbed by the project activity. Nest relocation is only allowed if nests laid within the travel corridor (beach access to MHWL) cannot be rerouted to avoid the nest.

In All Counties:

C5. To the maximum extent possible within the travel corridor, all ruts shall be filled or leveled to the natural beach profile prior to completion of daily construction.

C6. Exterior lighting shall not be permanently installed in association with the project. Temporary lighting of the construction area during the sea turtle nesting season shall be reduced to the minimum standard required by OSHA for general construction areas. Lighting on all equipment including offshore equipment shall be minimized through reduction, shielding, lowering, and appropriate placement to avoid excessive illumination of the water's surface and nesting beach while meeting all Coast Guard, Corps EM 385-1-1, and OSHA requirements. Light intensity of lighting equipment shall be reduced to the minimum standard required by OSHA for general construction areas, in order not to misdirect sea turtles. Shields shall be affixed to the light housing and be large enough to block light from all lamps from being transmitted outside the construction area and to the adjacent sea turtle nesting beach in line-of-sight of the dredge (**Figure 15**).

C7. If entrapment of sea turtle hatchlings occurs in the groin or jetty system during construction, the Corps shall contact the Service immediately.

C8. A report describing the work conducted during the year and actions taken to implement the Reasonable and Prudent Measures and Terms and Conditions of this incidental take statement shall be submitted to the Service electronically to seaturtle@fws.gov by December 31 of each year when the activity has occurred. This report will include the following information:

Table 22. Information to include in the report following the project completion.

All projects	Project location (include Florida DEP R-monuments and latitude and longitude coordinates)
	Project description
	Dates of actual construction activities
	Names and qualifications of personnel involved in sea turtle nesting surveys and mark and avoid activities
	Nesting survey, mark and avoid activities, and nest relocation results

The Service believes that incidental take will be limited to the 8.8 miles of shoreline per year within the northwest portion of Florida for the NGMRU (38 miles during an emergency year) and 18.9 miles of shoreline within the PFRU (64 miles during an emergency year) of beach that have been identified for sand placement. The reasonable and prudent measures, with their implementing terms and conditions, are designed to minimize the impact of incidental take that might otherwise result from the proposed action. The Service believes that no more than the following types of incidental take will result from the proposed action: (1) destruction of all nests that may be constructed and eggs that may be deposited and missed by a nest survey and egg relocation program within the boundaries of the project areas; (2) destruction of all nests deposited during the period when a nest survey and egg relocation program is not required to be in place within the boundaries of the projects; (3) reduced hatching success due to egg mortality during relocation and adverse conditions at the relocation site; (4) harassment in the form of disturbing or interfering with female turtles attempting to nest within the sand placement areas or on adjacent beaches during and after sand placement or construction activities; (5) misdirection of nesting and hatchling turtles on beaches adjacent to the sand placement or construction area as a result of project lighting including the ambient lighting from dredges; (6) behavior modification of nesting females due to escarpment formation within the project area during a nesting season, resulting in false crawls or situations where they choose marginal or unsuitable nesting areas to deposit eggs; and (7) destruction of nests from escarpment leveling within a nesting season when such leveling has been approved by the Service. The amount or extent of incidental take for sea turtles will be considered exceeded if the project results in more than a 8.8 miles of shoreline per year within the northwest portion of Florida for the NGMRU (38 miles during an emergency year) and 18.9 miles of shoreline within the PFRU (64 miles during an emergency year) of sand on the of beach that have been identified for sand placement. If, during the course of the action, this level of incidental take is exceeded, such incidental take represents new information requiring reinitiation of consultation and review of the reasonable and prudent measures provided. The Corps must immediately provide an explanation of the causes of the taking and review with the Service the need for possible modification of the reasonable and prudent measures.

CONSERVATION RECOMMENDATIONS

Section 7(a) (1) of the Act directs Federal agencies to utilize their authorities to further the purposes of the Act by carrying out conservation programs for the benefit of endangered and

threatened species. Conservation recommendations are discretionary agency activities to minimize or avoid adverse effects of a proposed action on listed species or critical habitat, to help implement recovery plans, or to develop information.

1. For sand placement projects in Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Miami-Dade, Monroe, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Hillsborough, Pinellas, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa and Escambia Counties, construction activities should be planned to take place outside the main part of the sea turtle nesting and hatching season (May 1 through October 31).
2. Work cooperatively with the Service, FWC, County or Municipality, to reduce sea turtle disorientations in the sand placement areas. After the annual report is completed, a meeting shall be set up with the Applicant, county or municipality, FWC, Corps, and the Service to discuss the survey report, as well as any documented sea turtle disorientations in or adjacent to the project area.
3. Work cooperatively with the Service to mimic the native beach berm elevation and beach slopes landward and seaward of the equilibrated berm crest. For all high density green turtle nesting beaches (http://ocean.floridamarine.org/SeaTurtleNesting/), the formation of a dune, either through direct creation or natural accretion, will be included in the project design. Prior to drafting the plans and specifications for a beach nourishment project, the Corps must meet with the Service, FWC, and FDEP to discuss the beach profile surveys, dune formation (specifically on high density green turtle nesting beaches), and the sea turtle monitoring reports from previous placement events.
4. If public driving is allowed on the project beach, and if the Corps has the authority, we recommend it exercise its discretionary authority to require the local sponsor or Applicant to have authorization from the Service for incidental take of sea turtles, their nests, and hatchlings and beach mice, as appropriate, due to such driving or provide written documentation from the Service that no incidental take authorization is required. If required, the incidental take authorization for driving on the beach should be obtained prior to any subsequent sand placement events.
5. Beach nourishment should not occur on publicly owned conservation lands during the sea turtle nesting season.
6. All created dunes should be planted with at least three species of appropriate native salt-resistant dune vegetation. Examples along the Atlantic coast include: bitter panicgrass, sea oats (grown from local genetic stock), beach morning-glory, or railroad vine. Examples along the Northwest Florida coast includes: bitter panicgrass, little bluestem (Schizachyrium scoparium), sea oats (grown from local genetic stock), beach morning-glory, or railroad vine. Examples along the Southwest Florida coast include: sea oats (grown from local genetic stock), bitter panicgrass, beach morning-glory, and railroad vine.
7. If the project area is within a local municipality that has not adopted a lighting ordinance, and lighting is shown to be an issue on a nourished beach, and if the Corps has the authority, we recommend it exercise its discretionary authority to require an ordinance be adopted prior to any subsequent sand placement event.

8. To increase public awareness about sea turtles and beach mice, informational signs should be placed at beach access points where appropriate. The signs should explain the importance of the beach to sea turtles and beach mice.
9. If the Corps has the authority, we recommend it exercise its discretionary authority to require predator control programs (including education of pet owners and cat colony supporters) should be implemented that target free-roaming cats.

In order for the Service to be kept informed of actions minimizing or avoiding adverse effects or benefiting listed species or their habitats, the Service requests notification of the implementation of any conservation recommendations.

REINITIATION NOTICE

This concludes formal consultation on the action outlined in the request. As provided in 50 CFR §402.16, reinitiation of formal consultation is required where discretionary Federal agency involvement or control over the action has been retained (or is authorized by law) and if: (1) the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded; (2) new information reveals effects of the agency action that may affect listed species or critical habitat in a manner or to an extent not considered in this opinion; (3) the agency action is subsequently modified in a manner that causes an effect to the listed species or critical habitat not considered in this opinion; or (4) a new species is listed or critical habitat designated that may be affected by the action. Reinitiation of formal consultation is also required ten years after the issuance of this SPBO. In instances where the amount or extent of incidental take is exceeded, any operations causing such take shall cease pending reinitiation.

The above findings and recommendations constitute the report of the Service. If you have any questions about this SPBO, please contact Ann Marie Lauritsen of this office at (904) 525-0661, Richard Zane of the Panama City Field Office at (850) 769-0552, or Jeffrey Howe of the South Florida Field Office at (772) 562-3909.

Sincerely,

for Larry Williams
State Supervisor

cc:
FWC, Lake City, Florida (Melissa Tucker)
FWC, Lake City, Florida (Nancy Douglass)
FWC, Lake City, Florida (Terry Doonan)
FWC, Panama City, Florida (John Himes)
FWC, Tallahassee, Florida, (Robbin Trindell)
NMFS, Protected Species Division, St. Petersburg (Eric Hawk)
Service, Atlanta RO digital version in Word
Service, Panama City, Florida, (Patricia Kelly, Lisa Lehnhoff)
Service, St. Peteresburg, Florida (Ann Marie Lauritsen)
Service, Vero Beach, Florida (Jeffrey Howe)

LITERATURE CITED

Ackerman, R.A. 1980. Physiological and ecological aspects of gas exchange by sea turtle eggs. American Zoologist 20:575-583.

Ackerman, R. A., T. Rimkus, and R. Horton. 1991. The hydric structure and climate of natural and renourished sea turtle nesting beaches along the Atlantic coast of Florida. Research report to Florida Department of Natural Resources, Tallahassee, Florida (Contract #6407); 1991, 59 pp.

Amorocho, D. 2003. Monitoring nesting loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*) in the central Caribbean coast of Colombia. Marine Turtle Newsletter 101:8-13.

Baldwin, R., G.R. Hughes, and R.I.T. Prince. 2003. Loggerhead turtles in the Indian Ocean. Pages 218-232 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Bangs, O. 1898. The land mammals of peninsular Florida and the coastal region of Georgia. Proceedings of the Boston Society of Natural History 28:157-235.

Bard, A. 2004. Personal communication. Summary of trapping history at Sebastian Inlet State Park. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Recreation and Parks, Apopka, Florida, to Billy Brooks, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Bernardo, J. and P.T. Plotkin. 2007. An evolutionary perspective on the arribada phenomenon and reproductive behavior polymorphism of olive ridley sea turtles (*Lepidochelys olivacea*). Pages 59-87 *in* Plotkin, P.T. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

Bigler, W.J. and J.H. Jenkins. 1975. Population characteristics of *Peromyscus gossypinus* and *Sigmodon hispidus* in tropical hammocks of South Florida. Journal of Mammalogy 56:633-644.

Billes, A., J.-B. Moundemba, and S. Gontier. 2000. Campagne Nyamu 1999-2000. Rapport de fin de saison. PROTOMAC-ECOFAC. 111 pages.

Bird, B.L. 2002. Effects of predatory risk, vegetation structure, and artificial lighting on the foraging behavior of beach mice. M.S. thesis. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Bird, B.L., L.C. Branch, and D.L. Miller. 2004. Effects of coastal lighting on foraging behavior of beach mice. Conservation Biology 18: 1435-1439.

Bjorndal, K.A., A.B. Meylan, and B.J. Turner. 1983. Sea turtles nesting at Melbourne Beach, Florida, I. Size, growth and reproductive biology. Biological Conservation 26:65-77.

Blair, W.F. 1951. Population structure, social behavior and environmental relations in a natural population of the beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus leucocephalus*). Contributions Laboratory Vertebrate Zoology, University of Michigan 48:1-47.

Blair, K. 2005. Determination of sex ratios and their relationship to nest temperature of loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*, L.) hatchlings produced along the southeastern Atlantic coast of the United States. M.S. thesis. Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida.

Bolten, A.B. 2003. Active swimmers - passive drifters: the oceanic juvenile stage of loggerheads in the Atlantic system. Pages 63-78 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Bouchard, S. S. and K.A. Bjorndal. 2000. Sea turtles as biological transporters of nutrients and energy from marine to terrestrial ecosystems. Ecology 81(8):2305-2312.

Bowen, B. W., A.L. Bass, L. Soares, and R.J. Toonen. 2005. Conservation implications of complex population structure: lessons from the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*). Molecular Ecology 14:2389-2402.

Bowen, W.W. 1968. Variation and evolution of Gulf coast populations of beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus*). Bulletin Florida State Museum of Biological Science 12:1-91.

Caldwell, D.K. 1962. Comments on the nesting behavior of Atlantic loggerhead sea turtles, based primarily on tagging returns. Quarterly Journal of the Florida Academy of Sciences 25(4):287-302.

Carr, A. and L. Ogren. 1960. The ecology and migrations of sea turtles, 4. The green turtle in the Caribbean Sea. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 121(1):1-48.

Caughley, G. and A. Gunn. 1996. Conservation biology in theory and practice. Blackwell Science, Oxford.

Chaloupka, M. 2001. Historical trends, seasonality and spatial synchrony in green sea turtle egg production. Biological Conservation 101:263-279.

Christens, E. 1990. Nest emergence lag in loggerhead sea turtles. Journal of Herpetology 24(4):400-402.

Coastal Engineering Research Center. 1984. Shore protection manual, volumes I and II. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Coastal Tech. 1999. St. Andrews Bay entrance. Inlet management - feasibility and design investigation. Preliminary draft 9/23/99 to FDEP, Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems.

Congdon, J.D., A.E. Dunham, and R.C. van Loben Sels. 1993. Delayed sexual maturity and demographics of Blanding's turtles (*Emydoidea blandingii*): implications for conservation and management of long-lived organisms. Conservation Biology 7(4):826-833.

Conroy, M.J. and J.P. Runge. 2006. Interim report: review of trapping protocols, demographic estimation, and viability analysis for the Alabama beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*) II. Critique of population viability analyses for Alabama beach mouse. Georgia Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Daphne, Alabama.

Corliss, L.A., J.I. Richardson, C. Ryder, and R. Bell. 1989. The hawksbills of Jumby Bay, Antigua, West Indies. Pages 33-35 *in* Eckert, S.A., K.L. Eckert, and T.H. Richardson (compilers). Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-232.

Crouse, D. 1999. Population modeling and implications for Caribbean hawksbill sea turtle management. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 3(2):185-188.

Dahlen, M.K., R. Bell, J.I. Richardson, and T.H. Richardson. 2000. Beyond D-0004: Thirty-four years of loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) research on Little Cumberland Island, Georgia, 1964-1997. Pages 60-62 i*n* Abreu-Grobois, F.A., R. Briseno-Duenas, R. Marquez, and L. Sarti (compilers). Proceedings of the Eighteenth International Sea Turtle Symposium. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-436.

Daniel, R.S. and K.U. Smith. 1947. The sea-approach behavior of the neonate loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*). Journal of Comparative and Physiological Psychology 40(6):413-420.

Danielson, B.J. 2005. Importance of multiple independent populations of Alabama beach mice. Issue paper and presentation to Alabama beach mouse recovery team. May 16, 2005. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Davis, G.E. and M.C. Whiting. 1977. Loggerhead sea turtle nesting in Everglades National Park, Florida, U.S.A. Herpetologica 33:18-28.

Dean, C. 1999. Against the tide: the battle for America's beaches. Columbia University Press; New York, New York.

Dickerson, D.D. and D.A. Nelson. 1989. Recent results on hatchling orientation responses to light wavelengths and intensities. Pages 41-43 *in* Eckert, S.A., K.L. Eckert, and T.H. Richardson (compilers). Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-232.

Dodd, C.K., Jr. 1988. Synopsis of the biological data on the loggerhead sea turtle *Caretta caretta* (Linnaeus 1758). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Report 88(14).

Dodd, M.G. and A.H. Mackinnon. 1999. Loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) nesting in Georgia, 1999: implications for management. Georgia Department of Natural Resources report

Dodd, M.G. and A.H. Mackinnon. 2000. Loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) nesting in Georgia, 2000: implications for management. Georgia Department of Natural Resources unpublished report.

Dodd, M.G. and A.H. Mackinnon. 2001. Loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) nesting in Georgia, 2001. Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida..

Dodd, M.G. and A.H. Mackinnon. 2002. Loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) nesting in Georgia, 2002. Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Report submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Dodd, M.G. and A.H. Mackinnon. 2003. Loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) nesting in Georgia, 2003. Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Report submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Dodd, M.G. and A.H. Mackinnon. 2004. Loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) nesting in Georgia, 2004. Georgia Department of Natural Resources. Report submitted to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Douglas, B. 1997. Global Sea Rise: A Redetermination. Surveys in Geophysics 18(2, 3):279-292.

Ehrhart, L.M. 1978. Choctawhatchee beach mouse. Pages 18-19 *in* Layne, J.N. (editor), Rare and endangered biota of Florida, Volume I, Mammals. University Presses of Florida, Gainsville, Florida.

Ehrhart, L.M. 1989. Status report of the loggerhead turtle. Pages 122-139 *in* Ogren, L., F. Berry, K. Bjorndal, H. Kumpf, R. Mast, G. Medina, H. Reichart, and R. Witham (editors). Proceedings of the Second Western Atlantic Turtle Symposium. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-226.

Ehrhart, L.M., D.A. Bagley, and W.E. Redfoot. 2003. Loggerhead turtles in the Atlantic Ocean: geographic distribution, abundance, and population status. Pages 157-174 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Ehrlich, P.R. 1988. The loss of diversity: causes and consequences. Pages 21-27 *in* Wilson, E.O. (editor). Biodiversity. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

Emanuel, K. 2005. Increasing destructiveness of tropical cyclones over the past 30 years. Nature 436(4): 686-688.

Encalada, S.E., J.C. Zurita, and B.W. Bowen. 1999. Genetic consequences of coastal development: the sea turtle rookeries at X'cacel, Mexico. Marine Turtle Newsletter 83:8-10.

Ernest, R.G. and R.E. Martin. 1993. Sea turtle protection program performed in support of velocity cap repairs, Florida Power & Light Company St. Lucie Plant. Applied Biology, Inc., Jensen Beach, Florida.

Ernest, R.G. and R.E. Martin. 1999. Martin County beach nourishment project: sea turtle monitoring and studies. 1997 annual report and final assessment. Report to Florida Department of Environmental Protection. Applied Biology, Inc., Jensen Beach, Florida

Extine, D.D. 1980. Population ecology of the beach mouse, *Peromyscus polionotus niveiventris*. M.S. thesis. Department of Natural Sciences, University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.

Extine, D.D. and I.J. Stout. 1987. Dispersion and habitat occupancy of the beach mouse *Peromyscus polionotus niveiventris*. Journal of Mammalogy 68:297-304.

Fleming, K.L. and N.R. Holler. 1990. Reproduction in captive Santa Rosa beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus leucocephalus*) and Choctawhatchee beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*). Journal of the Alabama Academy of Science 61:143

Fletemeyer, J. 1980. Sea turtle monitoring project. Report to the Broward County Environmental Quality Control Board, Florida.

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). 2007. Topsail Hill State Preserve unit management plan. Division of Recreation and Parks. Tallahassee, Florida. http://www.dep.state.fl.us/Parks/planning/parkplans/TopsailHillPreserveStatePark.pdf

Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP). 2009. Critically eroded beaches in Florida. Bureau of Beaches and Coastal Systems. Tallahassee, Florida http://www.dep.state.fl.us/BEACHES/publications/pdf/CritEroRpt09.pdf

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2007a. Light sources contributing to reported disorientation events in Florida, 2007. http://www.myfwc.com/docs/WildlifeHabitats/Seaturtle_DisorientationEvents2007.pdf

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2007b. Sea turtle protection ordinance adopted by counties and municipalities (as of 01/02/2008). http://www.myfwc.com/WILDLIFEHABITATS/Seaturtle_LightingOrdinances.htm

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2008a. 2008 Nest survey results do not change turtle nesting trends. http://research.myfwc.com/features/view_article.asp?id=27537

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2008b. Long-term monitoring of beach mouse populations in Florida. Final report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Panama City, FL. FWC/FWRI file code: F2176-04-080F. March. 68 pp.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2008c. Reported nesting activity of the Kemps Ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*), in Florida, 1979-2007. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. http://research.myfwc.com/images/articles/2377/sea_turtle_nesting_on_florida_bchs_93-07.pdf

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2008d. Personal communication to the Loggerhead Recovery Team. Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2008e. Personal communication. Summary disorientation data on Florida beaches during 2008. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Imperiled Species Management Section, Tequesta, Florida to Ann Marie Lauritsen, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2009a. Statewide Nesting Beach Survey database http://research.myfwc.com/features/view_article.asp?id=10690

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2009b. Index Nesting Beach Survey Totals. http://research.myfwc.com/features/view_article.asp?id=10690

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2009c. Florida's endangered species, threatened species, and species of special concern. http://research.myfwc.com/features/view_article.asp?id=5182

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2010. Florida's endangered species, threatened species, and species of special concern. http://myfwc.com/wildlifehabitats/imperiled/

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission/Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWC/FWRI). 2010a. A good nesting season for loggerheads in 2010 does not reverse a recent declining trend. http://research.myfwc.com/features/view_article.asp?id=27537

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission/Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWC/FWRI). 2010b. Index nesting beach survey totals (1989 - 2010). http://myfwc.com/research/wildlife/sea-turtles/nesting/beach-survey-totals-1989-2010/

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Index nesting beach survey totals (1989 - 2013). . 2010c. Perdido Key State Park Beach Mouse Track Tube Results May 2005 to August 2010. Panama City, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2012a. Beach Mouse Track Tube Monitoring in Northern Florida. 2011-2012. Panama City, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2012b. Beach Mouse Track Tube Monitoring in Northwest Florida April-July 2012. Panama City, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2012c. Beach Mouse Track Tube Monitoring in Northwest Florida August-October 2012. Panama City, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2013a. Beach Mouse Track Tube Monitoring in Northwest Florida January-June 2013. Panama City, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2013b. Beach Mouse Track Tube Monitoring in Northwest Florida July-December 2013. Panama City, Florida.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission/Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute (FWC/FWRI). 2014a.

Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2014b. Unpublished Beach mouse Track Tube Monitoring Data for Northwest Florida. 2009-2011. Panama City, Florida.

Foley, A. 2005. Personal communication to Loggerhead Recovery Team. Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.

Foley, A., B. Schroeder, and S. MacPherson. 2008. Post-nesting migrations and resident areas of Florida loggerheads. Pages 75-76 *in* Kalb, H., A. Rohde, K. Gayheart, and K. Shanker (compilers). Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-582.

Foltz, D.W. 1981. Genetic evidence for the long-term monogamy in a small rodent, *Peromyscus polionotus*. American Naturalist 117:665-675.

Foote, J., J. Sprinkel, T. Mueller, and J. McCarthy. 2000. An overview of twelve years of tagging data from *Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas* nesting habitat along the central

Gulf coast of Florida, USA. Pages 280-283 *in* Kalb, H.J. and T. Wibbels (compilers). Proceedings of the Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-443.

Frair, W., R.G. Ackerman, and N. Mrosovsky. 1972. Body temperature of *Dermochelys coriacea:* warm water turtle from cold water. Science 177:791-793.

Francisco-Pearce, A.M. 2001. Contrasting population structure of *Caretta caretta* using mitochondrial and nuclear DNA primers. Masters thesis. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Frank, P.A. and S.R. Humphrey. 1996. Populations, habitat requirements, and management of the endemic Anastasia island beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus phasma*), emphasizing the potential threat of exotic house mice (*Mus musculus*). Final Rep. No. NG88-006 to Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission. Tallahassee, Florida.

Frazer, N.B. and J.I. Richardson. 1985. Annual variation in clutch size and frequency for loggerhead turtles, *Caretta-caretta*, nesting at Little Cumberland Island, Georgia, USA. Herpetologica 41(3):246-251.

Fretey, J., A. Billes, and M. Tiwari. 2007. Leatherback *Dermochelys coriacea*, nesting along the Atlantic coast of Africa. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 6(1): 126-129.

Galindo-Leal, C. and C.J. Krebs. 1998. Effects of food abundance on individuals and populations of the rock mouse (*Peromyscus difficilis*). Journal of Mammology 79(4):1131-1142.

Garner, J. A., S.A. Garner, and W. Coles. 2005. Tagging and nesting research on leatherback sea turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) on Sandy Point, St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Island, 2005. Annual report to Fish and Wildlife Service. 54 pages.

Garten, C.T., Jr. 1976. Relationships between aggressive behavior and genetic heterozygosity in the oldfield mouse, *Peromyscus polionotus*. Evolution 30:59-72.

Gerrodette, T. and J. Brandon. 2000. Designing a monitoring program to detect trends. Pages 36-39 *in* Bjorndal, K.A. and A.B. Bolten (editors). Proceedings of a Workshop on Assessing Abundance and Trends for In-water Sea Turtle Populations. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-445.

Glen, F. and N. Mrosovsky. 2004. Antigua revisited: the impact of climate change on sand and nest temperatures at a hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) nesting beach. Global Change Biology 10:2036-2045.

Glenn, L. 1998. The consequences of human manipulation of the coastal environment on hatchling loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*, L.). Pages 58-59 *in* Byles, R. and Y.

Fernandez (compilers). Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-412.

Godfrey, P.J., S.P. Leatherman, and P.A. Buckley. 1978. Impact of off-road vehicles on coastal ecosystems. Pages 581-599 *in* Coastal Zone '78 Symposium on Technical, Environmental Socioeconomic and Regulatory Aspects of Coastal Zone Management. Vol. II, San Francisco, California.

Godfrey, M.H. and N. Mrosovsky. 1997. Estimating the time between hatching of sea turtles and their emergence from the nest. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2(4):581-585.

Gore, J. 1987. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission. Memorandum on St. Andrew beach mouse status.

Gore, J. 1990. Personal communication via a letter to Michael M. Bentzien, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida, on the status of the St. Andrew beach mouse. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.

Gore, J. 1994. Personal communication to John Milio, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.

Gore, J. 1995. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission. Memorandum on Beach mice status and recovery planning.

Gore, J.A. 1999. Personal communication about the Choctawhatchee beach population to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida Field Office. Mammal Research Coordinator. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. Panama City, Florida.

Gore, J. 2008. Personal communication to Lorna Patrick, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service on status of Perdido Key beach mice at Gulf Islands National Seashore. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.

Gore, J.A. and T. Schaefer. 1993. Santa Rosa beach mouse survey. Nongame Wildlife Program Final Performance Report. Florida Fish and Wildlife Fish Commission. Panama City, Florida. http://research.myfwc.com/engine/download_redirection_process.asp?file=93gore%5F4747%2Epdf&objid=53462&dltype=publication

Greer, A.E., J.D. Lazell, Jr., and R.M. Wright. 1973. Anatomical evidence for counter-current heat exchanger in the leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*). Nature 244:181.

Groom, M.J. and M. A. Pascual. 1997. The analysis of population persistence: an outlook on the practice of viability analysis. Pages 1-27 *in* Fiedler, P.L. and P.M. Karieva (editors). Conservation Biology for the Coming Decade. Chapman and Hall, New York.

Hailman, J.P. and A.M. Elowson. 1992. Ethogram of the nesting female loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*). Herpetologica 48:1-30.

Hall, E.R. 1981. The mammals of North America, second edition. John Wiley and Sons, New York, New York.

Hanson, J., T. Wibbels, and R.E. Martin. 1998. Predicted female bias in sex ratios of hatchling loggerhead sea turtles from a Florida nesting beach. Canadian Journal of Zoology 76(10):1850-1861.

Hawkes, L.A., A.C. Broderick, M.H. Godfrey, and B.J. Godley. 2005. Status of nesting loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta* at Bald Head Island (North Carolina, USA) after 24 years of intensive monitoring and conservation. Oryx 39(1):65-72.

Hawkes, L.A., A.C. Broderick, M.H. Godfrey, and B.J. Godley. 2008. Climate change and marine turtles. Endangered Species Research 7:137-154.

Hays, G.C. 2000. The implications of variable remigration intervals for the assessment of population size in marine turtles. Journal of Theoretical Biology 206:221-227.

Hendrickson, J.R. 1958. The green sea turtle *Chelonia mydas* (Linn.) in Malaya and Sarawak. Proceedings of the Zoological Society of London 130:455-535.

Hendrickson, J.R. 1980. The ecological strategies of sea turtles. American Zoologist 20:597-608.

Henwood, T.A. and L.H. Ogren. 1987. Distribution and migration of immature Kemp's ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys kempi*) and green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) off Florida, Georgia, and South Carolina. Northeast Gulf Science 9(2):153-159.

Heppell, S.S. 1998. Application of life-history theory and population model analysis to turtle conservation. Copeia 1998(2):367-375.

Heppell, S.S., L.B. Crowder, and T.R. Menzel. 1999. Life table analysis of long-lived marine species with implications for conservation and management. Pages 137-148 *in* Musick, J.A. (editor). Life in the Slow Lane: Ecology and Conservation of Long-lived Marine Animals. American Fisheries Society Symposium 23, Bethesda, Maryland.

Heppell, S.S., M.L. Snover, and L.B. Crowder. 2003. Sea turtle population ecology. Pages 275-306 *in* Lutz, P.L., J.A. Musick, and J. Wyneken (editors). The Biology of Sea Turtles, Volume II. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Herren, R. M. The effect of beach nourishment on loggerhead (Caretta caretta) nesting and reproductive success at Sebastian Inlet, Florida. M.S. Thesis, University of Central Florida, Orlando; 1999, 138 pp.

Hildebrand, H.H. 1963. Hallazgo del área de anidación de la tortuga marina "lora" *Lepidochelys kempi* (Garman), en la coasta occidental del Golfo de México. Sobretiro de Ciencia, México 22:105-112.

Hill, E.A. 1989. Population dynamics, habitat, and distribution of the Alabama beach mouse. M.S. thesis. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Hirth, H.F. 1997. Synopsis of the biological data on the green turtle *Chelonia mydas* (Linnaeus 1758). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Biological Report 97(1).

Holler, N.R. 1992a. Choctawhatchee beach mouse. Pages 76-86 *in* Humphrey, S.R. (editor). Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume 1. Mammals. University Presses Florida, Tallahassee, Florida.

Holler, N.R. 1992b. Perdido Key beach mouse. Pages 102-109 *in* Humphrey, S.R. (editor). Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume 1. Mammals. University Presses of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida.

Holler, N.R. 1995. Personal communication about beach mouse captive breeding program from Unit Leader, Alabama Fish and Wildlife Cooperative Research Unit, Auburn University, to Lorna Patrick, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Holler, N.R., D.W. Mason, R.M. Dawson, T. Simons, and M.C. Wooten. 1989. Reestablishment of the Perdido Key beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus trissyllepsis*) on Gulf Islands National Seashore. Conservation Biology 3: 397-403.

Holler, N.R., M.C. Wooten, and C.L. Hawcroft. 1997. Population biology of endangered Gulf coast beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus*): conservation implication. Technical Report. Alabama Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit.

Holler, N.R., M.C. Wooten, and M. Oli. 1999. Viability analysis of endangered Gulf coast beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus*) populations. Report for agreement 1448-0004-94-9174, mod. 2, Obj. 2 to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Holliman, D.C. 1983. Status and habitat of Alabama gulf coast beach mice *Peromyscus polionotus ammobates* and *P. p. trissyllepsis*. Northeast Gulf Science 6:121-129.

Hopkins, S.R. and T.M. Murphy. 1980. Reproductive ecology of *Caretta caretta* in South Carolina. South Carolina Wildlife Marine Resources Department Completion Report.

Hosier, P.E., M. Kochhar, and V. Thayer. 1981. Off-road vehicle and pedestrian track effects on the sea –approach of hatchling loggerhead turtles. Environmental Conservation 8:158-161.

Houghton, J.D.R. and G.C. Hays. 2001. Asynchronous emergence by loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) hatchlings. Naturwissenschaften 88:133-136.

Howard, B. and P. Davis. 1999. Sea turtle nesting activity at Ocean Ridge in Palm Beach County, Florida 1999. Palm Beach County Department of Environmental Resources Management, West Palm Beach, Florida.

Howell, A.H. 1909. Notes on the distribution of certain mammals in the southeastern United States. Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington 22:55-68.

Howell, A.H. 1921. A biological survey of Alabama. North American Fauna 49:1-88.

Howell, A.H. 1939. Description of five new mammals from Florida. Journal of Mammalogy 20:363-365.

Hughes, A.L. and E.A. Caine. 1994. The effects of beach features on hatchling loggerhead sea turtles. Pages 237 *in* Bjorndal, K.A., A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson, and P.J. Eliazar (compilers). Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-351.

Humphrey, S.R. and D.B. Barbour. 1981. Status and habitat of three subspecies of *Peromyscus polionotus* in Florida. Journal of Mammalogy 62:840-844.

Humphrey, S.R. and P.A. Frank. 1992a. Anastasia Island Beach Mouse. Pages 94-101 *in* Humphrey, S.R. (editor). Rare and endangered biota of Florida Volume 1 Mammals.

Humphrey, S.R. and P.A. Frank. 1992b. Survey for the southeastern beach mouse at Treasure Shores Park. Final report to Indian River County Board of Commissioners. Vero Beach, Florida.

Humphrey, S.R., W.H. Kern, Jr., and M.S. Ludlow. 1987. Status survey of seven Florida mammals. Florida Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit. Technical Report no. 25. Gainesville, Florida.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007a. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis - Summary for Policymakers. Contribution of Working Group I Contribution to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007b. Climate Change 2007: Climate Change Impacts, Adaptation and Vulnerability. Working Group II Contribution to the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Fourth Assessment Report.

Ivey, R.D. 1949. Life history notes on three mice from the Florida east coast. Journal of Mammalogy 30:157-162.

James, F.C. 1987. Endemism in a beach population of the oldfield mouse *Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis*. Final project report to Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, FL. Project Number GFC-86-047. November 1987. 23 pp.

James, F.C. 1992. St. Andrews beach mouse. Pages 87-93 *in* Humphrey, S.R. (editor). Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume 1. Mammals. University Presses of Florida, Tallahassee.

James, F.C. 1995. Endemism in a Beach Population of the oldfield mouse *Peromyscus polionotus peninsularis*, Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission: Nongame Wildlife Program.

Jennings, D. 2004. Personal communication. Summary of the status of the Southeastern beach mouse in Indian River County. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Vero Beach, Florida to Billy Brooks, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Kamezaki, N., Y. Matsuzawa, O. Abe, H. Asakawa, T. Fujii, K. Goto, S. Hagino, M. Hayami, M. Ishii, T. Iwamoto, T. Kamata, H. Kato, J. Kodama, Y. Kondo, I. Miyawaki, K. Mizobuchi, Y. Nakamura, Y. Nakashima, H. Naruse, K. Omuta, M. Samejima, H. Suganuma, H. Takeshita, T. Tanaka, T. Toji, M. Uematsu, A. Yamamoto, T. Yamato, and I. Wakabayashi. 2003. Loggerhead turtles nesting in Japan. Pages 210-217 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Kaufman, W. and O. Pilkey. 1979. The Beaches are Moving: The Drowning of America's Shoreline. Anchor Press/Doubleday, Garden City, New York.

Kautz, R.S. and J.A. Cox. 2001. Strategic habitats for biodiversity conservation in Florida. Conservation Biology 15:55-77.

Komar, P.D. 1983. Coastal erosion in response to the construction of jetties and breakwaters. Pages 191-204 *in* Komar, P.D. (editor). CRC Handbook of Coastal Processes and Erosion. CRC Press. Boca Raton, Florida.

Kovatch, L. 2003. Beach mouse tracking surveys at Grayton Beach State Park, Florida. August 26, 2003. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Labisky, R.F., M.A. Mercadante, and W.L. Finger. 1986. Factors affecting reproductive success of sea turtles on Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, Florida, 1985. Final report to the United

States Air Force. United States Fish and Wildlife Service Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit, Agreement Number 14-16-0009-1544, Research Work Order Number 25.

Lacy, R.C. 1993. Impact of Inbreeding in Natural and Captive Populations of Vertebrates: Implications for Conservation. The University of Chicago.

Lacy, R.C., G. Alaks, and A. Walsh. 1995. Hierarchical analysis of inbreeding depression in *Peromyscus polionotus*. Evolution 50:2187-2200.

Land Planning Group, Inc. 1991. Southeastern beach mouse survey of Seaview Subdivision, Indian River County, Florida. Final Report to Financial Services Group, Inc., Stuart, Florida.

LeBuff, C.R., Jr. 1990. The loggerhead turtle in the eastern Gulf of Mexico. Caretta Research, Inc.; Sanibel Island, Florida.

Limpus, C.J. 1971. Sea turtle ocean finding behaviour. Search 2(10):385-387.

Limpus, C.J. and D.J. Limpus. 2003. Loggerhead turtles in the equatorial and southern Pacific Ocean: a species in decline. Pages 199-209 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Limpus, C.J., V. Baker, and J.D. Miller. 1979. Movement induced mortality of loggerhead eggs. Herpetologica 35(4):335-338.

Limpus, C., J.D. Miller, and C.J. Parmenter. 1993. The northern Great Barrier Reef green turtle *Chelonia mydas* breeding population. Pages 47-50 *in* Smith, A.K. (compiler), K.H. Zevering and C.E. Zevering (editors). Raine Island and Environs Great Barrier Reef: Quest to Preserve a Fragile Outpost of Nature. Raine Island Corporation and Great Barrier Reef Marine Park Authority, Townsville, Queensland, Australia.

Linzey, D.W. 1978. Perdido Bay beach mouse. Pages 19-20 *in* Layne, J.N. (editor). Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume 1. Mammals. University Presses of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Loggins, R. 2007. Personal communication about the status of Perdido Key beach mice to Sandra Sneckenberger, Service Panama City, Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission.

Lohmann, K.J. and C.M.F. Lohmann. 2003. Orientation mechanisms of hatchling loggerheads. Pages 44-62 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Lomascolo, T. and T.M. Aide. 2001. Seed and seedling bank dynamics in secondary forests following hurricane Georges in Puerto Rico. Caribbean Journal of Science 37:259-270.

Lutcavage, M. E., P.Plotkin, and B.E. Witherington. 1997. Human impacts on sea turtle survival. Lutz, P. L. ,Musick, J. A. eds., The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Marine Science Series, CRC Press, Inc., Boca Raton, Florida. 432 pp.; 1997, p. 387-409.
Lynn, W.J. 2000a. Social organization and burrow-site selection of the Alabama Beach Mouse *Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*). M.S. thesis. Auburn University. Auburn, Alabama.

Lynn, W.J. 2000b. East Pass trapping. Alabama Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City, Florida. Memo dated September 18, 2000.

Lynn, W.J. 2002a. St. Andrew beach mouse survey to Jack Mobley, Tyndall Air Force base. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City, FL. Memo dated May 29, 2002.

Lynn, W.J. 2002b. Grayton Beach State Park trapping survey. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Lynn, W.J. 2002c. East Crooked Island, Tyndall Air Force Base trapping summary report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City, Florida.

Lynn, W.J. 2002d. East Pass - West Crooked Island side CBM status survey. First quarter trapping results. Janaury 15-20, 2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City Field Office, Florida. 4 pp. Memo dated January 31, 2002.

Lynn, W.J. 2002e. East Pass - West Crooked Island side CBM status survey. Second quarter trapping results. April 15-20, 2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City Field Office, Florida. 4 pp. Memo dated May 3, 2002.

Lynn, W.J. 2002f. East Pass - West Crooked Island side CBM status survey. Third quarter trapping results. August 6-10, 2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City Field Office, Florida. 4 pp. Memo dated August 29, 2002.

Lynn, W.J. 2002g. East Pass - West Crooked Island side CBM status survey. Fifth quarter trapping results. October 7-12, 2002. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City Field Office, Florida. 4 pp. Memo dated October 18, 2002.

Lynn, W.J. 2003a. Topsail Hill Preserve State Park Status Survey and translocation report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City, Field Office, Florida.

Lynn, W.J. 2003b. East Pass - West Crooked Island side CBM status survey. Fifth quarter trapping results. February 1-2, 2003. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City Field Office, Florida. 4 pp. Memo dated February 19, 2003.

Lynn, W.J. 2004a. Seigler property trapping report. Escambia County, Perdido Key, Florida. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City Field Office, Florida.

Lynn, W.J. 2004b. Monitoring and effects upon the Choctawhatchee beach mouse from the reopening of East Pass in Bay County, Florida. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Lynn, W.J. and L. Kovatch. 2004. Perdido Key beach mouse final translocation report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Panama City Field Office, Florida.

Mann, T.M. 1977. Impact of developed coastline on nesting and hatchling sea turtles in southeastern Florida. M.S. thesis. Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida.

Margaritoulis, D., R. Argano, I. Baran, F. Bentivegna, M.N. Bradai, J.A. Camiñas, P. Casale, G. De Metrio, A. Demetropoulos, G. Gerosa, B.J. Godley, D.A. Haddoud, J. Houghton, L. Laurent, and B. Lazar. 2003. Loggerhead turtles in the Mediterranean Sea: present knowledge and conservation perspectives. Pages 175-198 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Marquez-Millan, R. 1994. Synopsis of biological data on the Kemp's ridley sea turtle, *Lepidochelys kempi* (Garman, 1880). NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-343.

Marquez-Millan, R., A. Villanueva O., and P.M. Burchfield. 1989. Nesting population and production of hatchlings of Kemp's ridley sea turtle at Rancho Nuevo, Tamaulipas, Mexico. Pages 16-19 *in* Caillouet, Jr., C.W. and A.M. Landry, Jr. (editors). Proceedings of the First international Symposium on Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Biology, Conservation, and Management. Texas A&M University, Sea Grant Program. TAMU-SG-89-105. College Station, Texas.

Martin, R.E. 1992. Turtle nest relocation on Jupiter Island, Florida: an evaluation. Presentation to the Fifth Annual National Conference on Beach Preservation Technology, February 12-14, 1992, St. Petersburg, Florida.

McDonald, D.L. and P.H. Dutton. 1996. Use of PIT tags and photoidentification to revise remigration estimates of leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) nesting in St. Croix, U.S. Virgin Islands, 1979-1995. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2(2):148-152.

McGehee, M.A. 1990. Effects of moisture on eggs and hatchlings of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*). Herpetologica 46(3):251-258.

Meyers, J.M. 1983. Status, microhabitat, and management recommendations for *Peromyscus polionotus* on Gulf Coast beaches. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia.

Meylan, A. 1982. Estimation of population size in sea turtles. Pages 135-138 *in* Bjorndal, K.A. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Meylan, A. 1992. Hawksbill turtle *Eretmochelys imbricata*. Pages 95-99 *in* Moler, P.E. (editor). Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume III. University Press of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Meylan, A.B. 1999. Status of the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) in the Caribbean region. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 3(2):177-184.

Meylan, A.B. and M. Donnelly. 1999. Status justification for listing the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) as critically endangered on the 1996 IUCN *Red List of Threatened Animals*. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 3(2):200-224.

Meylan, A., B. Schroeder, and A. Mosier. 1995. Sea turtle nesting activity in the State of Florida 1979-1992. Florida Marine Research Publications Number 52, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Middlemas, K. 1999. Flow going. Article on the closure of East Pass. News Herald. Waterfront Section. Page 1. October 31, 1999.

Miller, K., G.C. Packard, and M.J. Packard. 1987. Hydric conditions during incubation influence locomotor performance of hatchling snapping turtles. Journal of Experimental Biology 127:401-412.

Mitchell, H.G., J.E. Moyers, and N.R. Holler. 1997. Current status and distribution of several Gulf coast subspecies of beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus* spp.). Poster paper presented at the 77th annual Meeting of the American Society of mammalogists, Stillwater, OK. Alabama Cooperative Wildlife Research Unit, Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Moody, K. 1998. The effects of nest relocation on hatching success and emergence success of the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) in Florida. Pages 107-108 *in* Byles, R. and Y. Fernandez (compilers). Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-412.

Moore, L. 2007. Experts say U.S. Barrier Islands Could Disappear. Reuters AlertNet (Accessed January 26, 2007). http://www.alertnet.org/thenews/newsdesk/N12369516.htm.

Moran, K.L., K.A. Bjorndal, and A.B. Bolten. 1999. Effects of the thermal environment on the temporal pattern of emergence of hatchling loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta*. Marine Ecology Progress Series 189:251-261.

Moyers, J.E. 1996. Food habits of Gulf coast subspecies of beach mice *Peromyscus polionotus* spp.). M.S. thesis. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Moyers, J.E. 2007. 2005 Annual Trapping Report. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida

Moyers, J.E and S. Shea. 2002. Annual trapping report. Choctawhatchee and St. Andrew beach mice at St. Joe development sites, Walton, Bay, and Gulf Counties, Florida. St. Joe Timberland Co. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Moyers, J.E., N.R. Holler, and M.C. Wooten. 1999. Species status report, current distribution and status of the Perdido Key, Choctawhatchee and St. Andrew Beach Mouse. Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Grant Agreement no. 1448-0004-94-9174.

Mrosovsky, N. 1968. Nocturnal emergence of hatchling sea turtles: control by thermal inhibition of activity. Nature 220(5174):1338-1339.

Mrosovsky, N. 1988. Pivotal temperatures for loggerhead turtles from northern and southern nesting beaches. Canadian Journal of Zoology 66:661-669.

Mrosovsky, N. and A. Carr. 1967. Preference for light of short wavelengths in hatchling green sea turtles (*Chelonia mydas*), tested on their natural nesting beaches. Behavior 28:217-231.

Mrosovsky, N. and J. Provancha. 1989. Sex ratio of hatchling loggerhead sea turtles: data and estimates from a five year study. Canadian Journal of Zoology 70:530-538.

Mrosovsky, N. and S.J. Shettleworth. 1968. Wavelength preferences and brightness cues in water finding behavior of sea turtles. Behavior 32:211-257.

Mrosovsky, N. and C.L. Yntema. 1980. Temperature dependence of sexual differentiation in sea turtles: implications for conservation practices. Biological Conservation 18:271-280.

Murphy, T.M. and S.R. Hopkins. 1984. Aerial and ground surveys of marine turtle nesting beaches in the southeast region. Report to National Marine Fisheries Service.

Musick, J.A. 1999. Ecology and conservation of long-lived marine mammals. Pages 1-10 *in* Musick, J.A. (editor). Life in the Slow Lane: Ecology and Conservation of Long-lived Marine Animals. American Fisheries Society Symposium 23, Bethesda, Maryland.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2001. Stock assessments of loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles and an assessment of the impact of the pelagic longline fishery on the loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles of the Western North Atlantic. U.S. Department of Commerce, NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-455.

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2009a. Loggerhead Sea Turtles (*Caretta caretta*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. Silver Springs, Maryland. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/turtles/loggerhead.htm

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2009b. Green Sea Turtles (*Chelonia mydas*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. Silver Springs, Maryland. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/turtles/green.htm

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2009c. Leatherback Sea Turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. Silver Springs, Maryland. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/turtles/leatherback.htm

National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS). 2009d. Hawksbill Turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources. Silver Springs, Maryland. http://www.nmfs.noaa.gov/pr/species/turtles/hawksbill.htm

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1991. Recovery plan for U.S. population of Atlantic green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Washington, D.C.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1992. Recovery plan for leatherback turtles (*Dermochelys coriacea*) in the U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico. National Marine Fisheries Service, Washington, D.C.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1993. Recovery plan for hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) in the U.S. Caribbean, Atlantic, and Gulf of Mexico. National Marine Fisheries Service, St. Petersburg, Florida.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1998a. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the East Pacific green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1998b. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the green turtle (*Chelonia mydas*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1998c. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the hawksbill turtle (*Eretmochelys imbricata*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1998d. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 1998e. Recovery plan for U.S. Pacific populations of the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*). National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

National Marine Fisheries Service and the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (NMFS and Service). 2008. Recovery plan for the Northwest Atlantic population of the loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*), second revision. National Marine Fisheries Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

National Marine Fisheries Service, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, and SEMARNAT. 2011. Bi-National Recovery Plan for the Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*), Second Revision. National Marine Fisheries Service. Silver Spring, Maryland 156 pp. + appendices.

National Research Council. 1987. Responding to changes in sea level: Engineering Implications. National Academy Press, Washington, D.C.

National Research Council. 1990a. Decline of the sea turtles: causes and prevention. National Academy Press; Washington, D.C.

National Research Council. 1990b. Managing coastal erosion. National Academy Press; Washington, D.C.

National Research Council. 1995. Beach nourishment and protection. National Academy Press; Washington, D.C.

Nelson, D.A. 1987. The use of tilling to soften nourished beach sand consistency for nesting sea turtles. Report of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Nelson, D.A. 1988. Life history and environmental requirements of loggerhead turtles. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service Biological Report 88(23). U.S. Army Corps of Engineers TR EL-86-2 (Rev.).

Nelson, D.A. and B. Blihovde. 1998. Nesting sea turtle response to beach scarps. Page 113 *in* Byles, R., and Y. Fernandez (compilers). Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-412.

Nelson, D.A. and D.D. Dickerson. 1987. Correlation of loggerhead turtle nest digging times with beach sand consistency. Abstract of the 7th Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology.

Nelson, D.A. and D.D. Dickerson. 1988a. Effects of beach nourishment on sea turtles. *In* Tait, L.S. (editor). Proceedings of the Beach Preservation Technology Conference '88. Florida Shore & Beach Preservation Association, Inc., Tallahassee, Florida.

Nelson, D.A. and D.D. Dickerson. 1988b. Hardness of nourished and natural sea turtle nesting beaches on the east coast of Florida. Report of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Nelson, D.A. and D.D. Dickerson. 1988c. Response of nesting sea turtles to tilling of compacted beaches, Jupiter Island, Florida. Report of the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Nelson, D.A., K. Mauck, and J. Fletemeyer. 1987. Physical effects of beach nourishment on sea turtle nesting, Delray Beach, Florida. Technical Report EL-87-15. U.S. Army Corps of Engineers Waterways Experiment Station, Vicksburg, Mississippi.

Nielsen, J.T., F.A. Abreu-Grobois, A. Arenas, and M.S. Gaines. 2012. Increased genetic variation uncovered in loggerhead turtles from Quintana Roo, Mexico and St. George Island, Florida. *In* Proceedings of the Twenty-ninth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum.

Noss, R.F. and B. Csuti. 1997. Habitat fragmentation. Pages 269–304 *in* Meffe, G.K. and R.C. Carroll (editors). Principles of Conservation Biology, Second Edition, Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.

Novak, J.A. 1997. Home range and habitat use of Choctawhatchee beach mice. M.S. thesis. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Ogren, L.H. 1989. Distribution of juvenile and subadult Kemp's ridley turtles: preliminary results from the 1984-1987 surveys. Pages 116-123 *in* Caillouet, C.W., Jr., and A.M. Landry, Jr. (eds.). Proceedings of the First International Symposium on Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Biology, Conservation and Management. Texas A&M University Sea Grant College Program TAMU-SG-89-105.

Oli, M., Holler, N.R, and M.C. Wooten. 2001. Viability analysis of endangered Gulf Coast beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus*) populations. Alabama Cooperative Fish and Wildlife Research Unit and Department of Zoology and Wildlife Science.

Osgood, W.H. 1909. Revision of the American genus *Peromyscus*. North American Fauna 28. Government Printing Office; Washington, D.C.

Otis, D.L., K.P. Burnham, G.C. White, and D.R. Anderson. 1978. Statistical inference from capture data on closed animal populations. Wildlife Monographs 62:1-135.

Packard, M.J. and G.C. Packard. 1986. Effect of water balance on growth and calcium mobilization of embryonic painted turtles (*Chrysemys picta*). Physiological Zoology 59(4):398-405.

Packard,G.C., M.J. Packard, T.J. Boardman, and M.D. Ashen. 1981. Possible adaptive value of water exchange in flexible-shelled eggs of turtles. Science 213:471-473.

Packard, G.C., M.J. Packard, and T.J. Boardman. 1984. Influence of hydration of the environment on the pattern of nitrogen excretion by embryonic snapping turtles (*Chelydra serpentina*). Journal of Experimental Biology 108:195-204.

Packard, G.C., M.J. Packard, and W.H.N. Gutzke. 1985. Influence of hydration of the environment on eggs and embryos of the terrestrial turtle *Terrapene ornata*. Physiological Zoology 58(5):564-575.

Packard G.C., M.J. Packard, K. Miller, and T.J. Boardman. 1988. Effects of temperature and moisture during incubation on carcass composition of hatchling snapping turtles (*Chelydra serpentina*). Journal of Comparative Physiology B 158:117-125.

Parmenter, C.J. 1980. Incubation of the eggs of the green sea turtle, *Chelonia mydas*, in Torres Strait, Australia: the effect of movement on hatchability. Australian Wildlife Research 7:487-491.

Pendleton, E., Hammer-Klose, E. Thieler, and S. Williams. 2004. Coastal Vulnerability Assessment of Gulf Islands National Seashore (GUIS) to Sea Level Rise, U.S. Geological Survey Open-File Report 03-108. http://pubs.usgs.gov/of/2003/of03-108/.

Philibosian, R. 1976. Disorientation of hawksbill turtle hatchlings (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) by stadium lights. Copeia 1976:824.

Pilkey, Jr., O.H., D.C. Sharma, H.R. Wanless, L.J. Doyle, O.H. Pilkey, Sr., W. J. Neal, and B.L. Gruver. 1984. Living with the East Florida Shore. Duke University Press, Durham, North Carolina.

Pilkey, O.H. and K.L. Dixon. 1996. The Corps and the shore. Island Press; Washington, D.C.

Pollock, K.H., J.D. Nichols, C. Brownie, and J.E. Hines. 1990. Statistical inference for capture-recapture experiments. Wildlife Monographs 107:1-97.

Possardt, E. 2005. Personal communication to Sandy MacPherson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, GA.

Pournelle, G.H. and B.A. Barrington. 1953. Notes on the mammals of Anastasia Island, St. Johns County, Florida. Journal of Mammalogy 34:133-135

Pritchard, P.C.H. 1982. Nesting of the leatherback turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea* in Pacific Mexico, with a new estimate of the world population status. Copeia 1982(4):741-747.

Pritchard, P.C.H. 1992. Leatherback turtle *Dermochelys coriacea*. Pages 214-218 *in* Moler, P.E. (editor). Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume III. University Press of Florida; Gainesville, Florida.

Provancha, J.A. and L.M. Ehrhart. 1987. Sea turtle nesting trends at Kennedy Space Center and Cape Canaveral Air Force Station, Florida, and relationships with factors influencing nest site selection. Pages 33-44 *in* Witzell, W.N. (editor). Ecology of East Florida Sea Turtles: Proceedings of the Cape Canaveral, Florida Sea Turtle Workshop. NOAA Technical Report NMFS-53.

Rabon, D.R., Jr., S.A. Johnson, R. Boettcher, M. Dodd, M. Lyons, S. Murphy, S. Ramsey, S. Roff, and K. Stewart. 2003. Confirmed leatherback turtle (*Dermochelys coriacea*) nests from North Carolina, with a summary of leatherback nesting activities north of Florida. Marine Turtle Newslettter 101:4-8.

Rave, E.H. and N.R. Holler. 1992. Population dynamics of Alabama beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*) in south Alabama. Journal of Mammalogy 73(2):347-355.

Raymond, P.W. 1984. The effects of beach restoration on marine turtles nesting in south Brevard County, Florida. M.S. thesis. University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.

Reina, R.D., P.A. Mayor, J.R. Spotila, R. Piedra, and F.V. Paladino. 2002. Nesting ecology of the leatherback turtle, *Dermochelys coriacea*, at Parque Nacional Marino Las Baulas, Costa Rica: 1988-1989 to 1999-2000. Copeia 2002(3):653-664.

Richardson, T.H., J.I. Richardson, C. Ruckdeschel, and M.W. Dix. 1978. Remigration patterns of loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) nesting on Little Cumberland Island and Cumberland Island, Georgia. Pages 39-44 *in* Henderson, G.E. (editor). Proceedings of the Florida and Interregional Conference on Sea Turtles. Florida Marine Research Publications Number 33.

Robson, M.S. 1989. Southeastern beach mouse survey. Nongame Wildlife Section Report, Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.

Ross, J.P. 1979. Sea turtles in the Sultanate of Oman. World Wildlife Fund Project 1320 Report.

Ross, J.P. 1982. Historical decline of loggerhead, ridley, and leatherback sea turtles. Pages 189-195 *in* Bjorndal, K.A. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Institution Press; Washington, D.C.

Ross, J.P. and M.A. Barwani. 1995. Review of sea turtles in the Arabian area. Pages 373-383 *in* Bjorndal, K.A. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles, Revised Edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Rostal, D.C. 2007. Reproductive physiology of the ridley sea turtle. Pages 151-165 *in* Plotkin P.T. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles. Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

Rostal, D.C., J.S. Grumbles, R.A. Byles, R. Marquez-M., and D.W. Owens. 1997. Nesting physiology of Kemp's ridley sea turtles, *Lepidochelys kempi*, at Rancho Nuevo, Tamaulipas, Mexico, with observations on population estimates. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2(4):538-547.

Routa, R.A. 1968. Sea turtle nest survey of Hutchinson Island, Florida. Quarterly Journal of the Florida Academy of Sciences 30(4):287-294.

Rumbold, D. G., Davis, P. W., and C. Perretta. Estimating the effect of beach nourishment on Caretta caretta (loggerhead sea turtle) nesting. Restoration Ecology; 2001, v. 9, no. 3, p. 304-310.

St. Joe/Arvida. 2003. ITP annual report reporting year 2002. Watercolor and Watersound. TE020830-1. Jacksonville, Florida.

St. Joe Company. 1999. ITP annual report reporting year 1998. Watercolor The Villages at Seagrove and Camp Creek d/b/a Watersound. TE020830-1. Seagrove Beach, Florida.

Sauzo, A. 2004. Personal communication. Summary of trapping events at Smyrna Dunes Park. University of Florida, Orlando, Florida to Billy Brooks, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Salmon, M., J. Wyneken, E. Fritz, and M. Lucas. 1992. Seafinding by hatchling sea turtles: role of brightness, silhouette and beach slope as orientation cues. Behaviour 122 (1-2):56-77.

Schroeder, B.A. 1981. Predation and nest success in two species of marine turtles (*Caretta caretta* and *Chelonia mydas*) at Merritt Island, Florida. Florida Scientist 44(1):35.

Schroeder, B.A. 1994. Florida index nesting beach surveys: are we on the right track? Pages 132-133 *in* Bjorndal, K.A., A.B. Bolten, D.A. Johnson, and P.J. Eliazar (compilers). Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-351.

Schroeder, B.A., A.M. Foley, and D.A. Bagley. 2003. Nesting patterns, reproductive migrations, and adult foraging areas of loggerhead turtles. Pages 114-124 *in* Bolten, A.B. and B.E. Witherington (editors). Loggerhead Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Books, Washington D.C.

Schmid, J.R. 1998. Marine turtle populations on the west central coast of Florida: results of tagging studies at the Cedar Keys, Florida, 1986-1995. Fishery Bulletin 96:589-602.

Schmid, J.R. and W.N. Witzell. 1997. Age and growth of wild Kemp's ridley turtles (*Lepidochelys kempi*): cumulative results of tagging studies in Florida. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2(4):532-537.

Scott, J. A. 2006. Use of satellite telemetry to determine ecology and management of loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) during the nesting season in Georgia. Unpublished Master of Science thesis. University of Georgia, Athens, Georgia.

Selander, R.K., M.H. Smith, S.Y. Yang, W.E. Johnson, and J.B. Gentry. 1971. Biochemical polymorphism and systematics in the genus *Peromyscus*. I. Variation in the old-field mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus*). University of Texas Studies in Genetics 6:49-90.

Shaffer, M. and B.A. Stein. 2000. Safeguarding our Precious Heritage. Chapter 11 in Stein, B.A., L.S. Kutner, J.S. Adams (eds). Precious Heritage: The Status of Biodiversity in the United States. Oxford University Press. New York.

Shaver, D. 2008. Personal communication via e-mail to Sandy MacPherson, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida, on Kemp's ridley sea turtle nesting in Texas in 2008. National Park Service.

Slaby, L. 2005. Letter to P.A. Lang, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission.

Smith, K.E.L. 2003. Movements and habitat use of the Santa Rosa beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus leucocephalus*) in a successional dune mosaic. M.S. thesis. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Smith, M.H. 1966. The evolutionary significance of certain behavioral, physiological, and morphological adaptations of the old-field mouse, *Peromyscus polionotus*. Ph.D. dissertation. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

Smith, M.H. 1971. Food as a limiting factor in the population ecology of *Peromyscus polionotus* group from Florida and Alabama. Journal of Mammalogy 7:149-184.

Smith, M.H., C.T. Garten, Jr., and P.R. Ramsey. 1975. Genic heterozygosity and population dynamics in small mammals. Pages 85-102 *in* Markert, C.L. (editor). Isozymes IV. Genetics and Evolution. Academic Press, New York.

Sneckenberger, S.I. 2001. Factors influencing habitat use by the Alabama beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*). M.S. thesis. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Sneckenberger, S.I. 2005. Personal communication about observing beach mouse burrows on private lands on Perdido Key to Lorna Patrick, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Snover, M. 2005. Personal communication to the Loggerhead Sea Turtle Recovery Team. National Marine Fisheries Service.

Snover, M.L., A.A. Hohn, L.B. Crowder, and S.S. Heppell. 2007. Age and growth in Kemp's ridley sea turtles: evidence from mark-recapture and skeletochronology. Pages 89-106 *in* Plotkin P.T. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Ridley Sea Turtles. John Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, Maryland.

Solow, A.R., K.A. Bjorndal, and A.B. Bolten. 2002. Annual variation in nesting numbers of marine turtles: the effect of sea surface temperature on re-migration intervals. Ecology Letters 5:742-746.

Soulé, M.E. and D. Simberloff. 1986. What do genetics and ecology tell us about the design of nature reserves? Biological Conservation 35:19-40.

Soulé, M.E. and B.A. Wilcox. 1980. Conservation biology: an evolutionary-ecological perspective. Sinauer Associates, Inc., Sunderland, Massachusetts.

Spotila, J.R., E.A. Standora, S.J. Morreale, G.J. Ruiz, and C. Puccia. 1983. Methodology for the study of temperature related phenomena affecting sea turtle eggs. Service Endangered Species Report 11.

Spotila, J.R., A.E. Dunham, A.J. Leslie, A.C. Steyermark, P.T. Plotkin, and F.V. Paladino. 1996. Worldwide population decline of *Dermochelys coriacea*: are leatherback turtles going extinct? Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2(2):290-222.

Spotila, J.R. R.D. Reina, A.C. Steyermark, P.T. Plotkin, and F.V. Paladino. 2000. Pacific leatherback turtles face extinction. Nature 405:529-530.

Stancyk, S.E. 1995. Non-human predators of sea turtles and their control. Pages 139-152 *in* Bjorndal, K.A. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles, Revised Edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Stancyk, S.E., O.R. Talbert, and J.M. Dean. 1980. Nesting activity of the loggerhead turtle *Caretta caretta* in South Carolina, II: protection of nests from raccoon predation by transplantation. Biological Conservation 18:289-298.

Steinitz, M. J., S. Kemp, D. Russell, M. Salmon, and J. Wyneken. Beach renourishment and loggerhead turtle reproduction: a seven year study at Jupiter Island, Florida. Epperly, S. P.

,Braun, J. Compilers, Proceedings of the Seventeenth Annual Sea Turtle Symposium. U.S. Dep. Commer. NOAA Tech Memo. NMFS-SEFSC-415. 294 pp.; 1998, p. 270-271.

Sternberg, J. 1981. The worldwide distribution of sea turtle nesting beaches. Center for Environmental Education, Washington, D.C.

Stewart, K. and C. Johnson. 2006. *Dermochelys coriacea*-Leatherback sea turtle. In Meylan, P.A. (editor). Biology and Conservation of Florida Turtles. Chelonian Research Monographs 3:144-157.

Stewart, K.R. and J. Wyneken. 2004. Predation risk to loggerhead hatchlings at a high-density nesting beach in Southeast Florida. Bulletin of Marine Science 74(2):325-335.

Stout, I.J. 1992. Southeastern beach mouse. Pages 242-249 *in* Humphrey, S.R. (editor). Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume 1. Mammals. University Press of Florida, Tallahassee, Florida.

Stout, I.J., J.D. Roth, C.L. Parkinson. 2006. The distribution and abundance of southeastern beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus niveiventris*) on the Cape Canaveral Air Force Station. Draft Annual Report to Cape Canaveral Air Force Station. Grant No.: 11-20-6012. 51 pages.

Sumner, F.B. 1926. An Analysis of geographic variation in mice of the *Peromyscus polinoyus* group from Florida and Alabama. Journal of Mammalogy 7:149-184.

Swilling, W.R. 2000. Ecological dynamics of the endangered Alabama beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*). M.S. thesis. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Swilling, W.R., M.C. Wooten, N.R. Holler, and W.J. Lynn. 1998. Population dynamics of Alabama beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*) following Hurricane Opal. American Midland Naturalist 140:287-298.

Talbert, O.R., Jr., S.E. Stancyk, J.M. Dean, and J.M. Will. 1980. Nesting activity of the loggerhead turtle (*Caretta caretta*) in South Carolina I: a rookery in transition. Copeia 1980(4):709-718.

Teska, W.R., M.H. Smith, and J.M. Novak. 1990. Food quality, heterozygosity, and fitness correlated in *Peromyscus polionotus*. Evolution 44:1318-1325.

Toothacker, L. 2004. Beach mouse tracking surveys at Grayton Beach State Park. Florida Park Service, Grayton Beach State Park, Florida.

Traylor-Holzer, K. 2004. Draft Population Viability Analysis for the Alabama Beach Mouse: Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, IUCN/SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, Apple Valley, NM.

Traylor-Holzer, K. 2005. Revised Population Viability Analysis for the Alabama Beach Mouse: Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, IUCN/SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, Apple Valley, NM.

Traylor-Holzer, K. 2006. Final Population Viability Analysis for the Alabama Beach Mouse: Report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, IUCN/SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, Apple Valley, New Mexico.

Trindell, R. 2005. Sea turtles and beach nourishment. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Imperiled Species Management Section. Invited Instructor, CLE Conference.

Trindell, R. 2007. Personal communication. Summary of lighting impacts on Brevard County beaches after beach nourishment. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Imperiled Species Management Section, Tallahassee, Florida to Lorna Patrick, U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Trindell, R., M. Conti, D. Gallagher, and B. Witherington. 2008. Sea turtles and lights on Florida's nesting beaches. Pages 152-153 *in* Kalb, H., A. Rohde, K. Gayheart, and K. Shanker (compilers). Proceedings of the Twenty-fifth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-582.

Turtle Expert Working Group (TEWG). 1998. An assessment of the Kemp's ridley (*Lepidochelys kempii*) and loggerhead (*Caretta caretta*) sea turtle populations in the western North Atlantic. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-409.

Turtle Expert Working Group. 2000. Assessment update for the Kemp's ridley and loggerhead sea turtle populations in the western North Atlantic. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-444. 115 pages.

Turtle Expert Working Group (TEWG). 2007. An assessment of the leatherback turtle population in the Atlantic Ocean. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-555.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 1987. Recovery plan for the Alabama beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus ammobates*), Perdido Key beach mouse (*P. p. trisyllepsis*), and Choctawhatchee beach mouse (*P. p. allophrys*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 1993. Recovery plan for the Anastasia Island and southeastern beach mouse. Atlanta, Georgia.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 1999. Multi-species recovery plan for South Florida. Atlanta, Georgia.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2003a. Choctawhatchee beach mouse trapping survey and translocation report: Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. May 2003. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2003b. Choctawhatchee beach mouse trapping survey and translocation report: Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. October 2003. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2004. Choctawhatchee beach mouse trapping survey and translocation report: Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. May 2004. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2005a. Choctawhatchee beach mouse trapping survey and translocation report: Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. March. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2005b. Choctawhatchee beach mouse trapping survey and translocation report: Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. April. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2005c. Choctawhatchee beach mouse trapping survey and translocation report: Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. June. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2005d. Choctawhatchee beach mouse trapping survey and translocation report: Topsail Hill Preserve State Park. October, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City Field Office, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2006. Strategic Habitat Conservation. Final Report of the National Ecological Assessment Team to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Geologic Survey.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2007a. Choctawhatchee beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*) 5-year review: summary and evaluation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2007b. Perdido Key beach mouse (*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*) 5-year review: summary and evaluation. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2007c. Draft communications plan on the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Role in Climate Change.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2009. Final report on the Mexico/United States of America population restoration project for the Kemp's ridley sea turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii*, on the coasts of Tamaulipas and Veracruz, Mexico.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2010. Final report on the Mexico/United States of America population restoration project for the Kemp's ridley sea turtle, *Lepidochelys kempii*, on the coasts of Tamaulipas and Veracruz, Mexico.

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and National Marine Fisheries Service (Service and NMFS). 1992. Recovery plan for the Kemp's ridley sea turtle (*Lepidochelys kempii*). U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Albuquerque, New Mexico.

Van Zant, J.L. 2000. Trapping data sheet GBSRA, cabins. September 27, 2000. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama.

Van Zant, J.L. 2003. Personal communication about beach mouse genetic research ongoing at Auburn University to Sandra Sneckenberger, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Van Zant, J.L. 2006. Personal communication. Summary of trapping events at Pelican Island National Wildlife Refuge. University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida to Annie Dziergowski, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Jacksonville, Florida.

Van Zant, J.L. and M.C. Wooten. 2003. Translocation of Choctawhatchee beach mice (*Peromyscus polionotus allophrys*): hard lessons learned. Biological Conservation 112(3):405-413.

Van Zant, J.L. and M.C. Wooten. 2006. Personal communication about beach mouse genetic research ongoing at Auburn University to Sandra Sneckenberger, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Panama City, Florida.

Wanless, H.R. and K.L Maier. 2007. An evaluation of beach renourishment sands adjacent to reefal settings, southeast Florida. Southeastern Geology 45(1):25-42.

Webster, P., G. Holland, J. Curry, and H. Chang. 2005. Changes in tropical cyclone number, duration, and intensity in a warming environment. Science 309(5742):1844-1846.

Weishampel, J.F., D.A. Bagley, and L.M. Ehrhart. 2006. Intra-annual loggerhead and green turtle spatial nesting patterns. Southeastern Naturalist 5(3):453-462.

Weston, J. 2007. Captive breeding of beach mice. Peromyscus Genetic Stock Center, University of South Carolina, Columbia, South Carolina.

Wiens, J.A. 1996. Wildlife in patchy environments: metapopulations, mosaics, and management. Pages 53-84 *in* McCullough, D.R. (editor). Metapopulations and Wildlife Conservation. Island Press, Washington D.C.

Williams-Walls, N., J. O'Hara, R.M. Gallagher, D.F. Worth, B.D. Peery, and J.R. Wilcox. 1983. Spatial and temporal trends of sea turtle nesting on Hutchinson Island, Florida, 1971-1979. Bulletin of Marine Science 33(1):55-66.

With, K.A., and T.O. Crist. 1995. Critical thresholds in species responses to landscape structure. Ecology 76:2446-2459.

Witherington, B.E. 1986. Human and natural causes of marine turtle clutch and hatchling mortality and their relationship to hatching production on an important Florida nesting beach. M.S. thesis. University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.

Witherington, B.E. 1992. Behavioral responses of nesting sea turtles to artificial lighting. Herpetologica 48:31-39.

Witherington, B.E. 1997. The problem of photopollution for sea turtles and other nocturnal animals. Pages 303-328 *in* Clemmons, J.R. and R. Buchholz (editors). Behavioral approaches to conservation in the wild. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom.

Witherington, B.E. 2006. Personal communication to Loggerhead Recovery Team on nest monitoring in Florida during 2005. Florida Fish and Wildlife Research Institute.

Witherington, B.E. and L.M. Ehrhart. 1989. Status and reproductive characteristics of green turtles (*Chelonia mydas*) nesting in Florida. Pages 351-352 *in* Ogren, L., F. Berry, K. Bjorndal, H. Kumpf, R. Mast, G. Medina, H. Reichart, and R. Witham (editors). Proceedings of the Second Western Atlantic Turtle Symposium. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-226.

Witherington, B.E. and K.A. Bjorndal. 1991. Influences of artificial lighting on the seaward orientation of hatchling loggerhead turtles (*Caretta caretta*). Biological Conservation 55:139-149.

Witherington, B.E. and R.E. Martin. 1996. Understanding, assessing, and resolving light pollution problems on sea turtle nesting beaches. Florida Marine Research Institute Technical Report TR-2.

Witherington, B.E., K.A. Bjorndal, and C.M. McCabe. 1990. Temporal pattern of nocturnal emergence of loggerhead turtle hatchlings from natural nests. Copeia 1990(4):1165-1168.

Witherington, B., L. Lucas, and C. Koeppel. 2005. Nesting sea turtles respond to the effects of ocean inlets. Pages 355-356 i*n* Coyne, M.S. and R.D. Clark (compilers). Proceedings of the Twenty-first Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-528.

Witzell, W.N. 1998. Long-term tag returns from juvenile Kemp's ridley turtles. Marine Turtle Newsletter 79:20.

Wood, D.W. and K.A. Bjorndal. 2000. Relation of temperature, moisture, salinity, and slope to nest site selection in loggerhead sea turtles. Copeia 2000(1):119-128.

Wooten, M.C. 1994. Estimation of genetic variation and systematic status of populations of the beach mouse, *Peromyscus polionotus*. Final Report, Florida Game and Freshwater Fish Commission. Tallahassee, Florida.

Wooten, M.C. and N.R. Holler. 1999. Genetic analyses within and among natural populations of beach mice. Final report to the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia.

Wyneken, J., L. DeCarlo, L. Glenn, M. Salmon, D. Davidson, S. Weege., and L. Fisher. 1998. On the consequences of timing, location and fish for hatchlings leaving open beach hatcheries. Pages 155-156 *in* Byles, R. and Y. Fernandez (compilers). Proceedings of the Sixteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-412.

Wyneken, J., L.B. Crowder, and S. Epperly. 2005. Final report: evaluating multiple stressors in loggerhead sea turtles: developing a two-sex spatially explicit model. Final Report to the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency National Center for Environmental Research, Washington, DC. EPA Grant Number: R829094.

Young, R.S. 2007. Personal communication with Mary Mittiga and Patty Kelly. January 22, 2007. Western Carolina University, Cullowhee, North Carolina,.

Zug, G.R. and J.F. Parham. 1996. Age and growth in leatherback turtles, *Dermochelys coriacea* (Testidines: Dermochelyidae): a skeletochronological analysis. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2(2):244-249.

Zurita, J.C., R. Herrera, A. Arenas, M.E. Torres, C. Calderón, L. Gómez, J.C. Alvarado, and R. Villavicencio. 2003. Nesting loggerhead and green sea turtles in Quintana Roo, Mexico. Pages 125-127 *in* Seminoff, J.A. (compiler). Proceedings of the Twenty-second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFSC-503.

Appendix A

PREVIOUS FORMAL CONSULTATIONS/BIOLOGICAL OPINIONS WITHIN FLORIDA THAT HAVE BEEN ISSUED FOR ALL PROJECTS THAT HAD ADVERSE IMPACTS TO THE SEA TURTLES ON THE NESTING BEACH

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
STATEWIDE	Nassau, Duval, St. Johns, Flagler, Volusia, Brevard, Indian River, St. Lucie, Martin, Palm Beach, Broward, Monroe, Miami-Dade, Collier, Lee, Charlotte, Sarasota, Manatee, Pinellas, Pasco, Franklin, Gulf, Bay, Walton, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Escambia	FEMA Emergency Beach Berm Repair	2007-F-0430		Repair of 5-year beach berms post-disaster	75 miles
JAX FIELD OFFICE						
1991	Brevard	Lighting at Cape Canaveral Air Force and Patrick Air Force Station	4-1-91-028	Lighting at both installations	Sea turtle lighting	75 disoriented loggerhead nests; 2 green turtles nests at CCAFS and 2 loggerhead nests at PAFB
1993	Brevard	Beach nourishment on Cape Canaveral	4-1-93-073C		Beach nourishment	2 miles
1995	Brevard	Inlet Bypass on Brevard County Beach at Cape Canaveral		R-1 to R-14	Inlet bypass	
1996	Brevard	Canaveral Port Authority Dredge and Beach Disposal		R-34 to R-38	Dredge and beach restoration	
1998	Brevard	Inlet bypass on Brevard County Beach at Cape Canaveral		R-1 to R-14		
2000	Brevard	Amended Lighting at Cape Canaveral Air Force and Patrick Air Force Station	00-0545	Lighting at both installations	Sea turtle lighting	2 percent hatchling and nesting female disorientations at each installation.
2001	Brevard	Brevard County Shore Protection Project (North Reach)		R-5 to R-12 and R-13 to R-54.5	Beach nourishment	9.4 miles
2001	Brevard	Patrick Air Force Base Beach Restoration		R-53 to R-70	Beach nourishment	

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
2002	Brevard	Brevard County Shore Protection Project (South Reach)		R-123.5 to R-139	Beach nourishment	3.02 miles
2002	Brevard	Brevard County Shore Protection Project (North Reach)		R-4 to R-20	Beach nourishment	
2002	Brevard	Permanent Sand Tightening of North Jetty at Canaveral Harbor	02-1090	North jetty at Canaveral Inlet	Sand tightening and extension of existing jetty	500 feet
2003	Brevard	Brevard County Shore Protection Project (South Reach)		R-118.3 to R-123.5		0.94 mile
2004	Brevard	Canaveral Harbor Federal Sand Bypass and Beach Placement	04-0077	R-14 to R-20	Inlet bypass and beach nourishment	18,600 linear feet
2005	Brevard	Brevard County Shore Protection Project (North and South Reach)	05-0443	R-5 to R-20 and R-21 to R-54.5 and R-118 to R-139	Beach nourishment	13.2 miles
2005	Brevard	Brevard County FEMA Berm and Dune Restoration	05-1054	R-75 to R-118	Dune repair	12 miles
2005	Brevard	Patrick Air Force Base Beach Restoration	05-0258	R-54.5 to R-75.3	Beach nourishment	
2005	Brevard	Sloped Geotexile Revetment Armoring Structures	05-0454	5 tubes along north and south Melbourne beach	Protec tube installation	4,600 linear feet
2006	Brevard	Brevard County FEMA Berm and Dune Restoration	41910-2006-F-0189	R-75 to R-118	Dune repair	12 miles
2006	Brevard	Amended Lighting at Cape Canaveral Air Force and Patrick Air Force Station	41910-2006-F-0841		Sea turtle lighting	3 percent hatchling and nesting female disorientations at each installation
15 Feb 2008	Brevard	Patrick Air Force Base Dune Restoration	41910-2008-F-0150	R-65 to R-70	Dune restoration	6,000 linear feet
25 Jan 2008	Brevard	Brevard County's Dune Restoration	41910-2008-F-0189	R-75 to R-118 and R-138 to R-202	Dune restoration	140,000 cy along 3,000 linear feet
2009	Brevard	Brevard County's Dune Restoration	41910-2009-F-0125	R 75.4 to R 118.3 and R-139 to R-213	Dune restoration	22 miles
2009	Brevard	Mid Reach		R-75 to R119	Beach berm repair (permanent)	40,748 linear feet
2009	Brevard	South Beach		R-139 to R-215	Beach berm repair (permanent)	70,385 linear feet

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
2009	Brevard	Patrick Air Force Base Dune Restoration and Beach Nourishment	41910-2009-F-0336	R-36 to R-75, R-53 to R-65	Sand placement	8,500 linear feet for dune restoration and 11,235 linear feet for beach nourishment.
2009	Brevard	Brevard Dune Restoration	41910-2009-F-0125	R-75.4 to R-118.3, R-139 to R-213	Dune restoration	Periodically on no more than 22 miles.
2009	Brevard	Mid Reach Shore Protection	41910-2008-F-0547	R-119 to R-75.4	Sand placement	7.7 linear miles
2009	Brevard	Canaveral Harbor Sand Bypass	41910-2008-F-0547	Canaveral Harbor	Sand bypass	18,600 linear no more than every 2 years
2009	Brevard	Kennedy Space Center Lighting	41910-2009-F-0306			3% of all hatchling disorientation events
2009	Brevard	South Beach Renourishment	41910-2009-F-0327			7.8 miles
1991	Duval	Duval County Beach Erosion Control		R-44 to R-52.5	Beach nourishment	9,000 linear feet
1996	Duval	Duval County Beach Erosion Control		R-47 to R-80	Beach nourishment	5 miles
2003	Duval	Duval County Beach Erosion Control		R-72 to R-80	Beach nourishment	
2005	Duval	Duval County Beach Erosion Control	05-1544	R-43 to R-53 and R-57 to R-80	Beach nourishment	5.7 miles
2010	Duval	Duval County Hurricane and Storm Damage Reduction	2010-CPA-0045	V-501 to R-80	Beach nourishment	52,800 linear feet
2005	Flagler	Road Stabilization from SR A1A	41910-2006-IE-0173		Seawall	140 linear feet
2009	Flager	State Road (SR) A1A Shoreline Stabilization	41910-2007-F-0495	200 feet south of South 28th Street to 980 feet south of Osprey Point Drive	Sand placement, revetments, and seawalls	5.2 miles = length of take; 3,000 linear feet of anticipated incidental take
2005	Hillsborough	Egmont Key Nourishment	05-1845	R-2 to R-10	Beach nourishment	8,000 linear feet
1993	Manatee	Anna Maria Island Beach Restoration		R-2 to R-36	Beach nourishment	4.7 miles
1997	Manatee	Dredge Material Disposal and Longboat Key Beach Restoration		R-48 to R-51	Dredge and beach nourishment	
2002	Manatee	Anna Maria Island Beach Restoration		R-7 to R-10 and R-12 to R-36	Beach nourishment	5.2 miles
2005	Manatee	Anna Maria Island Shore Protection Project	41910-2006-F-0079	R-7 to R-10	Beach nourishment	3,000 linear feet

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
2005	Manatee	Anna Maria Island Emergency Beach Restoration	05-1227	R-2 to R-41	Beach nourishment	4.2 miles
2005	Manatee	Town of Longboat Key Beach Renourishment	4-1-04-TR-4529	R-44.5 to R-46	Beach nourishment	0.34 mile
2007	Manatee	Longboat Key Groin Installation	41910-2007-F-0521		Groin installation	2,210 linear feet
2009	Manatee	Anna Maria Island Beach Nourishment	41910-2008-F-456	R-7 to R-10, R-35 +790 feet and R-41 +365 feet	Sand placement	8,000 linear feet
2010	Manatee	Longboat Key North End Nourishment	41910-2010-F-0301			4,015 linear feet of beach
1994	Nassau	South Amelia Island Beach Restoration		R-60 to R-78	Beach nourishment	
1997	Nassau	Dredging of Sawpit Creek Cut and Beach Disposal		R-73.5 to R-78	Dredge and beach nourishment	2,900 linear feet
2002	Nassau	South Amelia Island Beach Restoration		R-50 to R-80	Beach nourishment	3.4 miles
2002	Nassau	Fernandina Harbor Dredge and Beach Disposal		R-1 to R-9	Dredge and beach nourishment	8,000 linear feet
2004	Nassau	Nassau County Shore Protection Project at Amelia Island	05-1355	R-9 to R-33	Beach nourishment	3.6 miles
2005	Nassau	Nassau County Shore Protection Project at Amelia Island	05-1355	R-11 to R-34	Beach nourishment	4.3 miles
2005	Nassau	Dredging of Sawpit Creek Cut and Beach Disposal	41910-2006-F-0254	R-73.5 to R-78	Dredge and beach nourishment	2,900 linear feet
1988	Pinellas	Sand Key/Redington Beach Restoration		R-99 to R-107	Beach nourishment	
1990	Pinellas	Sand Key/Indian Rocks Beach Restoration		R-72 to R-85	Beach nourishment	
1991	Pinellas	Long Key Beach Restoration		R-144 to R-147	Beach nourishment	0.45 mile
1991	Pinellas	Johns Pass Dredge Material Disposal		R-127 to R-130	Dredge disposal and sand placement	
1992	Pinellas	Sand Key/Redington Beach Restoration		R-99 to R-107	Beach nourishment	
1992	Pinellas	Sand Key/Indian Shore Beach Restoration		R-85 to R-99	Beach nourishment	
1996	Pinellas	Treasure Island Beach Restoration		R-138 to R-142	Beach nourishment	2,500 linear feet
1996	Pinellas	Long Key Beach Restoration		R-144 to R-146	Beach nourishment	0.45 mile

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
1998	Pinellas	Sand Key/Belleair Beach Restoration		R-56 to R-66	Beach nourishment	
1999	Pinellas	Sand Key Beach Restoration		R-71 to R-107	Beach nourishment	
2000	Pinellas	Treasure Island Beach Restoration		R-136 to R-141	Beach nourishment	2.0 miles
2000	Pinellas	Terminal Groin at North End of Treasure Island			Groin construction	
2000	Pinellas	Long Key Beach Restoration		R-144 to R-145.6	Beach nourishment	2,800 linear feet
2000	Pinellas	Dredge Material Disposal and Honeymoon Island Beach Restoration		R-10 to R-12	Dredge disposal and sand placement	
2004	Pinellas	Treasure Island Beach Restoration	04-1247	R-136 to R-141	Beach nourishment	5,000 feet
2004	Pinellas	Long Key Beach Restoration	04-1247	R-144 to R-148	Beach nourishment	4,000 linear feet
2005	Pinellas	Sand Key Emergency Renourishment	05-0627	R-56 to R-66 and R-72 to R-106	Beach nourishment	8.6 miles
2006	Pinellas	Treasure Island, Sunset, Long Key, Pass a Grill Emergency Renourishment	41910-2006-F-0480	R-126 to R-146	Beach nourishment	9.5 miles
2006	Pinellas	Dredge Material Disposal and Mullet Key and Fort DeSoto Beach Restoration	41910-2006-F-0692	R-177 to R-179.5 and R-181 to R-183	Dredge disposal and sand placement	4,500 linear feet
2009	Pinellas	Treasure Island Beach Nourishment	41910-2009-F-0250	R-136 to R-141, R-144 to R-148	Sand placement	11,375 linear feet
1997	St. Johns	Maintenance Dredging of Matanzas Inlet and Sand Placement at Summer Haven	98-171D	R-197 to R-209		
2001	St. Johns	Maintenance Dredging of Matanzas Inlet and Sand Placement at Summer Haven	98-171D			
2002	St. Johns	St. Johns County Shore Protection Project at St. Augustine		R-137 to R-152	Beach nourishment	2.5 miles
2003	St. Johns	St. Johns County Shore Protection Project at St. Augustine		R-132 to R-152	Beach nourishment	3.8 miles

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
2003	St. Johns	Maintenance Dredging of Matanzas Inlet and Sand Placement at Summer Haven	98-171D	R-197 to R-209	Beach nourishment	
2005	St. Johns	St. Johns County Shore Protection Project at St. Augustine	05-0446	R-137 to R-150	Beach nourishment	2.5 miles
2006	St. Johns		TE091980-0		Beach driving	41.1 linear miles
2007	St. Johns	Maintenance Dredging of Matanzas Inlet and Sand Placement at Summer Haven	41910-2007-F-0305	R-200 to R-208	Beach nourishment	4,000 linear feet
2009	St. Johns	Beach berm repair		R-201 to R-203, R-207 to R-208	Beach berm repair	7,000 linear feet
2009	St. Johns	Matanzas Inlet Maintenance Dredge and Summer Haven Sand Placement	41910-2009-F-0462	R-200 to R-208	Sand placement	8,000 linear feet
2009	St. Johns	St. Augustine Shore Protection Project	41910-2009-F-0444	600 feet north of R-137 and 600 feet south of R-151	Sand placement	15,280 linear feet
2010	St. Johns	St. Augustine Inlet Dredge and Sand Placement	41910-2010-F-0105			20,000 linear feet
2004	Volusia	Volusia County FEMA Berm	05-1074	R-40 to R-145 and R-161 to R-208	Beach nourishment	
2005	Volusia	Ponce de Leon Dredge and Beach Placement	05-0884	R-143 to R-145	Dredge and sand placement	3,000 linear feet
2005	Volusia		TE811813-11		Beach driving	50 miles
2006	Volusia	New Smyrna/Silver Sands Dune Restoration	05-1007	R-161 to R-175	Beach restoration	5.4 miles
2006	Volusia	Volusia County FEMA Berm	41910-2006-F-0831		Repair of right of way and beach placement	230 linear feet
2007	Volusia	Ponce de Leon Dredge and Beach Placement	41910-2007-F-0109	R-158 to R-175	Dredge and sand placement	3.2 miles
2009	Volusia	Ponce de Leon Inlet Maintenance Dredging and Sand Placement	41910-2009-F-0362	R-143 to R-145	Sand placement	8,000 linear feet
PANAMA CITY FIELD OFFICE						
8 April 1998	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment	4-P-97-108	R-4.4 and R-93.2	Beach nourishment new project	16 miles
24 June 1998	Bay	Tyndall AFB Driving on the Beach	4-P-98-020	V-9 (virtual) to R-122	Driving on the beach for military missions	18 miles

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
31 July 1998	Bay	Lake Powell Emergency Opening	4-P-97-089	R- 0.5	Emergency outlet opening	1,500 feet
16 April 1999	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment Amendment 1	4-P-97-108	R-0.5 to R-9	Beach nourishment completion	16 miles (no additional take provided from original)
9 March 2000	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment Amendment 2	4-P-97-108	R-35 to R-71	Relief from tilling requirement beach nourishment	16 miles (no additional take provided from original)
10 April 2000	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment Amendment 3	4-P-97-108	R-35 to R-71	Relief from tilling requirement beach nourishment	16 miles (no additional take provided from original)
18 December 2000	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment Amendment 4	4-P-97-108	R-35 to R-71	Relief from tilling depth requirement and compaction testing sample numbers beach nourishment	16 miles (no additional take provided from original)
4 January 2001	Bay	East Pass Re-Opening	4-P-00-211	No R-monuments	Dredging of a closed inlet and dredged material placement on beach	2 miles
29 March 2001	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment Amendment 5	4-P-97-108	R-35 to R-71	Relief from tilling depth requirement beach nourishment	16 miles (no additional take provided from original)
7 Sept 2001	Bay	City of Mexico Beach Sand Bypass System	4-P-01-178	Mexico Beach canal	Dredging and spoil disposal	3,700 feet 2.0 acres
14 January 2005	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment Amendment 5	4-P-97-108	R-4.4 and R-93.2	Post hurricane restoration	16 miles (no additional take provided from original)
2006	Bay	Tyndall Air Force Base INRMP	4-P-05-240	V-9 (virtual) to R-122	Integrated Natural Resources Management Plan	18 miles
26 March 2006	Bay	Mexico Beach Canal Sand By Pass Amendment 1	4-P-05-281 2007-F-0205	R-127 to R-129	By pass system improvements	5,000 feet
24 May 2007	Bay	Panama City Beach Beach Nourishment Amendment 6	4-P-97-108 2007-TA-0127	R-4.5 to R-30 and R-76 to R-88	New work and post hurricane restoration	31,500 feet of 16 miles total no additional take provided
25 October 2007	Bay	Panama City Beach Nourishment Amendment 8	2008-F-0004	2008 project: R-74 to R-91; Entire project: R-0.5 to R-91	Beach nourishment	17.9 miles
29 Feb 2008	Bay	Panama City Harbor (revised BO)	2008-F-0168	R-97	Navigation channel maintenance dredging and beach placement of dredged material.	500 ft of beachfront at St. Andrew State Park

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
8 June 2009	Bay	Panama City Harbor Navigation Channel Amendment 1	2009-F-0175	R-92 to R-97	Maintenance navigation channel dredging and dredged material placement	0.85 mile
2009	Bay	City of Mexico Beach		R-128.5 to R-138.2	Beach berm repair (emergency)	9,393 linear feet
06 Jan 2010	Bay	Lake Powell Outlet Emergency Opening	2009-F-0226	R-0-A and R-1	Emergency opening of the outlet to the Gulf of Mexico	2,400 feet
7 August 2000	Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, Bay, Gulf, Franklin	Destin Dome OCS Offshore Oil and Gas Drilling	4-P-00-003	Gulf of Mexico federal waters	Oil and gas offshore exploration	Formal consultation with no take
3 June 2002	Escambia	Pensacola Beach Beach Nourishment	4-P-02-056	R-108 to R-143	Beach nourishment	8.3 miles Loggerhead 14 nests Green 1 nest Leatherback < 1 nest Kemp's ridley <1 nest
9 June 2009	Escambia	Perdido Key Beach Nourishment	2008-F-0059	R-1 to R-34	New beach nourishment	6.5 miles
9 Sept 2010	Escambia	Pensacola Navigation Channel	2009-F-0205; using statewide programmatic 41910-2010-F-0547	R-32 to R-64	Navigation channel maintenance and dredge material disposal	6.3 miles
11 Jan 2010	Escambia	FEMA Perdido Key Upland Berm	Using statewide programmatic 41910-2010-F-0547	R-21.5 to R-31.5	Post Tropical Storm Gustav berm	2.0 miles
8 April 2005	Escambia, Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Walton, Bay, Gulf	FEMA Beach Berms Post Hurricane Ivan Emergency Coordination (consultation incomplete)		UK	Emergency beach berms	Walton 20 miles Okaloosa 4.2 miles Mexico Bch 1 mile Panama City Bch UK St Joseph peninsula UK Perdido Key UK Navarre UK
10 May 2004	Franklin	Alligator Point Beach Nourishment	4-P-02-163	R-207 to R-210	Beach nourishment	2,500 feet Loggerhead,: 2 nests, green 1 nest; leatherback 1 nest
17 May 2007	Gulf	St. Joseph Peninsula Beach Nourishment	4-P-07-056 2007-F-0220	R-67 to R-105.5	Beach nourishment	7.5 miles
31 Jan 2008	Gulf	St. Joseph Peninsula Beach Nourishment; Amendment 2	2008-F-0161	R-67 to R-105.5	Beach nourishment – change from work in 2 to 1 season.	7.5 miles; no increase in IT.
2009	Gulf	St. Joseph Peninsula Beach		R-95.3 to R-105.5	Beach berm repair (emergency)	10,300 linear feet

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
25 April 2001	Okaloosa	Eglin AFB Porous Groin within Season	4-P-00-207	Eglin AFB Test Sites 1 and 3	Experimental porous groin system	
18 June 2002	Okaloosa	Eglin 737 Sensor Test Site 13-A SRI	4-P-02-088	V-507	Military testing	0.01 acre 0.12 mile
2009	Okaloosa	City of Destin		R-17.37 to R-19	Beach berm repair (emergency)	1,260 linear feet
23 Dec 2009	Okaloosa	East Pass at Destin Navigation Channel	2009-F-0096	R-17 to R-25.5	Navigational channel maintenance	1.7 miles
21 March 2003	Okaloosa Santa Rosa	Eglin Marine Expeditionary Unit Training	4-P-03-052	V-621 to V-501	Military marine training	
9 October 2003	Okaloosa Santa Rosa	Eglin AFB U.S. Army Ranger Los Banos	4-P-03-289	V-502 to V-533	Military army training	7 miles
25 February 2004	Okaloosa, Santa Rosa	Eglin AFB Advance Skills Training	4-P-03-264	R-502 to R-534	Military training	7 miles 70 acres
4 June 2004	Okaloosa Santa Rosa	Eglin AFB Airborne Littoral Reconnaissance Test	4-P-04-225	V-501 to V-514	Military naval testing	0.5 mile 15.2 acres
1 December 2005	Okaloosa Santa Rosa	Eglin Air Force Base Military Mission & Training Santa Rosa Island Programmatic	4-P-05-242	V-621 to V-501	Military missions	17 miles
6 December 2007	Okaloosa Santa Rosa	Eglin AFB Airborne Littoral Reconnaissance Test	2008-F-0056	V-501 to V-514 Test Site A-15	Military naval testing	0.7 acre
3 June 2008	Okaloosa Santa Rosa	Eglin AFB Beach and Dune Restoration	2008-F-0139	V-551 to V-609 excluding non-AF lands and V-512 to V-518	Beach nourishment including dune restoration (new)	5.0 miles
28 August 2008	Okaloosa, Santa Rosa	Eglin Air Force Base Armoring Santa Rosa Island Test Sites A-3, A-6, A-13B	2008-F-061	Test Sites A-3, A-6, A-13B	Storm protection at air force facilities, Santa Rosa island	0.57 miles
21 April 2009	Okaloosa, Santa Rosa	East Pass Destin Navigation Channel	2009-F-0295	V-619.5 to V-621 and R-17	Maintenance navigation channel dredging and dredged material placement	1.6 miles
28 Dec 2009	Okaloosa, Santa Rosa	Eglin Air Force Base protection of Test Sites A-3, A-13, and A-13b	2008-F-061 amendment 1	V-608 and V-512	Sand placement 100% proposed at sites A-3 and 50% of proposed between sites A-13b and A-13.	A-3, = 7,000 feet; between A-13b and A-13.5=5,500-7,000 feet

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
28 Dec 2009	Okaloosa, Santa Rosa	Eglin Air Force Base	2008-F-039 amendment 1	V-608 and V-512	Sand placement 100% proposed at sites A-3 and 50% of proposed between sites A-13b and A-13.	A-3, = 7,000 feet; between A-13b and A-13.5=5,500-7,000 feet
26 March 2002	Santa Rosa, Okaloosa, Gulf	Eglin AFB INRMP		V-621 to V-501	Integrated natural resources management program	17 miles
19 July 2005	Santa Rosa	Navarre Beach Nourishment Emergency Coordination (consultation incomplete)	4-P-04-244	R-192.5 to R-213.5	Emergency beach nourishment	4.1 miles
24 Aug 2006	Santa Rosa	Navarre Beach Restoration Amendment 1	4-P-04-244 2007-F-0139		Walkover construction associated with beach nourishment	4.1 miles (no additional take provided from original)
30 Aug 2006	Santa Rosa	Navarre Beach Restoration Amendment 1	4-P-04-244 2007-F-0139		Walkover construction associated with beach nourishment	4.1 miles (no additional take provided from original)
29 Nov 2006	Santa Rosa	Navarre Beach Restoration Amendment 1	4-P-04-244 2007-F-0139		Walkover construction associated with beach nourishment	4.1 miles (no additional take provided from original)
28 August 2008	Santa Rosa	Eglin AFB SRI Armoring at Test Sites	2008-F-0061	V-608, V-551, and V-512	Bulkheads around test sites A-3, A-6, and A-13B	0.57 mile
7 Dec 2006	Santa Rosa	Navarre Beach Restoration Amendment 1	4-P-04-244 2007-F-0139		Walkover construction associated with beach nourishment	4.1 miles (no additional take provided from original)
9 October 2009	Santa Rosa	Navarre Beach Restoration Amendment 7	2010-F-0036	R-192 to R-194	Emergency beach restoration	1,800 feet
30 April 2004	Walton, Okaloosa	Walton County-Destin Beach Nourishment	4-P-01-149	R-39 (Okaloosa Co.) to R-21.93 (Walton Co.)	New beach nourishment	6.7 miles Loggerhead: 11 nests; green 1 nests; leatherback & Kemp's ridley: < 1 nests
8 May 2006	Walton	Western Lake Emergency Opening	4-P-01-105	R-72 to R-73	Emergency outlet opening	0.5 miles 3.0 acres
26 October 2007	Walton	Eastern Lake Emergency Opening	2007-F-0627	R-94 to R-95	Emergency opening of coastal dune lake to GOM	0.5 mile

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
9 November 2007	Walton	Alligator Lake Emergency Opening	2007-F-0031	R-68 to R-70	Emergency opening of coastal dune lake to GOM	0.5 mile
2 October 2008	Walton	Walton County Beach Nourishment Phase 2	2008-F-060	R-41 to R-67, R-78 to R-98, R-105.5 to R-127	Beach nourishment (new)	13.5 miles
SOUTH FLORIDA FIELD OFFICE						3,390 feet
11 March 2003	Broward	Broward County Shore Protection Project	4-1-99-F-506		Port Everglades dredging and beach nourishment	
4 Dec 2003	Broward	Diplomat Beach Nourishment	4-1-00-F-743		Nourishment and 200 feet of riprap	
25 Aug 2004	Broward	Fishermen's Pier	4-1-04-F-8366		Pier repair	14,910 square feet
18 June 2007	Broward	Hillsboro Inlet Maintenance Dredging and Sand Placement	41420-2006-FA-0896	315 feet of the Inlet and 500 feet of shoreline at R-25.	Inlet dredging and sand nourishment	500 feet
10 Dec 2007	Broward	Town of Hillsboro Beach Pressure Equalizing Modules (PEMs) Pilot Project	41420-2007-F-0859	300 feet north of R-7 to 100 feet south of R-12 1 mile of shoreline	Pilot project to investigate the effectiveness of the PEMs	1 mile
7 Mar 2008	Broward	Broward County Glass Cullet Pilot Project	41420-2007-FA-0599	Centered at R-103	Pilot project to examine the effectiveness of glass cullet as potential beach fill supplement material for shoreline stabilization.	333 feet
28 April 2008	Broward	Town of Hillsboro Truck Haul Beach Nourishment Project	41420-2008-FA-0187	330 feet north and 100 feet south of R-7	Temporary beach nourishment	0.08 mile (430 feet)
3 Sept 2008	Broward	Hillsboro Inlet Maintenance Dredging and Sand Placement	41420-2006-FA-0896	500 feet south of R-25	Inlet dredging and sand placement. This is an amended BO in regard to the original BO completed on 18 June 2007.	500 feet
28 May 2010	Broward	Port Everglades Jetty Repair	41420-2010-CPA-0144	South Jetty	Repair of the south jetty.	0.15 mile

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
18 June 2010	Broward	Hillsboro Beach Sand Placement	41420-2008-FA-0187	R-5 +300 to R-12 +450 feet	Beach nourishment	1.35 miles
23 March 2005	Charlotte	Manasota Key Groin Construction	4-1-04-F-8338	R-19 to R-20	Stump Pass dredging (material placed on beach); and groin construction	1,000 feet
29 March 2006	Charlotte	Stump Pass Dredging and Beach Nourishment	4-1-04-F-8338	R-16.5 to R-18	Stump Pass dredging and beach nourishment	1,500 feet
26 April 2010	Charlotte	Stump Pass Dredging and Sand Placement	41420-2008-FA-0425	R-14.4 to R-20 R-22 to R-23 R-29 to R-39	Stump Pass dredging and sand placement	3.5 miles
3 April 2003	Collier	Keewaydin Island Limited Partnership T-Groin Project	4-02-F-1099	R-90 to R-91	Gordon Pass – maintenance dredge; nourish the section of beach where groins are to be constructed; construct three t-groins	1,000 feet
14 March 2005	Collier	Hideaway Beach	4-1-04-F-6342	H-1 to H-5 and H-9 to H-12	Beach nourishment and t-groin construction	1.4 miles
20 Sept 2005	Collier	Collier County Beach Re-Nourishment Project	4-1-04-TR-8709	Segments within R-22 and R-79	Beach nourishment	13.4 miles
14 Nov 2005	Collier	South Marco Island Beach Re-Nourishment	4-1-04-TR-11752	R-144 to G-2	Beach nourishment	0.83 mile
28 August 2008	Collier	Doctor's Pass North Jetty Repair	41420-2008-FA-0432	R-57 plus 500 feet south	Removing the existing 240 feet of existing jetty and constructing a new jetty within generally the same footprint.	0.25 mile
27 October 2009	Collier	Hideaway Beach Erosion Control	41420-2008-FA-0935	H-4 to H-9	Sand placement and construction of six T-head groins.	0.47 mile
18 August 2010	Collier	Gordon Pass Erosion Control Project – Phase 2 (T-head groins)	41420-2008-FA-0765	R-91 to R-92	Construction of two T-head groins.	0.19 mile
28 Oct 2010	Collier	Collier County Truck Haul Sand Placement (Park Shore & Naples Beach)	41420-2010-F-0225	R-45 +600 feet to R-46 +400 feet; R-58A -500 feet to R-58	A truck haul sand placement project	0.37 mile

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
12 Oct 2004	Indian River	Issuance of Permits to Homeowners for Emergency Coastal Armoring	10(a)(1)(B) permit			3,196 feet
28 Feb 2005	Indian River	Indian River County Beach Nourishment - Sectors 3 and 5	4-1-05-F-10922	Gaps between R-21 and R-107	Dune restoration and beach nourishment	5.90 miles dunes 0.8 mile beach
22 Nov 2005	Indian River	Indian River County Beach Nourishment – Sector 7	4-1-05-TR-9179	R-97 to R-108	Beach nourishment	2.2 miles
31 Oct 2006	Indian River	Indian River County Beach Nourishment – Sectors 1 and 2	41420-2006-FA-1491	R-3.5 to R-12	Dune enhancement and beach nourishment	1.62 miles
10 Sept 2007	Indian River	Sebastian Inlet Channel and Sand Trap Dredging, Sectors 1 and 2 Beach Nourishment	41420-2007-F-0864	R-3 to R-12	Sand trap dredging and beach nourishment	1.61 miles
10 October 2008	Indian River	Baytree and Marbrisa Condominium Dune Restoration	41420-2008-FA-0007	200 feet south of R-46 to 200 feet south of R-48	Dune restoration/enhancement	0.38 mile
16 October 2009	Indian River	City of Vero Beach, Outfall Pipe Installation	41420-2009-FA-0255	220 feet north and 930 feet south of R-83	Outfall pipe installation	0.22 mile
2 December 2009	Indian River	Indian River County Beach Nourishment Sector 3	41420-2007-F-0839	Phase 1 = R-32 to R-55 Phase 2 = R-20 to R-32	Beach and dune nourishment	Phase 1 = ~4.4 miles Phase 2 = ~2.3 miles
24 July 2002	Lee	Gasparilla Island Beach Nourishment	4-01-F-765	R-10 to R-26.5 R-25, R-25.5, R-26	Beach nourishment; breakwater construction; and two t-head groins	3.2 miles
19 June 2003	Lee	Bonita Beach Re-nourishment	4-1-02-F-1736		Beach nourishment	3,922 feet
4 March 2005	Lee	Sanibel and Captiva Island Beach Nourishment	4-1-04-F-9180	R-83 to R-109 and R-110 to R-118	Beach nourishment	6.0 miles
14 March 2007	Lee	Gasparilla Island Beach Nourishment (BO amendment)	41420-2007-FA-0509	South of R-26A	Beach nourishment	
27 August 2007	Lee	North Captiva Island Beach Nourishment	41420-2007-FA-1023	R-81 and 208 feet south of R-81A	Beach nourishment	0.23 mile
5 August 2009	Lee	Matanzas Pass Reopening	41420-2009-FA-0132	North end of Estero Island	Channel dredging	0.14 mile

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
21 March 2008	Lee	Blind Pass Reopening	41420-2006-FA-1549	R-109 to R-114	Reopening Blind Pass and then nourishing the shoreline between R-112 and R-114.	0.95 mile
7 Dec 2009	Lee	Sanibel Island Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0066	R-174A to Bay 1A	Beach nourishment	0.25 mile
15 Sept 2010	Lee	Big Hickory Island Sand Placement and Groin Construction	41420-2010-CPA-0100	R-222.3 to R-223.8	Beach nourishment and groin construction	0.47 mile
31 Jan 2002	Martin	Jupiter Island	4-1-05-TR-13281	R-75 to R-117	Beach nourishment	6.5 miles
5 Jan 2005	Martin	Martin County Shore Protection Project	4-1-05-F-10476	R-1 to R-25.6	Beach nourishment	4.1 miles
2 Dec 2005	Martin	Jupiter Island Modification	4-1-05-TR-13281	R-76 to R-84 and R-87 to R-11	Beach nourishment	5 miles
2 Feb 2007	Martin	Sailfish Point Marina Channel Dredging and Beach Nourishment	41420-2007-FA-0196	R-36 to R-39	Channel dredging and beach nourishment	0.66 mile
6 October 2009	Martin	Bathtub Beach Park Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0110	R-34.5 to R-36	Beach nourishment	0.24 mile
8 June 2010	Martin	Martin County Beach Erosion Control Project	41420-2009-FA-0190	R-1 to R-25	Beach nourishment	~ 4 miles
23 Sept 2005	Miami-Dade	Bal-Harbour T-Groin Reconstruction	4-1-05-12842	R-27 to R-31.5	Groin removal and reconstruction	0.85 mile
11 Oct 2005	Miami-Dade	Bakers Haulover AIW Maintenance Dredging	4-1-04-TR-8700	R-28 to R-32	Dredging and beach nourishment	0.85 mile
7 June 2006	Miami-Dade	Miami-Dade Beach Nourishment	41420-2006-FA-0028	3 segments within R-48.7 and R-61	Beach nourishment	3,716 feet
25 July 2007	Miami-Dade	Miami Beach Nourishment	41420-2006-F-0028	R-67 to R-70	BO modification to June 7, 2006 BO	3,000 feet
5 Nov 2008	Miami-Dade	Baker's Haulover Dredging and Sand Placement	41420-2008-FA-0729	R-28 to R-32	BO modification to the October 11, 2005 BO. Dredging and sand placement events will be biannual.	4,000 feet
12 Nov 2008	Miami-Dade	DERM Truck Haul Sand Placement	41420-2008-FA-0776	R-27 to R-29 R-7 to R-12 R-43 to R-44+500 feet	Beach nourishment	1.78 miles
25 Nov 2009	Miami-Dade	DERM 27th Street Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0045	R-60 to R-61	Beach nourishment	0.19 mile
17 Dec 2009	Miami-Dade	32nd and 63rd Streets Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0415	R-37.75 to R-46.25 R-53.7 to R-55.5 R-60 to R-61	Sand placement	2.14 miles

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
31 March 2010	Miami-Dade	55th Street Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0046	R-48.7 to R-50.7	Sand placement	0.38 mile
30 April 2010	Miami-Dade	44th Street Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0047	R-53.7 to R-55.5	Sand placement	0.34 mile
25 June 2010	Miami-Dade	Bal Harbour Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0593	R-29 to R-32	Sand Placement – truck haul	0.60 mile
28 June 2010	Miami-Dade	Sunny Isles BeachSand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0594	R-12 to R-15)	Sand Placement – truck haul	0.58 mile
30 July 2010	Miami-Dade	Miami Beach sand placement	41420-2009-FA-0595	R-45 to R-48 +700 feet	Sand Placement – truck haul	0.78 mile
13 Sept 2010	Miami-Dade	Miami Beach sand placement	41420-2009-FA-0527	R-43 to R-44 + 500 feet	Sand Placement – truck haul	0.26 mile
8 October 2010	Miami-Dade	Sunny Isles Beach Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0526	R-7 to R-12	Sand Placement – truck haul	0.95 mile
8 October 2010	Miami-Dade	Bal Harbour Sand Placement	41420-2009-FA-0525	R-27 to R-29	Sand Placement – truck haul	0.38 mile
2009	Monroe	Reclaimed sand placement and sand cleaning (seaweed removal)	41420-2010-F-0006	No R-monuments	Sand placement and cleaning	1,462 linear feet
2009	Monroe	City of Key West (South Beach)	41420-2010-F-0013	No R-monuments	Beach repair (emergency)	235 linear feet
2009	Monroe	City of Key West (Rest Beach)	41420-2010-F-0014	No R-monuments	Beach repair (emergency)	640 linear feet
2009	Monroe	City of Marathon, Sombrero Beach	41420-2010-F-0001	No R-monuments	Beach repair (emergency)	1,380 linear feet
5 March 2010	Monroe	City of Key West – Simonton Beach	41420-2010-FC-0412	Approximately 350 feet ENE of V-416 (latitude 24.562, longitude -81.8054	Emergency beach repair	95 linear feet
5 March 2010	Monroe	City of Key West – Dog Beach	41420-2010-FC-0413	Between V-414 and V-413 (latitude 24.5473, longitude -81.7929	Emergency beach repair	35 linear feet
13 May 2010	Monroe	City of Key West, Smathers Beach	41420-2008-FA-0185	No R-monuments	Sand placement	0.57 mile
27 March 2003	Palm Beach	Palm Beach Harbor M & O	4-1-03-F-139	200 feet south of the south jetty	Jetty sand tightening	200 feet
16 March 2004	Palm Beach	Boca Raton Inlet Sand Bypassing	4-1-04-F-4688	200 feet south of R-223	Inlet sand bypassing and beach nourishment	500 feet
11 Feb 2005	Palm Beach	Palm Beach Shoreline Protection Project - Delray Segment	4-1-05-F-10767	R-175 to R-188	Beach restoration	2.7 miles

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
24 Feb 2005	Palm Beach	Palm Beach Shoreline Protection Project - Ocean Ridge Section	4-1-05-F-10787	R-153 to R-159	Beach nourishment	1.12 miles
11 April 2005	Palm Beach	South Lake Worth Inlet Sand Transfer Plant Reconstruction and Bypassing	4-1-04-F-8640	135 feet south of R-151, to 275 feet south of R-152	STP reconstruction and bypassing	900 feet
5 Dec 2005	Palm Beach	Mid-Town Beach Nourishment Project (Reach 3 & 4)	4-1-00-F-742	R-90.4 to R-101.4	Beach nourishment	2.4 miles
23 Dec 2005	Palm Beach	Palm Beach Harbor M & O	4-1-05-TR-13258	R-76 to R-79	Dredging and beach nourishment	3,450 feet
23 Feb 2006	Palm Beach	Boca Raton Central Beach Nourishment Project	4-1-01-F-1795	R-216 to R-222	Dredge shoal fronting Boca Raton Inlet and beach nourishment	1.3 miles
23 Feb 2006	Palm Beach	Boca Raton South Beach Nourishment Project	41420-2008-FA-0777 Old database number 41-01-F-652	R-223.3 to R-227.9	Dredge shoal fronting Boca Raton Inlet and beach nourishment	Approx. 1 mile
28 April 2006	Palm Beach	Palm Beach Nourishment Project – Reach 8	41420-2006-F-0018	R-125 to R-134	Beach nourishment	2.17 miles
31 July 2006	Palm Beach	Sea Dunes Condominium Seawall	41420-2006-FA-1108		Seawall construction	0.03 acre
15 Dec 2006	Palm Beach	North Ocean Boulevard Rock Revetment	41420-2006-FA-1490	290 feet north of R-84; 1,150 feet south of R-85	Rock revetment construction	0.34 mile
5 Feb 2007	Palm Beach	Palm Beach Sand Transfer Plant Reconstruction	41420-2006-FA-1447	R-76 to R-79	Sand transfer plant reconstruction and discharge pipe extension	0.57 mile
28 March 2007	Palm Beach	Lake Worth Inlet Jetty Repair	41420-2007-FA-0221	200 feet north of R-75 and 200 feet south of R-76	Jetty repair	400 feet
25 May 2007	Palm Beach	Singer Island and South Palm Beach Emergency Dune Restoration	41420-2007-FA-1001	385' south of R-137 to 500' north of R-136; 500'south of R-60 to 850' south of R-65	Dune Restoration	6,135 feet
25 May 2007	Palm Beach	Jupiter Island ICWW Maintenance Dredging and Beach Nourishment	41420-2006-FA-1582	16,000 feet (130,000 cy) of the ICWW dredged; material placed between R-13 and R-19.	Channel dredging and beach nourishment	1.04 miles
20 July 2007	Palm Beach	North Boca Raton Beach Nourishment	41420-2007-FA-0477	T-205 to 181 feet south of R-212	Beach nourishment	1.45 miles

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
9 Nov 2007	Palm Beach	Jupiter Inlet and channel dredging	41420-2006-FA-1582	R-13 to R-17	Dune restoration	~ 4,000 linear feet
14 Nov 2007	Palm Beach	Jupiter Inlet Sand Trap Dredging and Sand Placement	41420-2007-FA-0600	Maintenance dredging of the inlet; beach compatible placed R-13 to R-19	Inlet dredging and beach nourishment	1.02 miles
28 Nov 2007	Palm Beach	Modification to a Sheet Pile and Rubble-Mound T-Head Groin System	41420-2007-FA-0574	500 feet north of R-94 south to R-95	T-groin repair, extension, construction	0.4 mile
5 Feb 2008	Palm Beach	Reach 8 Dune Restoration	41420-2006-F-0018	R-125 to 350 feet south of R-134	Dune restoration	2.17 miles
9 Sept 2008	Palm Beach	Juno Beach Sand Placement	41420-2008-FA-0081	R-26 to R-38	Sand placement	2.45 miles
4 Nov 2008	Palm Beach	Palm Beach Harbor M&O and Sand Placement	41420-2008-FA-0524	R-76 to R-79	Biannual Inlet dredging and sand placement events.	3,450 feet
2009	Palm Beach	Beach berm repair	41420-2010-F-0008	R-60 to R-68	Beach berm repair (permanent work)	6,880 linear feet
2009	Palm Beach	Beach berm repair	41420-2010-F-0009	R-135 to R-138	Beach berm repair (permanent work)	3,590 linear feet
2009	Palm Beach	Beach berm repair	41420-2010-F0010	R-137 to R-138	Beach berm repair (emergency)	125 linear feet
21 June 2010	Palm Beach	Mid-Town Reaches 3 & 4 Sand Placement	41420-2006-F-0011-R001	R-95 to R-100	Beach nourishment	0.95 mile
2 July 2010	Palm Beach	Phipps Ocean Park Reaches 7&8	41420-2010-CPA-0110	R-116 to R-125	Sand Placement	3.4 miles
3 Sept 2010	Palm Beach	Singer Island Breakwater	41420-2008-FA-0019	R-60.5 to R-66	Segmented, submerged breakwater	1.1 miles
19 June 2003	St. Lucie	Fort Pierce Shoreline Protection	4-1-03-F-1867 41420-2006-FA-1575	R-33.8 to R-41	Beach nourishment; berm expansion; and six t-head groins	1.3 miles
9 March 2006	St. Lucie	Blind Creek Restoration and South St. Lucie Emergency Berm Remediation Project	41420-2006-FA-0075	R-98 to R-115 R-88 to R-90	Wetland restoration and beach nourishment	3.6 miles
27 June 2008	St. Lucie	Fort Pierce Shoreline Protection Project	41420-2006-FA-1575	R-34 to R-41	Beach nourishment, berm expansion, and six t-head groins	1.3 miles
25 Aug 2004	Sarasota and Manatee	Longboat Key Beach Nourishment	4-1-04-F-4529	R-46A to R-29.5	Beach nourishment	9.45 miles
4 Oct 2005	Sarasota and Manatee	Longboat Key Beach Nourishment Project – BO Amendment	4-1-04-TR-4529	R-44 to R-44.5 and R-46A to R-44.5	Beach nourishment	0.47 mile

YEAR	COUNTY	PROJECT NAME	SERVICE FEDERAL ACTIVITY CODE	PROJECT LOCATION	PROJECT TYPE	ANTICIPATED INCIDENTAL TAKE (linear footage, no. of eggs, etc.)
20 Oct 2005	Sarasota	South Siesta Key	4-1-05-TR-12691	R-67 to R-77 plus 200 feet	Beach nourishment	2.1 miles
7 Dec 2007 (original BO) 28 July 08 (BO mod)	Sarasota	Lido Key Beach Fill Placement Project	41420-2007-F-0841	R-35.5 to R-44.2 2.27 miles	Beach nourishment with 425,000 cy of fill material.	2.27 miles
13 August 2008	Sarasota	Longboat Key Permeable Adjustable Groins	41420-2007-FA-0205	R-13 to R-13.5	Construction of two permeable adjustable groins.	0.09 mile project area 0.43 mile action area
2009	Sarasota		41420-2010-F-0003	R-77 to midpoint between R-77 and R-76	Beach restoration	700 linear feet
2009	Sarasota	Longboat Key Beach	41420-2010-F-0007	R-13 to R-14 Sarasota County; R-44 to R-5, and R-48.5 to R-49.5 Manatee County	Beach berm repair	951, 1,197, and 1,142 linear feet, respectively

Appendix B

NMFS Consultations

CONSULTATION ACTIVITY	TYPE OF ACTION	DATE SIGNED	ACTION AREA	INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT (ANTICIPATED TAKE)									
				Loggerhead (NWAO & NP DPS)		Green Turtle		Leatherback		Hawksbill		Kemp's Ridley Olive Ridley	
				Alive	Dead	Alive	Dead	Alive	Dead	Alive	Dead	Alive	Dead
Non-Fishery Consultations													
North Carolina DENR Inshore Gillnet-Incidental Take Permit	Section 10(a)(1)(B)	9/6/13	North Carolina Inshore Waters	1-yr Estimate									
						330	165					98	49
				1-yr Observed									
				24		18		8		8		12	
Removal of Offshore Structures in the Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf	Oil & Gas	8/28/2006	Gulf of Mexico	6-yr Estimate									
				15*	0	3*	0	3*	0	3*	0	3*	0
Sinking Exercises (SINKEX) in the Western North Atlantic Ocean	Military	9/22/2006	Western North Atlantic Ocean	1-yr Estimate									
				ITS - We do not have information to determine an amount of take. Survey data for the SINKEX location is extremely limited and the densities or abundance of sea turtles within the area is not known. Therefore, we anticipate the extent of take would be within the water column that would be affected by the shock and pressure waves above levels of 12 psi and 182 dB re 1 μ Pa2-sec in the greatest 1/3 octave band. For the largest underwater detonations, the extent includes the volume within 2 nmi of the detonation. Thus, the extent of take includes the "exclusion zone" of the SINKEX.									
Issuance of multiple permits to conduct scientific research on Atlantic sturgeon pursuant to section 10 (a)(1) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973	Section 10(a)(1)(A) for Sturgeon Research	4/2/2012	U.S. Atlantic Coast (from ME to FL)	Anticipated take for the entire research permit (5 years)									
				4*	0	4*	0	4*	0	4*	0	4*	0
National Science Foundation - Marine Seismic Survey in the Central Pacific Ocean	Seismic	11/23/2011	Central Pacific Ocean	Anticipated take for the entire project period									
				ITS - We do not have information to determine an amount of take. Harassment of these sea turtles is expected to occur at received levels of seismic sounds above 166 dB re 1 μPa. Because density estimates of sea turtles in the survey area are unknown, we estimate take as the number of turtles exposed to seismic operations above 166 dB re 1 μPa during the proposed activities. These turtles could be of all ages and life stages in the survey area.									
Navy - Conduct of training in the Virginia Capes, Cherry Point and Jacksonville Range Complexes June 2011 to June 2012	Navy Activities	6/1/2011	Central Pacific Ocean	Anticipated take for the entire project period									
				485	9	311*	3*	20	1	311*	3*	557	5

Appendix C

ASSESSMENTS: DISCERNING PROBLEMS CAUSED BY ARTIFICIAL LIGHTING

LIGHTING INSPECTIONS

WHAT ARE LIGHTING INSPECTIONS?

During a lighting inspection, a complete census is made of the number, types, locations, and custodians of artificial light sources that emit light visible from the beach. The goal of lighting inspections is to locate lighting problems and to identify the property owner, manager, caretaker, or tenant who can modify the lighting or turn it off.

WHICH LIGHTS CAUSE PROBLEMS?

Although the attributes that can make a light source harmful to sea turtles are complex, a simple rule has proven to be useful in identifying problem lighting under a variety of conditions:

An artificial light source is likely to cause problems for sea turtles if light from the source can be seen by an observer standing anywhere on the nesting beach.

If light can be seen by an observer on the beach, then the light is reaching the beach and can affect sea turtles. If any glowing portion of a luminaire (including the lamp, globe, or reflector) is directly visible from the beach, then this source is likely to be a problem for sea turtles. But light may also reach the beach indirectly by reflecting off buildings or trees that are visible from the beach. Bright or numerous sources, especially those directed upward, will illuminate sea mist and low clouds, creating a distinct glow visible from the beach. This “urban skyglow” is common over brightly lighted areas. Although some indirect lighting may be perceived as nonpoint-source light pollution, contributing light sources can be readily identified and include sources that are poorly directed or are directed upward. Indirect lighting can originate far from the beach. Although most of the light that sea turtles can detect can also be seen by humans, observers should realize that some sources, particularly those emitting near-ultraviolet and violet light (e.g., bug-zapper lights, white electric-discharge lighting) will appear brighter to sea turtles than to humans. A human is also considerably taller than a hatchling; however, an observer on the dry beach who crouches to the level of a hatchling may miss some lighting that will affect turtles. Because of the way that some lights are partially hidden by the dune, a standing observer is more likely to see light that is visible to hatchlings and nesting turtles in the swash zone.

HOW SHOULD LIGHTING INSPECTIONS BE CONDUCTED?

Lighting inspections to identify problem light sources may be conducted either under the purview of a lighting ordinance or independently. In either case, goals and methods should be similar.

GATHER BACKGROUND INFORMATION

Before walking the beach in search of lighting, it is important to identify the boundaries of the area to be inspected. For inspections that are part of lighting ordinance enforcement efforts, the jurisdictional boundaries of the sponsoring local government should be determined. It will help to have a list that includes the name, owner, and address of each property within inspection area so that custodians of problem lighting can be identified. Plat maps or aerial photographs will help surveyors orient themselves on heavily developed beaches.

PRELIMINARY DAYTIME INSPECTIONS

An advantage to conducting lighting inspections during the day is that surveyors will be better able to judge their exact location than they would be able to at night. Preliminary daytime inspections are especially important on beaches that have restricted access at night. Property owners are also more likely to be available during the day than at night to discuss strategies for dealing with problem lighting at their sites.

A disadvantage to daytime inspections is that fixtures that are not directly visible from the beach will be difficult to identify as problems. Moreover, some light sources that can be seen from the beach in daylight may be kept off at night and thus present no problems. For these reasons, daytime inspections are not a substitute for nighttime inspections. Descriptions of light sources identified during daytime inspections should be detailed enough so that anyone can locate the lighting. In addition to a general description of each luminaire (e.g., HPS floodlight directed seaward at top northeast corner of the building at 123 Ocean Street), photographs or sketches of the lighting may be necessary. Descriptions should also include an assessment of how the specific lighting problem can be resolved (e.g., needs turning off; should be redirected 90° to the east). These detailed descriptions will show property owners exactly which luminaries need what remedy.

NIGHTTIME INSPECTIONS

A nighttime survey shall be conducted of all lighting visible from the beach placement area by the FWC permit holder, using standard techniques for such a survey. During the nighttime lighting surveys, the surveyor shall walk the length of the beach placement area looking for light from artificial sources. During the nighttime lighting surveys, a complete census shall be made of the number, types, locations, and custodians of artificial light sources that emit light visible from the beach. Because problem lighting will be most visible on the darkest nights, lighting inspections are to be conducted when there is no moon visible. Descriptions of light sources identified during the survey should be detailed enough so that anyone can locate the lighting. In addition to a general description of each luminaire (e.g., HPS floodlight directed seaward at top northeast corner of the building at 123 Ocean Street), photographs or sketches of the lighting may be necessary. Descriptions should also include an assessment of how the specific lighting problem can be resolved (e.g., needs turning off; should be redirected 90° to the east, etc.). A summary report of the survey shall be submitted to the Corps, FWC, and the Service.

Surveyors orienting themselves on the beach at night will benefit from notes made during daytime surveys. During nighttime lighting inspections, a surveyor walks the length of the nesting beach looking for light from artificial sources. There are two general categories of artificial lighting that observers are likely to detect:

1. **Direct lighting**. A luminaire is considered to be direct lighting if some glowing element of the luminaire (e.g., the globe, lamp [bulb], reflector) is visible to an observer on the beach. A source not visible from one location may be visible from another farther down the beach. When direct lighting is observed, notes should be made of the number, lamp type (discernable by color; style

of fixture), mounting (pole, porch, *etc.*), and location (street address, apartment number, or pole identification number) of the luminaire(s). If exact locations of problem sources were not determined during preliminary daytime surveys, this should be done during daylight soon after the nighttime survey. Photographing light sources (using long exposure times) is often helpful.

2. **Indirect lighting**. A luminaire is considered to be indirect lighting if it is not visible from the beach but illuminates an object (e.g., building, wall, tree) that is visible from the beach. Any object on the dune that appears to glow is probably being lighted by an indirect source. When possible, notes should be made of the number, lamp type, fixture style, and mounting of an indirect-lighting source. Minimally, notes should be taken that would allow a surveyor to find the lighting during a follow-up daytime inspection (for instance, which building wall is illuminated and from what angle?).

WHEN SHOULD LIGHTING INSPECTIONS BE CONDUCTED?

Because problem lighting will be most visible on the darkest nights, lighting inspections are ideally conducted when there is no moon visible. Except for a few nights near the time of the full moon, each night of the month has periods when there is no moon visible. Early-evening lighting inspections (probably the time of night most convenient for inspectors) are best conducted during the period of two to 14 days following the full moon. Although most lighting problems will be visible on moonlit nights, some problems, especially those involving indirect lighting, will be difficult to detect on bright nights.

A set of daytime and nighttime lighting inspections before the nesting season and a minimum of three additional nighttime inspections during the nesting-hatching season are recommended. The first set of day and night inspections should take place just before nesting begins. The hope is that managers, tenants, and owners made aware of lighting problems will alter or replace lights before they can affect sea turtles. A follow-up nighttime lighting inspection should be made approximately two weeks after the first inspection so that remaining problems can be identified. During the nesting-hatching season, lighting problems that seemed to have been remedied may reappear because owners have been forgetful or because ownership has changed. For this reason, two midseason lighting inspections are recommended. The first of these should take place approximately two months after the beginning of the nesting season, which is about when hatchlings begin to emerge from nests. To verify that lighting problems have been resolved, another follow-up inspection should be conducted approximately one week after the first midseason inspection.

WHO SHOULD CONDUCT LIGHTING INSPECTIONS?

Although no specific authority is required to conduct lighting inspections, property managers, tenants, and owners are more likely to be receptive if the individual making recommendations represent a recognized conservation group, research consultant, or government agency. When local ordinances regulate beach lighting, local government code-enforcement agents should conduct lighting inspections and contact the public about resolving problems.

WHAT SHOULD BE DONE WITH INFORMATION FROM LIGHTING INSPECTIONS?

Although lighting surveys serve as a way for conservationists to assess the extent of lighting problems on a particular nesting beach, the principal goal of those conducting lighting inspections should be to ensure that lighting problems are resolved. To resolve lighting problems, property managers, tenants, and owners should be give the information they need to make proper alterations to light sources. This information should include details on the location and description of problem lights, as well as on how the lighting problem can be solved. One should also be prepared to discuss the details of how lighting affects sea turtles. Understanding the nature of the problem will motivate people more than simply being told what to do.

Appendix D
Sea Turtle Lighting Survey Form

Lighting Survey Form

The lighting survey must be conducted to include a landward view from the seaward most extent of the beach profile. The survey must occur after 9 p.m. The survey must follow standard techniques for such a survey and include the number and type of visible lights, location of lights and photo documentation.

Date: _____

Contact information of person conducting the lighting survey: _____

_____

Location (name of beach): _____

Lighting ordinance (applicable County or Municipality): _____

Compliance Officer name and contact information: _____

Survey start time: _____

Survey end time: _____

Survey start location (include address or GPS location):_____

_____

_____

Survey end location (include address or GPS location): _____

_____

Date summarizing report sent to the following: marineturtle@myfwc.com, JCPCompliance@dep.state.fl.us, and seaturtle@fws.gov:_____

County or Municipality contact information for follow up meeting with the FWS and FWC:

_____

For each light visible from the nesting beach provide the following information:

Location of light (include cross street and nearest beach access)	GPS location of light	Description of light (type and location)	Photo take (YES/ NO)	Notification letter with recommendations sent? (YES/NO)

Location of light (include cross street and nearest beach access)	GPS location of light	Description of light (type and location)	Photo take (YES/ NO)	Notification letter with recommendations sent? (YES/NO)

Appendix E

Nesting Seabird and Shorebird Protection Conditions

a. Selection of Bird Monitors. The Permittee or designated representative ("Permittee") shall hire one or more Bird Monitors, depending on the size of the area to be affected, who shall monitor shorebird and seabird (shorebird) activity before, during, and after construction. Bird Monitors shall have proven seabird and shorebird identification skills and avian survey experience. Before hiring any Bird Monitors, the Representative shall provide a list of candidate Bird Monitors with (1) their contact information and (2) a summary of their qualifications, including bird identification skills and avian survey experience, to the FWC Regional Species Conservation Biologist (see the attached FWC contact information exhibit) and copied to JCPCompliance@dep.state.fl.us for FWC approval before the Permittee hires the Bird Monitor(s).

b. The Bird Monitor(s) shall review and become familiar with the general information on the FWC's Florida Shorebird Database (FSD) website (www.FLShorebirdDatabase.org). They shall use the data-collection protocol and implement data-entry procedures as outlined in that website. An outline of data to be collected, including downloadable field data sheets, is available on the website.

c. Breeding season varies by species. Most species have completed the breeding cycle by September 1, but flightless young may be present through September. The following dates are based on the best available information regarding ranges and habitat use by species for this project: February 15 – September 1.

   Surveys during the breeding season shall begin on the first day of the breeding season or 10 days before any site work begins, whichever is later. Surveys shall be conducted through August 31 or until all breeding activity has concluded, whichever is later.

d. During the breeding season, the Bird Monitor(s) shall survey all potential beach-nesting bird habitats that may be affected by construction or pre-construction activities. The Bird Monitor(s) shall establish one or more shorebird survey routes in the FSD website to cover these areas.

e. During the pre-construction and construction phases of the project, the Bird Monitor(s) shall complete surveys on a daily basis to detect breeding activity and the presence of flightless chicks before (1) equipment is moved to the area, (2) vehicles are operated in the area, or (3) any other activities occur that have the potential to disrupt breeding behavior or cause harm to the birds or their eggs or young. Once construction is completed and all personnel and equipment have been removed from the beach, surveys may be conducted at weekly intervals.

f. The Bird Monitor(s) shall survey the project area by walking and looking for evidence of (1) shorebirds exhibiting breeding behavior, (2) shorebird chicks, or (3) shorebird juveniles, as outlined in the FSD's Breeding Bird Protocol for Shorebirds and Seabirds. The Bird Monitor(s) shall use binoculars for these surveys.

g. If an ATV or other vehicle is needed to cover large project areas, operators shall adhere to the FWC's Best Management Practices for Operating Vehicles on the Beach (http://myfwc.com/conservation/you-conserve/wildlife/beach-driving/). Specifically, the vehicle shall be operated at a speed under 6 mph and only on beaches at or below the high-tide line. The Bird Monitor(s) shall stop at no greater than 200-meter intervals to look for breeding activity.

h. Once the Bird Monitor(s) confirms that birds are breeding, as evidenced by the presence of a scrape, eggs, or young, the Bird Monitor(s) shall notify the FWC Regional Species Conservation Biologist (see the attached FWC contact information exhibit) within 24 hours. The Bird Monitor(s) shall report all breeding activity to the FSD website within one week of data collection.

Seabird and Shorebird Buffer Zones and Travel Corridors

The Bird Monitor(s) shall establish a disturbance-free buffer zone around any location within the project area where shorebirds have been engaged in breeding behavior, including territory defense. The FWC considers a 300-foot-wide buffer to be adequate based on published studies; however, a smaller, site-specific buffer may be established if approved by the FWC Regional Species Conservation Biologist (see the attached FWC contact information exhibit). All sources of human disturbance (including pedestrians, pets, and vehicles) shall be prohibited in the buffer zone.

a. The Bird Monitor(s) shall keep breeding sites under sufficient surveillance to determine if birds appear agitated or disturbed by construction or other activities in adjacent areas. If birds do appear to be agitated or disturbed by these activities, then the Bird Monitor(s) shall widen of the buffer zone immediately to a sufficient size to protect breeding birds.

b. The Bird Monitor(s) shall ensure that reasonable and traditional pedestrian access is not blocked in situations where breeding birds will tolerate pedestrian traffic. This is generally the case with lateral movement of beach-goers walking parallel to the beach at or below the highest tide line. Pedestrian traffic may also be tolerated when breeding was initiated within 300 feet of an established beach access pathway. The Bird Monitor(s) shall work with the FWC Regional Species Conservation Biologist to determine if pedestrian access can be accommodated without compromising nesting success.

c. The Bird Monitor(s) shall ensure that the perimeters of designated buffer zones are marked with posts, twine, and signs stating "Do Not Enter, Important Nesting Area" or similar language. The signs shall include the name and a phone number of the entity responsible for posting. Posts shall not be higher than 3 feet once installed. "Symbolic fencing" (i.e., twine, string, or rope) shall be placed between all posts and be clearly visible to pedestrians. In areas where marine turtles nest, the ropes shall be at least 2.5 feet above the ground. If pedestrian pathways are approved by the FWC Regional Species Conservation Biologist within the 300-foot buffer zone, these shall be clearly marked. The Bird Monitor(s) shall ensure that the posting is maintained in good repair until breeding is completed or terminated. Although solitary nesters may leave the buffer zone with their chicks, the posted area continues to provide a potential refuge for the family until breeding is complete. Breeding is not considered to be completed until all chicks have fledged.

d. The Bird Monitor(s) shall ensure that no construction activities, pedestrians, moving vehicles, or stockpiled equipment are allowed within the buffer area.

e. The Bird Monitor(s) shall designate and mark travel corridors outside the buffer areas so as not to cause disturbance to breeding birds. Heavy equipment, other vehicles, or pedestrians may go past breeding areas in these corridors. However, other activities such as stopping or turning heavy equipment and vehicles shall be prohibited within the designated travel corridors adjacent to the breeding site.

f. When flightless chicks are present on the beach, the Bird Monitor(s) shall accompany any moving vehicles or equipment to ensure that no chicks are in the path of the moving vehicle and no tracks are left that could trap flightless chicks.

g. The FWC recommends that the Bird Monitor(s) ensure that some activity in the travel corridor is maintained on a daily basis in order to discourage birds from nesting within the travel corridor. These activities shall not be allowed to disturb shorebirds nesting on site or interfere with marine turtle nesting, especially if the corridors are established before construction has started.

h. *Notification.* If the Bird Monitor(s) find that shorebirds are breeding within the project area, he or she shall ensure that an informational bulletin board is placed and maintained in the construction staging area. This bulletin board shall display the location map of the construction site, depict the location(s) of the bird breeding areas, and include a clearly visible warning stating: "NESTING BIRDS ARE PROTECTED BY LAW INCLUDING THE FLORIDA ENDANGERED AND THREATENED SPECIES ACT AND THE STATE AND FEDERAL MIGRATORY BIRD ACTS".

Post-construction Conditions, Monitoring and Reporting

i. Shorebird: If beach cleaning will occur on the nourished beach, a minimum of 30 percent of the biotic material within the wrack line shall be left on the beach post-cleaning at the strand line in a natural configuration to ensure that the nourished beach re-establishes its function as foraging habitat for shorebirds. This shall occur for as long as the placed sand remains on the beach.

Appendix F

EXAMPLES OF PREDATOR PROOF TRASH RECEPTACLES

Example of predator proof trash receptacle at Gulf Islands National Seashore. Lid must be tight fitting and made of material heavy enough to stop animals such as raccoons.

Example of trash receptacle anchored into the ground so it is not easily turned over.

Example of predator proof trash receptacle at Perdido Key State Park. Metal trash can is stored inside. Cover must be tight fitting and made of material heavy enough to stop animals such as raccoons.

Example of trash receptacle must be secured or heavy enough so it is not easily turned over.