NOAA's National Marine Fisheries Service

Endangered Species Act Section 7 Consultation

Biological Opinion

Agency: Permits and Conservation Division of the Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service

Proposed Action: Proposal to issue modification to permit No. 15661 to Arnold Palacios of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Division of Fish and Wildlife for research on green and hawksbill sea turtles in the CNMI, pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973

Prepared by: Endangered Species Act, Interagency Cooperation Division
Office of Protected Resources, National Marine Fisheries Service

Approved by: Perry Gayaldo
for Donna S. Wieting
Director, Office of Protected Resources

Date: DEC 2 4 2013

Section 7(a)(2) of the Endangered Species Act (ESA; 16 U.S.C. 1531 *et seq.*) requires each federal agency to ensure that any action authorized, funded or carried out by such an agency is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any endangered or threatened species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat of such species. When an action of a federal agency "may affect" endangered or threatened species or critical habitat, that agency is required to consult with the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) or U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, depending on the species that may be affected. This Biological Opinion is the result of an intra-agency consultation between the Permits and Conservation Division and the ESA Interagency Cooperation Division in the NMFS Office of Protected Resources. This Opinion describes whether Permits and Conservation Division's issuance of a modification to an existing scientific research permit 15661 (Responsible Party: Arnold Palacios) would likely jeopardize the existence of the threatened green and endangered hawksbill sea turtles.

This Biological Opinion has been prepared in accordance with section 7 of the ESA and regulations promulgated to implement that section of the ESA. This Biological Opinion is based on information provided in the research permit application, *the Draft Supplemental Environmental Assessment (SEA) On the Issuance of a Modification to Scientific Research Permit No. 15661 to the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands Department of Lands and Natural Resources to Conduct Research on Listed Sea Turtles*, published and unpublished

scientific information on the biology and ecology of endangered and threatened sea turtles, and other sources of information.

A brief account of the consultation history precedes the Biological Opinion. The Biological Opinion first describes the proposed permit and research activities, including activities that may affect listed species and the action area. The Status of the Species and the Environmental Baseline serve as the context for the analysis of the effects of the proposed action on these species. The Effects of the Action section describes the evidence and rationale behind our conclusion that these species are not likely to be jeopardized by issuance of the proposed research permit.

Consultation History

On August 23, 2011, the Permits and Conservation Division requested a consultation under the ESA in a memorandum on its proposal to issue a scientific research permit 15661. The applicant would be conducting research on listed green (*Chelonia mydas*) and hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) sea turtles in nearshore habitats off the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI).

The Permits and Conservation Division requested re-initiation of consultation under the ESA in a memorandum dated August 2, 2013, on its proposal to issue a modification to existing permit 15661, which would be valid until the permit expires on January 31, 2017. The applicant requests authorization for additional sampling procedures on green and hawksbill sea turtles. Consultation was initiated on August 2, 2013.

Biological Opinion

Description of the Proposed Action

The Permits and Conservation Division of the NMFS Office of Protected Resources proposes to issue a permit modification to a scientific research permit pursuant to section 10(a)(1)(A) of the ESA.

The proposed action is issuance of a modification to a scientific research permit to Arnold Palacios of the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) Division of Fish and Wildlife, pursuant to the ESA. The permit currently authorizes research activities designed to characterize population structure, size class composition, foraging ecology, and migration patterns for green (*Chelonia mydas*) and hawksbill (*Eretmochelys imbricata*) sea turtles in the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI) with a focus on identifying potential conservation or critical habitat areas for immature and adult sea turtles in nearshore waters.

Currently, researchers are authorized to annually capture up to 300 green and 50 hawksbill sea turtles by hand capture using snorkelers. All green sea turtles are measured, photographed/videoed, weighed, shell etched with an identification mark, tissue sampled, passive integrated transponder (PIT) tagged, flipper tagged, and released at the capture site. All hawksbill sea turtles are measured, weighed, photographed/videoed, PIT tagged, flipper tagged, shell etched, tissue sampled, and released at the capture site. A subset of green and hawksbill sea turtles additionally have a transmitter attached; in the event a telemetry-tagged turtle is

recaptured and the transmitter has expired, the transmitter is removed. The permit also authorizes the opportunistic collection of sea turtle parts and carcasses. The annual take is summarized below; the text in bold indicates the take rows affected by the modification.

The annual proposed increase in takes for permit 15661:

No. Turtles	Sea Turtle Species	Collection Method	Take Activity
265	Green	Hand Capture	Count/survey, measure, Mark, carapace (temporary), weigh, flipper tag, PIT tag, tissue sample, photograph/video, and release
15	Green	Hand Capture	Count/survey, measure, Mark, carapace (temporary), weigh, flipper tag, PIT tag, tissue sample, photograph/video, Instrument, epoxy attachment (e.g., satellite, VHF tag), gear removal if recaptured, transport, release and tracking
20	**Green**	**Hand Capture**	**Count/survey, measure, Mark, carapace (temporary), weigh, flipper tag, PIT tag, tissue sample, blood sample, scute scraping, photograph/video, and release**
30	Hawksbill	Hand Capture	Count/survey, measure, Mark, carapace (temporary), weigh, flipper tag, PIT tag, tissue sample, photograph/video, and release
5	Hawksbill	Hand Capture	Count/survey, measure, Mark, carapace (temporary), weigh, flipper tag, PIT tag, tissue sample, photograph/video, Instrument, epoxy attachment (e.g., satellite, VHF tag), gear removal if recaptured, transport, release and tracking
15	**Hawksbill**	**Hand Capture**	**Count/survey, measure, Mark, carapace (temporary), weigh, flipper tag, PIT tag, tissue sample, blood sample, scute scraping, photograph/video, and release**
5	Green	Hand Capture	Salvage of carcass, tissue and parts from dead animals
5	Hawksbill	Hand	Salvage of carcass, tissue and parts from dead animals

		Capture	

The proposed action would authorize additional research activities to address a new objective--to analyze a broad suite of environmental pollutants that may be threatening the health of sea turtles in the NMI. To analyze the extent of contamination from environmental pollutants in NMI sea turtles, the researchers requested the addition of blood sampling and scute scraping up to 20 green and 15 hawksbill sea turtles annually. The overall number of sea turtle takes would remain the same; the number of green and hawksbill sea turtles slated for the blood sampling and scute scraping would now be a second subset of the 300 green and 50 hawksbill sea turtles already authorized for capture. The blood samples would be analyzed for the presence of recent exposure to contaminants like persistent organic pollutants and perflourinated contaminants. Scute scraping samples would be analyzed to measure past exposure to contaminants.

The existing research and the additional proposed research activities would result in collection of baseline data to help determine the decline or recovery of these populations. Permit 15661 addresses elements of the recovery plans for each species such as determining distribution, home range and abundance of sub-adult and adult sea turtles in the marine environment, contributing to the carcass stranding network, identifying foraging areas, and determining population size, status and trends. The research conducted under the proposed modification would focus on gathering information on sea turtle exposure to contaminants and pollutants. Chemical pollutants have been identified as a threat to green and hawksbill sea turtle populations in the Pacific (NMFS and USFWS 1998c; NMFS and USFWS 1998d).

Permit No. 15661-01:

Currently, researchers are permitted to perform the following activities on up 300 green and 50 hawksbill sea turtles annually: count/survey, hand capture, photograph/video, measure, weigh, flipper and PIT tag, temporarily mark (i.e., shell etching) and tissue sample. A subset of each species may be fitted with telemetry tags. Researchers will continue with these sampling methods as currently authorized, with the terms and conditions outlined in the permit. The effects of these activities were examined in the BO originally prepared for issuance of the permit (No. 15661) (NMFS 2012). If authorized, the blood sampling and scute scraping will take place on a second subset of turtles and will occur in addition to the above sampling procedures; that is, the researchers are not requested an increase in the overall number of sea turtle captures. The additional activities (blood and scute sampling) in the proposed action are described below.

Blood Sampling

The researchers will use the following methods to collect blood samples from the turtles. Blood sampling will occur within the first 5-15 minutes after the turtle has been captured. During blood collection, the turtle will be safely restrained and inclined so the head is angled downward. The needle insertion site will be cleaned with water and a soft-bristled brush, followed by disinfection of the area with two applications of isopropanol. A double-ended needle is placed into the dorsal neck, and a vacuum blood container is placed on the exterior portion of the needle. The needle is inserted into the dorsocervical sinus. The amount of blood collected will be limited by the conditions of the permit (3mL of blood per 1kg of turtle), and will typically be

between 12.5-22.5mL. After blood collection, the site of insertion will be cleaned again with isopropanol.

Scute Scraping
To collect scute material for analysis, the researchers will use the method described here, known as the "George Balazs method". The entire fifth central (posterior vertebral) scute and surrounding areas are cleaned with isopropanol and water with paper towels. Then, the edge of a knife blade is held horizontal at the anterior edge of the fifth central scute, and the knife is moved along the scute surface, shaving thing scrapings of outer layers of keratin into a bag. The shaving is continued over the entire surface of the scute until 1-2mm depth has been collected. Scute edges, seams and areas of previous injury will be avoided. Total sample collected will be between 0.3-1.0 grams.

No other changes to Permit No. 15661 would occur. The modification to the existing permit 15661 if issued would be valid until the permit expires on January 31, 2017.

Permit Conditions
The following information outlines the main mitigation measures researchers would employ to minimize the potential for any adverse impacts to the target species (green and hawksbill sea turtles) as well as any additional ESA-listed species in the action area. The research project is designed to minimize the potential of any stress, pain or suffering. All the investigators and personnel involved are experienced in capturing sea turtles and will undertake the following precautions. Turtles will be handled carefully so they do not incur additional injury during or after research procedures. Antiseptic methods such as sterilizing equipment with bleach solution and the use of antiseptic solutions such as 10% povidone-iodine at tag sites will be standard protocol to prevent the transmittal of disease and prevent infection. To comply with this requirement, the researchers have stated they will use isopropanol as a disinfectant. Turtles found to have serious injuries will be evaluated for possible transport to a rehabilitation facility. The following specific research conditions will be placed on the research should the permit modification (No. 15661-01) be issued to ensure compliance with appropriate research protocols:

1. The Permit Holder would ultimately be responsible for all activities of any individual who is operating under the authority of the proposed permit modification. The Principal Investigator (PI) would share this responsibility. Individuals operating under the specified Permit and conducting the activities authorized herein, must be approved by NMFS. Alternatively, there must be a NMFS approved individual present to supervise these activities until such time that the other individuals have been approved by NMFS.

2. Accidental Mortality of Authorized Sea Turtles: If a turtle is seriously injured or dies during sampling, the Permit Holder must cease research immediately and notify the Chief, Permits and Conservation Division by phone (301-427-8401) as soon as possible, but no later than two days following the event. The Permit Holder must re-evaluate the techniques that were used and those techniques must be revised accordingly to prevent further injury or death. The Permit Holder must submit a written report describing the circumstances surrounding the event. The Permit Holder must send this report to the Chief, Permits and Conservation Division, F/PR1, 1315 East-West Highway, Silver Spring, MD 20910. Pending review of these circumstances, NMFS may suspend

authorization of research activities or amend the Permit in order to allow research activities to continue.

3. An annual report would be submitted and reviewed by NMFS for each year the permit is valid. In addition to an account of actual "take" that occurred, the reports would include detailed descriptions of the animal's reactions, measures taken to minimize disturbance, research plans for the forthcoming year, and an indication as to when or if any results have been published or otherwise disseminated during the year. At the end of the proposed permit, the Permit Holder would submit a final report that includes: (1) a reiteration of the objectives and summary of results of the research and how they pertain to or further the research goals stated in the Permit application and NMFS conservation plan; and (2) an indication of where and when the research results would be published.

4. Instruments and equipment that are used for invasive procedures must be sterilized or disinfected with an appropriate disinfectant (e.g., mild bleach solution or 10% povidone-iodine) between animals, and shall be the appropriate weight/size ratio to the receiving animal.

5. When handling and/or tagging turtles displaying fibropapilloma tumors and/or lesions, researchers will use the following procedures:

    - Clean all equipment that comes into contact with the turtle (tagging equipment, tape measures, etc.) with a mild bleach solution, between the processing of each turtle, and
    - Maintain a separate set of sampling equipment for handling animals displaying fibropapilloma tumors and/or lesions.
    - Limit procedures conducted on compromised turtles.

6. All turtles shall be examined for existing tags, including PIT tags, before attaching or inserting new ones.
7. Flipper Tagging with Metal Tags—All tags shall be cleaned (e.g., to remove oil residue) and disinfected before being used.

8. Blood Sampling:
    - Blood samples must be taken by experienced personnel.
    - New disposable needles must be used on each animal.
    - Collection sites must always be scrubbed with alcohol or another antiseptic prior to sampling.
    - Care should be taken to ensure no injury results from the sampling. If an animal cannot be adequately immobilized for blood sampling or conditions on the boat preclude the safety and health of the turtle, samples must not be taken.
    - Attempts (i.e., needle insertions) to extract blood from the neck must be limited to a total of four, two on either side.
    - A single sample must not exceed 3 mL per 1kg of animal.
    - Sampling period. Within a 45-day period of time, the cumulative blood volume taken from a single turtle must not exceed the minimum safe limit described

above. If more than 50% of the maximum safe limit is taken, in a single event or cumulatively from repeat sampling events, from a single turtle within a 45-day period that turtle must not be re-sampled for 3 months from the last blood sampling event.

- Research coordination. Researchers must, to the maximum extent practicable, attempt to determine if any of the turtles they blood sample may have been sampled within the past 3 months or will be sampled in the next 3 months by other researchers. The permit holder must contact the other researchers working in the area that could capture the same turtles to ensure that none of the above limits are exceeded.

9. Biopsy (tissue/skin) Sampling:
    - A new biopsy punch must be used on each turtle.
    - Sterile techniques must be used at all times. Samples must be collected from the trailing edge of a flipper if possible and practical (preference should be given to a rear flipper if practical). The tissue surface must be thoroughly swabbed once with both Betadine and alcohol, sampled, and then thoroughly swabbed again with just Betadine. The procedure area and hands must be clean.
    - If it can be easily determined (through markings, tag number, etc.) that a sea turtle has been recently sampled by this permit, no additional biopsy samples may be collected from the animal over the permit year.

10. Sonic Tagging:
    - Great care shall be taken to ensure that no resin, silicone, or epoxy drips onto the skin of the turtle.
    - Adequate ventilation around the head of the turtle must be provided during the attachment of satellite tags or attachment of radio/sonic tags if attachment materials produce fumes and that the epoxy that is chosen, cures releasing little heat that would not be injurious to animals. To prevent skin or eye contact with harmful chemicals used to apply tags, turtles must not be held in water during the application process.
    - The weight of the transmitters would not exceed 5 percent of the turtle's body mass.
    - Each attachment must be made so that there is no risk of entanglement. The transmitter attachment must either contain a weak link (where appropriate) or have no gap between the transmitter and the turtle that could result in entanglement. The lanyard length (if used) must be less than ½ of the carapace length of the turtle. If must include corrodible, breakaway link that will corrode and release the tag-transmitter after the tag-transmitter life is finished.
    - Researchers must make attachments as hydrodynamic as possible.

11. Painting of Carapace
    - Researchers must use non-toxic paints that do not generate heat or contain xylene or toluene.
    - For turtles < approximately 4 years old, paint must be applied without crossing suture lines (margins) if the paint will remain on the shell for 3 months or more.

- For juvenile turtles > approximately 4 years old, paint must be applied without crossing suture lines (margins) if the paint will remain on the shell for 1 year or more.
- For adult turtles, paint must be applied without crossing suture lines (margins) if the paint will remain on the shell for 2 years or more.

12. General Handling and Releasing of Turtles: The Principal Investigator, Co-investigator(s), or Research Assistant(s) acting on the Permit Holder's behalf must use care when handling live animals to minimize any possible injury, and appropriate resuscitation techniques must be used on any comatose turtle prior to returning it to the water. Whenever possible, stressed or injured animals should be transferred to rehabilitation facilities and allowed an appropriate period of recovery before return to the wild. An experienced veterinarian, rehabilitation facility must be named for emergencies. All turtles must be handled according to procedures specified in 50 CFR 223.206(d)(1)(i).

13. Turtles are to be protected from temperature extremes of heat and cold, and kept moist during sampling. The turtle will be placed on pads for cushioning and this surface will be disinfected between turtles. The area surrounding the turtle may not contain any materials that could be accidentally ingested.

14. During release, turtles shall be lowered as close to the water's surface as possible, to prevent potential injuries.

15. Transport and Holding:
    - Turtles are to be transported via a climate-controlled environment, protected from temperature extremes of heat and cold, and kept moist. The turtle will be placed on pads for cushioning. The area surrounding the turtle may not contain any material that could be accidentally ingested.
    - Turtles transported to a facility and held (e.g., for rehabilitation) must be maintained and cared for under the "Care and Maintenance Guidelines for Sea Turtles Held in Captivity" issued by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Approach to the Assessment

NMFS approaches its section 7 analyses of research permits through a series of steps. The first step identifies those aspects of proposed actions that are likely to have direct and indirect physical, chemical, and biotic effects on listed species or on the physical, chemical, and biotic environment of an action area. As part of this step, we identify the spatial extent of these direct and indirect effects, including changes in that spatial extent over time. The results of this step define the action area for consultation. The second step of our analyses identifies the listed resources that are likely to co-occur with these effects in space and time and the nature of that co-occurrence (these represent our exposure analyses). In this step of our analyses, we try to identify the number, age (or life stage), and gender of the individuals that are likely to be exposed to an action's effects and the nature of that exposure, we examine the scientific and commercial data available to determine whether and how those listed resources are likely to respond given their exposure (these represent our response analyses).

The final steps of our analyses—establishing the risks those responses pose to listed resources—are different for listed species and designated critical habitat (these represent our risk analyses). Our jeopardy determinations must be based on an action's effects on the continued existence of threatened or endangered species as those "species" have been listed, which can include true biological species, subspecies, or distinct populations of vertebrate species. Because the continued existence of species depends on the fate of the populations that comprise them, the continued existence of these "species" depends on the fate of the populations that comprise them.

Similarly, the continued existence of populations are determined by the fate of the individuals that comprise them; populations grow or decline as the individuals that comprise the population live, die, grow, mature, migrate, and reproduce (or fail to do so).

Our risk analyses reflect these relationships between listed species, the population that comprise that species, and the individuals that comprise those populations. Our risk analyses begin by identifying the probable risks actions pose to listed individuals that are likely to be exposed to an action's effects. Our analyses then integrate those individual risks to identify consequences to the populations those individuals represent. Our analyses conclude by determining the consequences of those population level risks to the species those populations comprise. We measure risks to listed individuals using the individuals' "fitness", or the individual's growth, survival, annual reproductive success, and lifetime reproductive success. In particular, we examine the scientific and commercial data available to determine if an individual's probable lethal, sub-lethal, or behavioral responses to an action's effect on the environment (which we identify during our response analyses) are likely to have consequences for the individual's fitness.

When individual, listed plants, or animals are expected to experience reductions in fitness in response to an action, those fitness reductions are likely to reduce the abundance, reproduction, or growth rates (or increase the variance of these measures) of the populations those individuals represent (Sterns 1992). Reductions in at least one of these variables (or one of the variables we derive from them) is itself a necessary condition for reductions in a species' viability. As a result, when listed plants or animals exposed to an action's effects are not expected to experience reductions in fitness, we would not expect the action to have adverse consequences on the viability of the populations those individuals represent or the species those populations comprise (e.g., Mills and Beatty 1979; Anderson 2000; Brandon 1978; Stearns 1992). As a result, if we conclude that listed plants or animals are not likely to experience reductions in their fitness, we would conclude our assessment.

Although reductions in fitness of individuals are a necessary condition for reductions in a population's viability, reducing the fitness of individuals in a population is not always sufficient to reduce the viability of the population(s) those individuals represent. Therefore, if we conclude that listed plants or animals are likely to experience reductions in their fitness, we determine whether those fitness reductions are likely to reduce the viability of the populations' abundance, reproduction, spatial structure and connectivity, growth rates, variance in these measures, or measures of extinction risk). In this step, of our analyses, we use the population's base condition (established in the Environmental Baseline and Status of the Species sections of this Opinion) as our point of reference. If we conclude that reductions in individual fitness are not likely to reduce the viability of the populations those individuals represent, we would conclude our assessment.

Reducing the viability of a population is not always sufficient to reduce the viability of the species those populations comprise. Therefore, in the final step of our analyses, we determine if reductions in a population's viability are likely to reduce the viability of the species those populations comprise using changes in a species' reproduction, numbers, distribution, estimates of extinction risk, or probability of being conserved. In this step of our analyses we use the species' status (established in the Status of the Species section of this Opinion) as our point of reference. Our final determinations are based on whether such reductions are likely to be appreciable.

To conduct these analyses, we rely on all of the evidence available to us. This evidence might consist of monitoring reports submitted by past and present permit holders; reports from NMFS Science Centers; reports prepared by natural resource agencies in states and other countries; reports from domestic and foreign non-governmental organizations involved in marine conservation issues, the information provided by the Permits and Conservation Division when it initiates formal consultation, and the general scientific literature.

During each consultation, we conduct electronic searches of the general scientific literature using American Fisheries Society, Google Scholar, ScienceDirect, BioOne, Conference Papers Index, JSTOR, and Aquatic Sciences and Fisheries Abstracts search engines. We supplement these searches with electronic searches of doctoral and master's theses. These searches specifically try to identify data or other information that supports a particular conclusion (for example, a study that suggests sea turtles will exhibit a particular response to tagging) as well as data that does not support our conclusion. When data are equivocal, or in the face of substantial uncertainty, our decisions are designed to avoid the risks of incorrectly concluding that an action would not have an adverse effect on listed species when, in fact, such adverse effects are likely.

We rank the results of these searches based on the quality of their study design, sample sizes, level of scrutiny prior to and during publication, and study results. Carefully designed field experiments (for example, experiments that control potentially confounding variables) are rated higher than field experiments that are not designed to control those variables. Carefully designed field experiments are generally ranked higher than computer simulations. Studies that produce large sample sizes with small variances are generally ranked higher than studies with small sample sizes or large variances.

Action Area

The action area is defined in 50 CFR 402.2 as "all areas to be affected directly or indirectly by the Federal Action and not merely the immediate area involved in the action." The action area under these proposed activities would be as follows. Sampling would continue to occur in the nearshore waters of the NMI. Activities would continue to occur around the islands of Saipan, Tinian, Guam, and Rota until the permit expires on January 31, 2017. Sampling would include Aguigan, Farallon de Medinilla, Anatahan, Sarigan, Guguan, Alamagan, Pagan, Agrihan, Asuncion, Uracas, and Maug should the opportunity arise.

Status of the Species

The following listed species under the jurisdiction of NMFS may occur in the action area that would be covered under the proposed issuance of Section 10 research permit modification to the applicant may be affected:

Common Name	Scientific Name	Listing Status
Sea Turtles		
Green sea turtle*	*Chelonia mydas*	Endangered/Threatened
Hawksbill sea turtle	*Eretmochelys imbricata*	Endangered
Leatherback sea turtle	*Dermochelys coriacea*	Endangered
Loggerhead sea turtle (N. Pacific DPS)	*Caretta caretta*	Endangered
Olive ridley sea turtle**	*Lepidochelys olivacea*	Endangered/Threatened
Marine Mammals		
Blue Whale	*Balaenoptera musculus*	Endangered
Fin Whale	*Balaenoptera physalus*	Endangered
Gray Whale (Western Pacific population)	*Eschrichtius robustus*	Endangered
Humpback Whale	*Megatera novaeangliae*	Endangered
North Pacific right whale	*Eubalaena japonica*	Endangered
Sperm Whale	*Physter macrocephalus*	Endangered
Sei Whale	*Balaenoptera borealis*	Endangered
Fish		
Scalloped Hammerhead Shark (Indo-West Pacific DPS)	*Sphyrna lewini*	Proposed Threatened

*Green sea turtles in US waters are listed as threatened except for the Florida breeding population, which is listed as endangered. Because we are unable to distinguish between the populations away from the nesting beached, green sea turtles are considered endangered wherever they occur in US waters.

**Olive ridley sea turtle breeding populations on the Pacific Coast of Mexico are listed as endangered; all other populations are listed as threatened.

Critical Habitat

Critical habitat has been designated for three sea turtles: green (50 CFR Section 226.208), hawksbill (50 CFR Section 226.209) and leatherback (50 CFR 226.207). Critical habitat for green and hawksbill sea turtles exists in the coastal waters of Puerto Rico. Critical habitat for leatherback sea turtles has been designated in the U.S. Virgin Islands; recently, additional critical habitat was designated along the U.S. West Coast (77 FR 4170). Critical habitat has been proposed for loggerhead sea turtles within the range of the Northwest Atlantic Ocean DPS; none was proposed for the North Pacific Ocean DPS (78 FR 43005). No critical habitat for any of these sea turtles or any other species would be affected by the proposed action, since the proposed action would not occur in these areas.

Critical habitat has been designated for the North Pacific right whale in the Bering Sea and the Gulf of Alaska (50 CFR Section 226.215); these areas would not be affected by the proposed

action. No critical habitat has been designated for any of the other above-named threatened or endangered marine mammal species in the Pacific Ocean. The proposed permit would not affect critical habitat in a way as to modify, damage or destroy habitat, and will not be considered further in this Opinion.

Species not considered further in this Opinion

To refine the scope of this Opinion, NMFS used two criteria (risk factors) to determine whether any endangered or threatened species or critical habitat are not likely to be adversely affected by vessel traffic, aircraft traffic or human disturbance associated with the proposed actions. The first criterion was exposure: if we conclude that particular endangered or threatened species or designated critical habitat are not likely to be exposed to vessel traffic, or human disturbance, we must also conclude that those listed species or designated critical habitat are not likely to be adversely affected by the proposed action. The second criterion is susceptibility upon exposure: species or critical habitat may be exposed to vessel traffic, or human disturbance, but may not be unaffected by those activities—either because of the circumstances associated with the exposure or the intensity of the exposure—are also not likely to be adversely affected by the vessel traffic or human disturbance. This section summarizes the results of our evaluations.

Blue, fin, gray (Western population), humpback, North Pacific right, sei and sperm whales occur in the Pacific Ocean. However, since the research will take place in near-shore habitat, and outside the reported range of each of these whale species, encounters with most of these whale species would be considered rare. If the investigators encounter a whale species by boat, they would maintain a distance of 100 yards (in accordance with NMFS marine mammal viewing guidelines) to minimize the probability of adversely affecting the species.

Loggerhead, Olive ridley and leatherback sea turtles could occur within the action areas and could be subject to disturbance from free divers and the research vessel. However, there are no reports of leatherback or loggerhead sea turtle sightings or evidence of nesting in the NMI (NMFS and USFWS 1998e; NMFS and USFWS 1998a). Researchers will be targeting green and hawksbill sea turtles only. The capture method is by hand, and thus a directed capture method which allows researchers to be very selective as to what species they interact with and capture.

No other species will be affected by the activities authorized under the proposed actions. Because of the mitigation measures in the permit, we conclude that the proposed action may affect but is not likely to adversely affect these species, so they will not be considered further in this Opinion.

Species Likely to be Adversely Affected

NMFS has determined that the action being considered in the Opinion is likely adversely affect green and hawksbill sea turtles. Background information on the range-wide status of these species can be found in a number of published documents including recovery plans and other information on sea turtles. Summary information on the biology and status of this species is provided below.

Green Sea Turtles

Listing Status and Critical Habitat
The green sea turtle was listed in 1978 as threatened, except for the Florida and Pacific coast of Mexico breeding populations which were listed as endangered. It is also listed as endangered under the internationally recognized IUCN Red List of Threatened Species. Causes for this decline include harvest of eggs, sub adults and adults, incidental capture by fisheries, loss of habitat and disease.
Critical habitat for the green sea turtle has been designated for the waters surrounding Isla Culebra, Puerto Rico and its associated keys.

Taxonomy
The genus Chelonia is composed of two taxonomic units at the subspecies/subspecific level: the east Pacific green turtle (also known as the "black turtle," *C. mydas agassizii*), which ranges (including nesting) from Baja California south to Peru and west to the Galapagos Islands, and the nominate *C. m. mydas* in the rest of the range (insular Pacific, including Hawaii).

Physical Description
Green turtles are distinguished from other sea turtles by their smooth carapace with four pairs of lateral scutes, a single pair of prefrontal scutes, four post-orbital scales, and a serrated upper and lower jaw. Adult green turtles have a light to dark brown carapace, sometimes shaded with olive, and can exceed one meter in carapace length and 200 kilograms (kg) in body mass. Females nesting in Hawaii averaged 92 centimeters (cm) in straight carapace length (SCL), while at the Olimaro Atoll in Yap, females averaged 104cm in curved carapace length (CCL) and weighed approximately 140kg. Eastern Pacific green turtles are conspicuously smaller and lighter than their counterparts in the central and western Pacific. At the rookeries of Michoacán, Mexico, females averaged 82cm (CCL) while males averaged 77cm CCL (in (NMFS and USFWS 1998c).

Diet
Although most adult green turtles appear to have a highly herbivorous diet, consisting primarily of sea grass and algae (Bjorndal 1985), those along some areas of the east Pacific coast seem to have a more carnivorous diet. Analysis of stomach contents of green turtles found off Peru revealed a large percentage of molluscs and polychaetes, while fish and fish eggs, and jellyfish and commensal amphipods comprised a lesser percentage (Bjorndal 1997). Black turtles studied in the Magdalena Bay region of the Baja California Peninsula were found to feed predominantly on red algae, *Gracilariopsis*, and to a lesser extent, sea lettuce (*Ulva lactuca*) (Hilbert et al. 2002). These turtles locate algae in the rocky coasts and marine grasses plentiful in the shallow waters of the coastal areas, including lagoons and bays (Marquez Millan and Carrasco 2003). Black turtles foraging in areas adjacent to Magdalena Bay fed primarily on sea grass. The stomach contents of one turtle in this area contained more than 82% red crabs (*Plueroncodes planipes*), perhaps the first record of this species feeding predominantly on crustaceans (Mendilaharsu et al. 2003). In the Hawaiian Islands, green turtles are site-specific and consistently feed in the same areas on preferred substrates, which vary by location and between islands (Landsberg et al. 1999).

General Distribution
Green turtles are found throughout the world, occurring primarily in tropical, and to a lesser extent, subtropical waters. The species occurs in five major regions: the Pacific Ocean, Atlantic Ocean, Indian Ocean, Caribbean Sea, and Mediterranean Sea. These regions can be further divided into nesting aggregations within the eastern, central and western Pacific Ocean; the western, northern and eastern Indian Ocean; Mediterranean Sea; and eastern, southern and western and western Atlantic Ocean, including the Caribbean Sea. Primary nesting aggregations of green turtles (i.e., sites with greater than 500 nesting females per year) include: Ascension Island (south Atlantic Ocean), Australia, Brazil, Comoros Islands, Costa Rica, Ecuador (Galapagos Archipelago), Equatorial Guinea (Bioko Island), Guinea-Gissau (Bijagos Archipelago), Iles Espases Islands (Tromelin Island, Europa Island), Indonesia, Malaysia, Oman, Philippines, Saudi Arabia, Seychelles Islands, Suriname, and United States (Florida) (Seminoff 2002b).

Smaller nesting aggregations (defined as) include: Angola, Bangladesh, Bikar Atoll, additional sites in Brazil, Chagos Archipelago, China, Cuba, Cyprus, Democratic Republic of Yemen, Dominican Republic, d'Entrecasteaux Reef, French Guiana, Ghana, Guyana, India, Iran, Japan, Kenya, Madagascar, Maldives Islands, Mayotte Archipelago, Mexico, Micronesia, Pakistan, Palmerston Atoll, Papua New Guinea, Primieras Islands, Sao Tome é Principe, Sierra Leone, Solomon Islands, Somalia, Sri Lanka, Taiwan, Tanzania, Thailand, Turkey, Scilly Atoll, United States (Hawaii), Venezuela, and Vietnam (Seminoff 2002a).

Green turtles appear to prefer waters that usually remain around 20 degrees C in the coldest month. During warm spells (e.g., El Nino), green turtles may be found considerably north of their normal distribution. Stinson (1984) found green turtles to appear most frequently in U.S. coastal waters with temperatures exceeding 18 degrees C. An east Pacific green turtle equipped with a satellite transmitter was tracked along the California coast and showed a distinct preference for waters with temperatures above 20 degrees C (Eckert, unpublished data).

Additionally, it is presumed that drift lines or surface current convergences are preferential zones due to increased densities of likely food items. In the western Atlantic, drift lines commonly contain floating sargassum capable of providing small turtles with shelter and sufficient buoyancy to raft upon (NMFS and USFWS 1998c). Underwater resting sites include coral recesses, the underside of ledges, and sand bottom areas that are relatively free of strong currents and disturbance from natural predators and humans. Available information indicates that green turtle resting areas are in proximity to their feeding pastures (NMFS and USFWS 2007a).

Molecular genetic techniques have helped researchers gain insight into the distribution and ecology of migrating and nesting green turtles. Throughout the Pacific, nesting assemblages group into two distinct regional clades: 1) western Pacific and South Pacific islands, and 2) eastern Pacific and central Pacific, including the rookery at French Frigate Shoals, Hawaii. In the eastern Pacific, greens forage coastally from San Diego Bay, California in the north to Mejillones, Chile, in the south. Based on the mtDNA analyses, green turtles found on foraging grounds along Chile's coast originate from the Galapagos nesting beaches, while those greens foraging in the Gulf of California originate primarily from the Michoacan nesting stock. Green

turtles foraging in San Diego Bay and along the Pacific coast of Baja California originate primarily from rookeries of the Islas Revillagigedos (Dutton 2003).

Life History

Sea turtles are a long-lived species with delayed maturity and have a life history that includes large numbers of early stage individuals (as a result of high fecundity in the adult life stages) of which relatively few survive through the rigors of natural mortality from predation, environmental variation, and individual fitness to older reproductive stages (Crouse 1999a). Compared to all other sea turtles, green turtles exhibit particularly slow growth rate, and age to maturity appears to be the longest. Based on age-specific growth rates, green turtles are estimated to attain sexual maturity beginning at age of between 25 to 50 years (Limpus and Chaloupka 1997; Bjorndal et al. 2000; Zug et al. 2002). The length of reproductivity/fecundity has been estimated to range from 17 to 23 years (Carr et al. 1978; Fitzsimmons et al. 1995 in Seminoff 2002a).

The basic life cycle of green turtles (based on (Chaloupka 2002)) can be broken into six life stages: (1) egg/neonate; (2) pelagic juvenile; (3) benthic juvenile; (4) sub-adult; (5) maturing adult; and (6) adult, each with their own expected survival rate. The earliest life stages (Stages 1 and 2) have the highest proportion of individuals but the lowest survival probabilities. Despite low abundances in the mature life stages, mature individuals have more chances to reproduce and replace themselves. Consequently, changes in the survival rates of adults would be expected to have significant effect on the growth and persistence of this population. Persistence of long-lived species with delayed maturity would be most vulnerable to impacts that preclude individuals from attaining age and sexual maturity.

The observed declines in the green turtle populations attest to the effect of changing these survival rates on species' persistence. Green turtles have long survived natural fluctuations in environmental conditions (environmental stochasticity) such as change in climate, coastal erosion, or destruction of nesting beaches by hurricanes and typhoons. Green turtles have survived these phenomena by evolving a life history strategy that allows their populations to withstand periodic, and often significant, losses in the life stages that would be most vulnerable to environmental change (that is, eggs, hatchlings, and juveniles) while buffering the adult life stages from these environmental changes through ocean dispersal. Although adult females on nesting beaches are also vulnerable to phenomena like beach erosion, hurricanes and typhoons, the reproductive pattern in which adult females only nest every two or more years exposes only a portion of the breeding populations to these risks. Conversely, most anthropogenic activities such as harvest and poaching of eggs and adults, incidental capture in fisheries, or human destruction or encroachment of nesting habitat place these populations under constant pressure, can affect entire regions in short periods of time, and can affect all life stages simultaneously.

For example, green turtle eggs and hatchlings are vulnerable to many of the same factors affecting other sea turtle populations: beach erosion, human or wildlife poaching and predation, and wildly fluctuating beach temperatures. Once the green turtles transition into the oceanic environment, however, individual life stages are vulnerable to different impacts based on the habitats they inhabit. Pelagic individuals are incidentally captured in pelagic fisheries such as

longlines. Benthic life stages are injured or killed by coastal fisheries (e.g., trawling or gill netting) and other hazards associated with the nearshore environment. While relatively few green turtles are taken by pelagic fisheries, based on past observations in the Hawaii-based longline fishery, sub-adult and adult green turtles are the life stage most commonly captured and injured or killed. Because changes in the survival rates of these stages have the highest proportional effect on a population's finite growth rate (λ), the consequences of these fisheries on the survival and recovery of green turtle populations would be significant, particularly when these losses are added to losses in other life stages. The combined effect of these activities, which affect most or all life stages of most green turtle populations, would cause these populations to have λs that would reflect declining populations.

Migration

The nonbreeding range of green turtles is generally tropical, and can extend thousands of miles from shore in certain regions. Hawaiian green turtles monitored through satellite transmitters were found to travel more than 1,100km from their nesting beach in the French Frigate Shoals, south and southwest against prevailing currents to numerous distant foraging grounds within the 2,400km span of archipelago (Balazs 1994; Balazs et al. 1994; Balazs and Ellis 1996). Three green turtles outfitted with satellite tags on the Rose Atoll (the easternmost island at the Samoan Archipelago) traveled on a southwesterly course to Fiji, approximately 1,500km distance (Balazs et al. 1994; Craig et al. 2004).

Tag returns of eastern Pacific green turtles establish that these turtles travel long distances between foraging and nesting grounds. In fact, 75 percent of tag recoveries from 1982-1990 were from turtles that had traveled more than 1,000km from Michoacán, Mexico. Even though these turtles were found in coastal waters, the species is not confined to these areas, as indicated by 1990 sightings records from a NOAA research ship. Observers documented green turtles 1,000-2,000 statute miles from shore (Eckert 1993). The east Pacific green turtle is also the second-most sighted turtle in the east Pacific during tuna fishing cruises; they are frequent along a north-south band from 15 degrees N to 5 degrees S along 90 degrees W, and between the Galapagos Islands and Central American coast (NMFS and USFWS 1998b). In a review of sea turtle sighting records from northern Baja California to Alaska, Stinson (1984) determined that the green turtle was the most commonly observed sea turtle on the U.S. Pacific Coast, with 62% reported in a band from southern California and southward.

The northernmost reported resident population of green turtles occurs in San Diego Bay, where about 50-60 mature and immature turtles concentrate in the warm water effluent discharged by a power plant (McDonald et al. 1994). These turtles appear to have originated from east Pacific nesting beaches of the Revillagigedo Islands Archipelago (west of Baja California) (NMFS and USFWS 2007a).

Population Status and Trends

Seminoff (2004) estimated that analyses of subpopulation changes at 32 Index Sites distributed globally showed a 48% to 67% decline in the number of mature females nesting annually over the last 3 generations. These estimates are, however, based on a conservative approach; actual declines were thought to possibly exceed 70%. However, NMFS and USFWS (2007a) analyzed 23 threatened nesting concentrations among 11 ocean regions around the world that included

both large and small rookeries and are believed to be representative of the overall trends for their respective regions. Of these 23 sites for which assessment of current trends was possible, 10 nesting populations are increasing, 9 are stable, and 4 are decreasing. Continuous datasets ≥ 20 years are available for 9 threatened population sites, all of which are either increasing or stable. The review cautioned that despite the apparent global increase in numbers, the positive overall trend should be viewed cautiously since trend data are available for just over half of all sited examined. Nesting populations are doing relatively well in the Pacific, Western Atlantic, and Central Atlantic Ocean but are doing poorly in Southeast Asia, Eastern Indian Ocean, and perhaps the Mediterranean (NMFS and USFWS 2007a). NMFS and USFWS (2007a) also reviewed the endangered breeding populations' status and found that the nesting population of Florida appears to be increasing based on 18 years of index nesting data from throughout the state. Data for the largest nesting concentration in Pacific Mexico where nesting beach monitoring has been ongoing every year since the 1981-1982 nesting season shows an increase in nesting.

Green turtles are thought to be declining throughout the Pacific Ocean, with the exception of Hawaii, as a direct consequence of a historical combination of overexploitation and habitat loss (Eckert 1993; Seminoff 2002a). A more detailed description of the abundance, distribution and population trends for green turtles in the Pacific Ocean is presented in the following subsections.

--American Samoa

The U.S. territory of American Samoa is located east of Samoa in the south Pacific and consists of the main island of Tutuila, the Manu`a group (Ofu, Olosega, and Ta`u Islands), Swains Island, and Rose Atoll (Tuato'o-Bartley et al. 1993). In American Samoa, sub-adult and adult green turtles occur in low abundance in nearshore waters around Tutuila, Ofu, Olosega, Ta`u and Swains Islands with sporadic, low-level green turtle nesting occurring on Tutuila and Swains Islands (Tagarino et al. 2008; Tagarino and Utzurrum 2010). A May 2009 survey at Swains identified a total of 56 locations of pits/possible nests, turtle tracks, and evidence of pig activity (wallows) (Tagarino and Utzurrum 2010). However, the primary green turtle nesting location is at Rose Atoll with up to several dozen nests laid annually between October and March (review provided by Balazs 2009). No nesting trend data are available, but anecdotal information suggests major declines in the last 50 years (Tuato'o-Bartley et al. 1993; Utzurrum 2002). Since 1971, 42 individual nesting green turtles have been flipper tagged on Rose Atoll during various trips (Grant et al. 1997). Of seven post-nesting green turtles satellite-tagged in 1993-95, six migrated nearly directly to Fiji, possibly to feed on Fiji's extensive seagrass beds (Craig et al. 2004). Several surveys cited in a summary of nesting observations at Rose Atoll 1839-1993 (Balazs 2009) documented pits on Sand and Rose Islands (up to 301 in one survey), however, it is unclear how that relates to numbers of individuals because some pits could be from prior nesting seasons.

In addition to protection under the federal ESA, sea turtles in American Samoa are protected by the Fishing and Hunting Regulations for American Samoa (DMWR 1995) which prohibit the import, export, sale, possession, transport, or trade of sea turtles or their parts and take (as defined by the ESA) and carry additional penalties for violations at the local government level. The Department of Marine and Wildlife Resources (DMWR) is the agency with vested authority

and responsibility for conservation of protected species and enforcement of protected species regulations in American Samoa.

--Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands
The Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) consists of 15 volcanic islands in the Marianas archipelago (excluding Guam). The three largest and southernmost islands are Saipan, Rota, and Tinian with the majority of the human population residing on Saipan. In CNMI, green turtle nesting occurs from March through August with some year round nesting documented. It is estimated that possibly fewer than 10 individual turtles nest annually on the islands of Saipan, Tinian and Rota (NMFS and USFWS 1998). Surveys of the northern islands, Alamagan, Pagan, Agrigan, and Asuncion, were sponsored by the Department of Defense and organized by the USFWS from May – June 2010. Turtle nesting activity was only observed on Agrigan, with seven nests documented (C. Eggleston and F. Amidon pers. com.). There were no recorded nesting observations during a survey of Anatahan in 2002 (Ilo and Manglona 2002).

The CNMI Division of Fish and Wildlife (DFW) has monitored nesting activity on Saipan since 1999 and has documented four to eighteen nests laid per year (DFW unpublished annual reports to PIRO). At least five beaches on Saipan have been monitored somewhat consistently over the past five years: Bird Island, Wing, Tank, Lao Lao Bay, and Obyan beaches (Kolinski 2001; Ilo et al. 2005; DFW 2009). Nesting likely occurs on all or most of the accessible beaches on Tinian (Pultz et al. 1999), with six beaches occurring on Navy lands monitored for turtle nesting activity by Navy personnel: Chulu, Lamlam, Babui, Chiget, Dangkulo (Long Beach), and Masalok (Vogt 2009). Eleven beaches on Rota are known to support nesting: Songton, Teteto, Mochong, Sagua (Kokomo), Coral Garden, Okgok, Apanon, and Gaonan (the Cave Beaches), Uyulan, Tatgua, and Latte Stone (Lalayak or I Batko) (Ilo, Camacho et al. 2005), of which two beaches had confirmed nesting activity in 2009 (Okgok and Tagua).

Intensive monitoring occurred on Saipan at seven beaches from March 4 to August 31, 2009 resulting in 16 green turtle nests documented (DFW 2009). Of major concern, however, is that three of potentially five nesting turtles and three nests were illegally harvested which suggests that poaching remains a significant threat to turtles on Saipan. Rapid assessments at Rota beaches Okgok and Tatgua on July 12, 2009 yielded 13 nests. On Tinian, from July 22-31, 2009, 36 nests at five beaches were documented with evidence of one nesting female illegally harvested (DFW 2009). Additional nesting assessments and dedicated monitoring efforts at Tinian and Rota are needed as these islands may provide viable nesting beaches in CNMI and are likely good candidate index sites for long-term monitoring to assess nesting trends over time. Genetic samples analyzed to date indicate that nesting females in CNMI and Guam are indistinguishable and should be treated as a single management unit (Dutton 2009 unpublished). However, sample sizes are small and additional sampling may reveal other haplotypes. Sufficient information on nesting trend is not available for green turtles in CNMI although anecdotal information from residents suggests that nesting activity has decreased over time, likely as a result of direct harvest, coastal development, and WWII impacts to nesting turtles and their habitats.

In addition to protection under the federal ESA, sea turtles in CNMI are protected by the Fish, Game and Endangered Species Act (PL 2-51). CNMI PL 2-51 establishes a Fish and Wildlife

Division and states that the Director of Natural Resources shall determine whether any species shall be designated as threatened or endangered. Green and hawksbill turtles are listed as protected species in the CNMI Hunting Regulations (CNMI DFW website, accessed 2013) prohibiting hunting for these species. The CNMI Department of Land and Natural Resources, Division of Fish and Wildlife is the agency with vested authority and responsibility for the conservation of protected species and enforcement of protected species regulations in CNMI.

--Guam

Guam is the southernmost island in the Marianas archipelago located in the western Pacific, south of Japan and north of Papua New Guinea. There is regular, low density green turtle nesting on Guam at a number of sites. Nesting activity appears to occur at low levels year round with a more concentrated nesting season apparent from May through August (Pritchard 1995; NMFS and USFWS 1998c). Documented nesting beaches include: Ritidian National Wildlife Refuge, Haputo, Urunao, Tumon Bay, Cabras Island, the waterfront annex of Naval Base Guam, Spanish Steps, Cocos Island, Acho Bay, Nomña Bay, Jinapsan, and Tarague Beach (Grimm and Farley 2008; DAWR 2004). The nearshore marine environment around Guam has been degraded by impacts from intense combat during WWII, shoreline development, sediment-laden runoff, pollution, and years of poorly treated wastewater effluent. Spanish Steps is at the mouth of Apra Harbor which has been heavily modified, particularly since World War II.

The Guam Department of Agriculture Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR) initiated a sea turtle program in 1999 with primary objectives to monitor nesting activity and collect population data. From October 1, 2006 through July 31, 2008, 55 green turtle nests were counted at various beaches during opportunistic surveys throughout Guam (DAWR 2009). Spanish Steps, or Orote point, on U.S. Navy land is considered one of the primary nesting locations on Guam (Grimm and Farley 2008). Naval Facilities Engineering Command Marianas (NAVFACMAR) monitored nesting beaches at Spanish Steps three times per week from May to July during 2007 and 2008 that resulted in five and 18 green turtle nests, respectively (Grimm and Farley 2008). Based on this limited information, one to four adult green turtles may nest per season at Spanish Steps; however, sufficient long-term and standardized monitoring information is not available to quantitatively describe the abundance or trend of nesting green turtles at Spanish Steps or for Guam overall. In 2000 and 2007, two post-nesting green turtles were satellite tagged on Guam and traveled to the Philippines and Japan, respectively (DAWR unpublished). Currently, nesting activity is documented opportunistically by Haggan-watch, a community-based volunteer network administered by DAWR.

In addition to protection under the federal ESA, sea turtles are protected by the Endangered Species Act of Guam which adopts the same definitions and status designations as the federal ESA and carries additional penalties for violations at the local government level. DAWR is the agency with vested authority and responsibility for the conservation of protected species and enforcement of the ESA of Guam. Other Guam resource agencies, such as the Bureau of Statistics and Plans (BSP), also have specific mandates in relation to sea turtle conservation. The BSP administers the Guam Coastal Management Plan (GCMP) through the Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972 (Guam Public Law 92-583 and Public Law 94-370). The GCMP guides the use, protection, and development of land and ocean resources within Guam's coastal

zone, which includes all non-Federal property and all submerged lands and waters out to 3 nm (5.6 km) from the shoreline.

--Hawaii
The State of Hawaii is an archipelago in the central Pacific Ocean containing hundreds of volcanic islands, separated into two groups: eight large southeastern Main Hawaiian Islands (MHI; seven of which are inhabited), and numerous uninhabited Northwestern Hawaiian Islands (NWHI; designated the Papahanaumokuakea Marine National Monument by Presidential Proclamation in June 2006). Green turtles nesting and foraging within the Hawaiian Archipelago are likely comprised of one genetic stock, and may be considered a discreet management unit separate from other Pacific stocks (Dutton et al. 2008). Nesting occurs between May and August, and the primary nesting location at French Frigate Shoals (FFS) in the NWHI supports over 90% of documented green turtle nesting in Hawaii (Balazs 1976; Balazs 1980). Minor nesting also occurs at other atolls and islands in the NWHI and on Kauai, Oahu, Molokai, Lanai, and Maui within the MHI (NMFS and USFWS 1998b). Within FFS, over 50% of all nesting occurs on East Island (Balazs 1976; Niethammer et al. 1997; Balazs and Chaloupka 2004a), where nesting surveys have been conducted annually at this index site since 1973 via a collaborative arrangement between NMFS Pacific Islands Fisheries Science Center (PIFSC) and USFWS.

The Hawaiian green turtle population was subjected to extensive human exploitation in the form of turtle and egg harvest at foraging and nesting grounds from the mid-1800s until the early 1960s, and nesting habitat destruction as a result of development (Balazs 1976; Niethammer et al. 1997; Balazs and Chaloupka 2004). Since enactment of State and federal ESA protections in 1974 and 1978, respectively, the nesting population at FFS has exhibited high annual variability in nesting female abundance and a consistent upward trend over the past thirty years with an estimated annual growth rate of 5.7% (Chaloupka et al. 2008). In Hawaii, green turtles lay up to six clutches of eggs per year (mean of 3.7) and clutches consist of about 100 eggs each. Females migrate to breed only once every two or possibly many more years. On the Hawaiian Archipelago, females nest every 3 to 4 years (Balazs and Chaloupka 2004). The largest number of nesting females observed during a field season at East Island occurred in 2008 with 580 females identified during the six week sampling period (PIFSC and FWS unpublished).

In addition to protection under the federal ESA and international agreements and conventions, sea turtles in Hawaii are protected by the Hawaii Revised Statutes, Chapter 195D (Hawaii State Legislature, accessed 9/20/2013) and Hawaii Administrative Rules, 13-124 (Hawaii Administrative Rules, accessed 9/20/2013) which adopt the same definitions, status designations, and prohibitions as the federal ESA and carry additional penalties for violations at the State government level. The Hawaii Department of Land and Natural Resources (DLNR) Division of Aquatic Resources (DAR) is the state agency responsible for the conservation and management of protected species in Hawaii. The Division of Conservation and Resources Enforcement (DOCARE) is the agency with enforcement authority at the state level in matters involving violations of Hawaii's protected species regulations.

--Pacific Remote Island Areas
The Pacific Remote Island Areas (PRIAs) are U.S. areas that are widely spread throughout the

Pacific and include Wake, Johnston and Palmyra Atolls, Kingman Reef, and Jarvis, Howland, and Baker Islands. Following a 28 day assessment in 1983 it was concluded that green turtles do not nest at Johnston Atoll, but occur foraging within the atoll (Balazs et al. 1987). Low level nesting was observed at Palmyra in 1987 and along the west coast of Jarvis Island in the1930s (NMFS & FWS 1998) but no recent surveys have been conducted. Both Jarvis and Palmyra are geographically part of the Line Islands chain of coral atolls and islands in the central Pacific and are uninhabited remote National Wildlife Refuges administered by the USFWS. Jarvis is visited infrequently by refuge staff for one to two days at a time every two years. There is a research station on Cooper Island at Palmyra Atoll operated by The Nature Conservancy (TNC) that houses a small maintenance staff year-round and various research groups for shorter time periods. Anecdotally, no evidence of sea turtle nesting has been observed at Palmyra in recent years (USFWS, pers. comm.). In 2007, an in-water sea turtle research project was initiated at Palmyra by the American Museum of Natural History and Columbia University. While nesting beach monitoring is not a focus of the project, any nesting activities will be documented by either the project or by TNC staff that currently reside at the Atoll.

The PRIAs do not support resident human populations and do not have local governments. Therefore, all sea turtle species that occur in the PRIAs are protected by the federal ESA as described previously.

Threats

Threats to green sea turtles include present and threatened destruction, modification or curtailment of habitat. There are increasing impacts to the nesting (e.g., beach construction) and marine habitat (e.g., contamination, structural degradation) (NMFS and USFWS 2007a). Green sea turtles are also subject to overutilization and vulnerable to anthropogenic impacts during all life-stages. Poaching of eggs and killing of turtles continues to threaten subpopulations in many areas (NMFS and USFWS 2007a). This species is also vulnerable to being captured as bycatch in fisheries or affected incidentally by other human activities. Also, while the effects of climate change may be difficult to predict, its potential effects to the sea turtle environment (e.g., nesting habitat) or food sources is of concern (NMFS and USFWS 2007a).

Diseases also threaten a large number of existing subpopulations. The most commonly identified disease in green turtles is fibropapillomatosis (FP) (NMFS and USFWS 2007a).

Hawksbill Sea Turtles (*Eretmochelys imbricata*)

Listing Status and Critical Habitat

The hawksbill sea turtle was listed as endangered under the ESA in 1970, and is considered "Critically Endangered" by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN) based on global population declines of over 80 percent during the past three 3 generations (105 years) (Meylan and Donnelly 1999). Anecdotal reports throughout the Pacific indicate that the current population is well below historical levels. In the Pacific, this species is rapidly approaching extinction primarily due to the harvesting of the species for its meat, eggs, and shell, as well as the modification and destruction of nesting habitat by humans (NMFS and USFWS 1998d).

Critical habitat for the hawksbill sea turtle includes the waters surrounding the islands of Mona and Monito, Puerto Rico from the mean high water line seaward to 3 nautical miles (5.6 km). Key physical or biological features essential for the conservation of the hawksbill sea turtle found in this designated critical habitat include important foraging habitat, water quality, and shelter.

Physical Description

The hawksbill sea turtle has two pairs of prefrontal scales; thick, posteriorly overlapping scutes on the carapace; four pairs of costal scutes (the anterior- most not in contact with the nuchal scute); two claws on each flipper; and a beak-like mouth. In addition, when on land the hawksbill has an alternating gait, unlike the leatherback and green sea turtles. The carapace is heart-shaped in very young turtles and becomes more elongate or subovate with maturity. The lateral and posterior carapace margins are sharply serrated in all but very old individuals. The scutes are unusually thick and overlap posteriorly on the carapace in all but hatchlings and very old individuals. Carapacial scutes are often richly patterned with irregularly radiating streaks of brown and black on an amber background. The soft skin on the hawksbill's venter is cream or yellow and may be pinkish-orange in mature individuals. The scales of the head and forelimbs are dark brown or black and have sharply defined yellow borders. There are typically four pairs of inframarginal scales. The head is elongate and tapers sharply to a point. The hawksbill is a small to medium-sized marine turtle. Nesting females average about 87 cm in curved carapace length (Eckert 1993) and weight may be to 80 kg in the Caribbean (Pritchard et al. 1983), with a record weight of 127 kg (Carr 1952). Hatchlings in the U.S. Caribbean average about 42 mm in straight carapace length and range in weight from 13.5 to 19.5 g (Hillis and Mackay 1989; Eckert 1993).

Diet

Data on the diet of oceanic stage hawksbills are limited, but indicate a combination of plant and animal material (Bjorndal 1997). Studies have shown post-oceanic hawksbills to feed on sponges throughout their range, but to be especially spongivorous in the Caribbean (Meylan 1988; van Dam 1997; León and Bjorndal 2002), and rather more omnivorous in the Indo-Pacific. They also are known to eat small crustaceans.

General Distribution

Hawksbills are found in all tropical seas between about 30 N and 30 S latitudes (NMFS and USFWS 1998d). They occur 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, with representatives of at least some life history stages regularly occurring in southern Florida and the northern Gulf of Mexico (especially Texas); in the Greater and Lesser Antilles; and along the Central American mainland south to Brazil.

Within the United States, hawksbills are most common in Puerto Rico and its associated islands, and in the U.S. Virgin Islands. In the continental U.S., the species is recorded from all the Gulf states and from along the eastern seaboard as far north as Massachusetts, with the exception of Connecticut, but sightings north of Florida are rare (Meylan and Donnelly 1999).

Hawksbills are observed in Florida with some regularity on the reefs off Palm Beach County, where the warm Gulf Stream current passes close to shore, and in the Florida Keys. Texas is the only other state where hawksbills are sighted with any regularity. Most sightings involve post-hatchlings and juveniles. They are closely associated with coral reefs and other hard-bottom habitats, but they are also found in other habitats including inlets, bays, and coastal lagoons. These small turtles are believed to originate from nesting beaches in Mexico.

Nesting within the Caribbean dependent areas of the United States occurs principally in Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands, the most important sites being Mona Island and Buck Island. Nesting also occurs on other beaches of St. Croix, and on Culebra Island, Vieques Island, mainland Puerto Rico, St. John and St. Thomas. Within the continental United States, nesting is restricted to the southeast coast of Florida and Florida Keys.

In the U.S. Pacific Ocean, there have been no hawksbill sightings off the west coast. Hawksbills have been observed in the Gulf of California as far north as 29 degrees N, throughout the northwestern states of Mexico, and south along the Central and South American coasts to Columbia and Ecuador. In the Hawaiian Islands, nesting occurs in the main islands, primarily on several small sand beaches on the Islands of Hawaii and Molokai. Two of these sites are at a remote location in the Hawaii Volcanos National Park.

Within the Central Pacific, nesting is widely distributed but scattered and in very low numbers. Foraging hawksbills have been reported from virtually all of the island groups of Oceania, from the Galapagos Islands in the eastern Pacific to the Republic of Palau in the western Pacific (Pritchard 1982; Witzell 1983). Along the far western and southwestern Pacific, hawksbills nest on the islands and mainland of southeast Asia, from China and Japan, throughout the Philippines, Malaysia, and Indonesia, to Papua New Guinea (PNG), the Solomon Islands (McKeown 1977) and Australia (Limpus 1982). Along the eastern Pacific rim, hawksbill turtles were common to abundant in the 1930s (Cliffton 1982). By the 1990s, the hawksbill turtle was rare to absent in most localities where it was once abundant (Cliffton 1982; Cornelius 1982).

Life History

The life history of hawksbills consists of a pelagic stage that lasts from the time they leave the nesting beach as hatchlings until they are approximately 22–25 cm in straight carapace length (Meylan 1988), data suggest that the turtle switches foraging behaviors from pelagic surface feeding to benthic reef feeding (Limpus 1992), followed by residency in developmental habitats (foraging areas where immatures reside and grow) in coastal waters. Within the Great Barrier Reef of Australia, hawksbills move from a pelagic existence to a “neritic” life on the reef at minimum CCL of 35 cm. The best estimate of age at sexual maturity for hawksbill turtles is about 20 to 40 years (Chaloupka and Limpus 1997; Crouse 1999b). Boulon (1994) estimated that juvenile hawksbills from the U.S. Virgin Islands would require between 16.5 and 19.3 additional years to reach maturity after entering nearshore habitats at several years of age at 21.4 cm straight carapace length. Australian hawksbill turtles are sex dependent with the female growing faster. Maximal growth rates for both males and females occurred at 60 cm curved carapace length (CCL) and then declined to minimal rates of growth as the turtles neared maturity at 80 cm CCL (Chaloupka and Limpus 1997). The growth rates of Australian hawksbills appear to be less than those of Caribbean turtles, indicating geographic variation in growth. The maturing

turtle establishes foraging territory and will remain in this territory until it is displaced (Limpus 1992). As with other sea turtles, hawksbills will make long reproductive migrations between foraging and nesting areas (Meylan 1999a), but otherwise they remain within coastal reef habitats. In Australia, juvenile turtles outnumber adults 100:1. These populations are also sex biased with females outnumbering males 2.57:1 (Limpus 1992).

Adult foraging habitat, which may or may not overlap with developmental habitat, is typically coral reefs, although other hard-bottom communities and occasionally mangrove-fringed bays may be occupied. Hawksbills show fidelity to their foraging areas over periods of time as great long as several years (van Dam and Diez 1998). Females nest an average of 3 to 5 times per season, with some geographic variation in this parameter (see references on pp. 204-205 of in Meylan and Donnelly 1999; (Richardson et al. 1999)). Clutch size is higher on average (up to 250 eggs) than that of green turtles (Hirth 1980). Reproductive females may exhibit a high degree of fidelity to their nest sites. This, plus the tendency of hawksbills to nest at regular intervals within a season, makes them vulnerable to capture on the nesting beach.

Hawksbills utilize different habitats at different stages of their life cycle. Post-hatchling hawksbills occupy the pelagic environment, taking shelter in weed lines that accumulate at convergence points. Hawksbills reenter coastal waters when they reach approximately 20-25 cm carapace length. Coral reefs are widely recognized as the resident foraging habitat of juveniles, subadults and adults. This habitat association is undoubtedly related to their diet of sponges, which need solid substrate for attachment. The ledges and caves of the reef provide shelter for resting both during the day and night. Hawksbills are also found around rocky outcrops and high energy shoals, which are also optimum sites for sponge growth. Hawksbills are also known to inhabit mangrove-fringed bays and estuaries, particularly along the eastern shore of continents where coral reefs are absent. Tag return data (Pritchard and Trebbau 1984a) and recent genetic studies (Bowen 1995) suggest that individual foraging areas support hawksbills from distant breeding populations rather than just from nearby rookeries.

Although hawksbill nesting is broadly distributed, at no one place do hawksbills nest in large numbers, and many areas have experienced notable declines. Until recently, hawksbills were considered to be naturally rare and to have a more dispersed nesting pattern than other sea turtle species (Groombridge and Luxmoore 1989). However, it is now believed that the dispersed nesting observed today is the result of overexploitation of previously large colonies (Limpus 1995; Meylan and Donnelly 1999). Hawksbills utilize both low- and high-energy nesting beaches in tropical oceans of the world. Both insular and mainland nesting sites are known. Hawksbills will nest on small pocket beaches and, because of their small body size and great agility can traverse fringing reefs that limit access by other species. They exhibit a wide tolerance for nesting substrate type. Nests are typically placed under vegetation.

There is much variation in clutch size from site to site and among sizes of turtles, with the larger turtles laying the largest clutches. Known clutch size in the Pacific averages 130 eggs per clutch, around 3 clutches per year, and anecdotal reports indicate that hawksbill remigration intervals average around two years (Eckert 1993; NMFS and USFWS 1998d). Hawksbills nest throughout the insular tropical Pacific, though only in low density colonies. In the Campbell Island colony of northeastern Australia, nesting females average 83.2 cm CCL, weigh 51.6 kg and lay three

clutches of eggs 14 days apart. Average clutch size was 132 eggs (Limpus et al. 1983). In Samoa, hawksbill nests averaged 149.5 eggs.

Mrosovsky et al. (1995) evaluated the effect of incubation temperature on sex determination in hawksbill hatchlings. Incubation temperatures warmer than approximately 29.2 C produced females, while cooler temperatures produced males.

Migration

Like other sea turtles, hawksbills may undertake developmental migrations (migrations as immatures) and reproductive migrations that involve travel over hundreds or thousands of kilometers (Meylan 1999b). Reproductive females undertake periodic (usually non-annual) migrations to their natal beach to nest. An adult female tagged in its foraging ground in the Torres Strait was observed nesting 322 days later in the Solomon Islands, a distance of over 1,650 km (Pritchard and Trebbau 1984b). Another female traveled 1,400 km from the Solomon Islands to its foraging grounds in Papua New Guinea (Parmenter 1982). Movements of reproductive males are less well known, but are presumed to involve migrations to the nesting beach or to courtship stations along the migratory corridor.

Population Status and Trends

Since the hawksbill has become a solitary nester, population trends or estimates are difficult to determine. There are no world population estimates for hawksbill turtles, but a minimum of 15,000 to 25,000 females are thought to nest annually in more than 60 geopolitical entities (Groombridge and Luxmoore 1989). Moderate population levels appear to persist around the Solomons, northern Australia, Palau, Persian Gule islands, Oman, and parts of the Seychelles (Groombridge 1982). In a more recent review, Groombridge and Luxmoore (1989) list Papua New Guinea, Queensland, and Western Australia as likely to host 500-1,000 nesting females per year, while Indonesia and the Seychelles may support >1,000 nesting females. The largest known nesting colony in the world is located on Milman Island, Queensland, Australia where Loop (1995) tagged 365 hawksbills nesting within an 11 week period. With the exception of Mexico, and possibly Cuba, nearly all Wider Caribbean countries are estimated to receive <100 nesting females per year (Meylan 1989).

Hawksbills appear to be declining throughout their range. By far the most serious problem hawksbill turtles face is the harvest by humans, while a less significant threat, but no less important, is loss of habitat due to expansion of resident human populations and/or increased tourism development. Dramatic reductions in the numbers of nesting and foraging hawksbills have occurred in Micronesia and the Mexican Pacific coast, probably due largely to technological advances in fishing gear, which facilitate legal and illegal harvest. In addition, the hawksbill tortoiseshell trade probably remains an important contributing factor in the decline of the hawksbill. Although the Japanese market was closed in 1994, southeast Asia and Indonesia markets remain lucrative (NMFS and USFWS 1998d). In addition to the demand for the hawksbill's shell, there is a demand for other products including leather, oil, perfume, and cosmetics. Prior to being certified under the Pelly Amendment, Japan had been importing about 20 metric tons of hawksbill shell per year, representing approximately 19,000 turtles. A negotiated settlement was reached regarding this trade on June 19, 1992. The hawksbill shell commands high prices, a major factor preventing effective protection.

Distribution and Abundance of Nesting Females in the Pacific Ocean
Generally, in the Pacific, the largest nesting concentrations of hawksbills occur on remote oceanic islands off Australia (Torres Strait), while remote beaches in the Solomon Islands, Papua New Guinea, Indonesia, and Malaysia serve as less significant sites. Otherwise, hawksbill nesting does not occur in abundance in the Pacific. Throughout Micronesia, hawksbill nesting is in decline, with Palau representing the highest activity, with conceivably as few as 20 nesting females per year (NMFS and USFWS 1998d). In Japan, nesting is very rare and is confined to the southern islands. Hawksbill nesting also occurs in Vietnam and China, although the status in these areas is unknown. Nesting is widespread throughout the Philippines, although the sites are relatively poorly known, and population abundance has not been quantified (Eckert 1993).

--American Samoa
For American Samoa, based on interviews, Tuato'o-Bartley et al. (1993) estimated 50 nesting female hawksbills per year on Tutuila and 30 nesting females per year on the Manu'a island group of Ofu, Olosega and Ta'u, using an average 2.8 nesting turtles per active beach. A total of 120 nesting females were estimated throughout American Samoa. However, since local people almost always seem to underestimate individual fecundity (numbers of clutches per female), the actual number of turtles nesting at Tutuila and Manu'a could be significantly lower than Tuato'o-Bartley's estimates. Given an estimate of 120 nesting females, recent records indicate that there is a decline in the number of females nesting annually, based on confirmed nests and clutches of hatchlings (Utzurrum 2002).

--CNMI
There are no reports of hawksbills nesting in the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands (CNMI) (Pritchard 1982). This is partly because there is a long history of occupation on the more southern islands of Saipan, Rota, and Tinian, and partly because almost no hawksbill nesting surveys of small pocket beaches have ever been done in remote areas of the CNMI. However, lack of evidences does not rule out the possibility of hawksbills nesting at low levels at unknown locations.

--Hawaii
Within the State of Hawaii, hawksbill turtles are known to nest on the Hawaiian Islands of Maui, Molokai, and Hawaii. Two nesting sites are located in the Hawaii Volcanoes National Park (Balazs 1980; Katahira et al. 1994). In surveys conducted between 1989 and 1993, 18 hawksbill turtles were tagged and 98 nests documented (NMFS and USFWS 1998d), although total population numbers and trends in abundance are not known for the Hawaiian population of hawksbill turtles. The peak nesting occurs from late July to early September (Katahira et al. 1994). Although hawksbill nesting habitat on the Big Island at Halape and Apua are within Hawaii Volcanoes National Park, nesting on the island of Hawaii is also known to occur at Kamehame, Punaluu, Horseshoe, Ninole, Kawa, and Pohue; on Maui, nesting occurs at Kealia, Makena, Kihei, Lahaina, and Hana; on Molokai, nesting occurs at Halawa Valley (E. Sharpe, pers. comm., 2005). However, because many of the shoreline areas on all the islands have not been monitored for nesting turtles, hawksbill turtles probably nest on additional beaches (E. Sharpe, pers. comm., 2005). Hawksbill turtles appear to prefer nesting sites with steep beaches and coarse sand, and this may explain, in part, their presence in the main Hawaiian Islands. Only

the ETP purse seine fishery has observed the take of hawksbills. Unfortunately, turtles in this fishery are not sampled to determine nesting origin. Nonetheless, because of the location of fishing effort, hawksbills taken in this fishery likely originate from eastern Pacific nesting beaches.

Threats

Threats to hawksbill sea turtles include present and threatened destruction, modification or curtailment of habitat. There are increasing impacts to the nesting (e.g., beach construction) and marine habitat (e.g., contamination, structural degradation) (NMFS and USFWS 2007b). Hawksbill sea turtles are also subject to overutilization and vulnerable to anthropogenic impacts during all life-stages. Although hawksbills are subject to the suite of threats on both nesting beaches and in the marine environment that affect other sea turtles, the decline of the species is primarily attributed to centuries of exploitation for tortoise shell, the beautifully patterned scales that cover the hawksbill's shell (Parsons 1972). Poaching of eggs and killing of turtles continues to threaten populations in many areas (NMFS and USFWS 2007b). The current primary global threat to hawksbills is habitat loss of coral reef communities. Hawksbill turtles rely on coral reefs and sea grass beds for food resources and habitat. As these communities continue to decline in quantity and quality, hawksbills will have reduced foraging opportunities and limited habitat options. Hawksbills are also vulnerable to being captured as bycatch in fisheries or affected incidentally by other human activities.

Coral reefs are vulnerable to destruction and degradation caused by human activities. Humans can alter coral reefs either gradually (i.e., pollution can degrade habitat quality) or catastrophically (e.g., toxic spills and vessel groundings). These habitats can be affected by eutrophication, sedimentation, chemical poisoning, collecting-gleaning, trampling (by fishermen and divers), anchoring, etc. (NMFS and USFWS 2007b). Chemical pollutants, such as petroleum, sewage, pesticides, solvents, industrial discharges, and agricultural runoff are responsible for an unquantifiable level of sea turtle mortality each year (NMFS and USFWS 2007b). The entanglement in and ingestion of marine debris threatens the survival of hawksbill sea turtles. Such debris includes not only discarded or abandoned fishing gear (lines, ropes, nets), but also plastic bags, plastic sheets, "6-pack" rings, and other discarded debris. Turtles can die from ingested garbage, such as plastic or tar (NMFS and USFWS 2007b). Recent evidence also suggests that global climate change is negatively impacting coral reefs by causing higher incidences of coral diseases, which can ultimately kill entire coral reef communities (Crabbe 2008), as well as other potential effects to the sea turtle environment (e.g., nesting habitat) (NMFS and USFWS 2007b).

Throughout the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico, problems at nesting beaches such as domestic animals, beach driving, litter, beach erosion, beach mining, beach replenishment, and recreational use of beaches have presented problems for nesting hawksbill turtles. In addition, beach front lights appear to pose a serious problem for hatchling hawksbill turtles in U.S. coastal areas (USFWS 1999).

The continuing demand for the hawksbill's shell as well as other products (leather, oil, perfume, and cosmetics), constitutes an important threat to this species. The British Virgin Islands, Cayman Islands, Cuba, Haiti, and the Turks and Caicos Islands (U.K.) all permit some form of

legal take of hawksbill turtles. In the northern Caribbean, hawksbills are directly harvested primarily for their commercially valuable carapace, which is often carved into hair clips, combs, jewelry, and other trinkets (Márquez 1990; Stapleton and Stapleton 2006). Additionally, hawksbills are harvested for their eggs and meat while whole stuffed turtles are sold as curios in the tourist trade. Hawksbill products are openly available in the Dominican Republic and Jamaica despite a prohibition on harvesting hawksbills and eggs (Fleming 2001). While the international trade in the shell of this species is prohibited between those countries that have signed the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species (CITES), illegal trade remains a problem.

In addition to anthropogenic threats, hawksbill turtles are also threatened by natural causes including hurricanes (NMFS and USFWS 2007b) and predation by exotic species (fire ants (Spp), raccoons (*Procyon lotor*) and opossums (*Didelphus virginiana*)) (USFWS 1999).

Hawksbill sea turtles are the focus of research activities worldwide. Research on sea turtles in the U.S. is carefully controlled and managed so that it does not operate to the disadvantage of the species. A very small percentage of the takes related to these activities results in injury or mortality.

Environmental Baseline

Environmental baselines for Biological Opinions include the past and present impacts of all state, Federal or private actions and other human activities in the action area, the anticipated impacts of all proposed Federal projects in the action area that have already undergone formal or early section 7 consultation, and the impact of state or private actions that are contemporaneous with the consultation process. The environmental baseline for this Biological Opinion includes the effects of several activities that impact the sea turtles discussed in this Opinion. A number of these activities are operating outside of the action area, but due to the great distances these sea turtles travel, other activities may impact them when they migrate out of the action area. To provide the reader with a more comprehensive discussion of the other activities affecting the species found in the action area, we have included some activities occurring in areas to which these species could migrate during the course of their life cycle.

Fisheries Impacts

Few fisheries in the Pacific Ocean are well observed or monitored for bycatch. Rough estimates can be made of the impacts of coastal, offshore and distant water fisheries on sea turtle populations in the Pacific Ocean by extrapolating data collected on fisheries with known effort that have been observed to incidentally take sea turtles. Such estimates are hampered by a lack of data on pelagic distribution of sea turtles.

This section will summarize some of the fisheries that have been observed or reported to incidentally or intentionally take sea turtles. Estimates of total fishing effort are complicated by the fact that not all active vessels fish equivalent days per trip or annually, or use the same number of hooks, length of net, or mesh size, or have the same carrying capacity. However, even with minimum effort estimates, it is apparent that there is significant fishing effort in the Pacific Ocean for which NMFS has minimal or no bycatch information for sea turtles.

North Pacific Driftnet Fisheries (before December 1992)
Because the effects of high seas driftnet fisheries operating prior to 1992 may still be evident in sea turtle population trends, it is important to summarize what little is known about the impact of the fisheries on sea turtles in the North Pacific Ocean. Foreign high-seas driftnet fishing in the North Pacific Ocean for squid, tuna and billfish ended with a United Nations moratorium in December, 1992. Except for observer data collected in 1990-1991, there is virtually no information on the incidental take of sea turtle species by the driftnet fisheries prior to the moratorium. The high seas squid driftnet fishery in the North Pacific was observed in Japan, Korea, and Taiwan, while the large-mesh fisheries targeting tuna and billfish were observed in the Japanese fleet (1990-91) and the Taiwanese fleet (1990). A combination of observer data and fleet effort statistics indicate that 4,373 turtles, mostly loggerheads and leatherbacks, were entangled by the combined fleets of Japan, Korea and Taiwan during June, 1990 through May, 1991, when all fleets were monitored (Wetherall 1997). Of these incidental entanglements, an estimated 1,011 turtles were killed (77 percent survival rate).

Green turtles and the majority of loggerheads measured by observers were immature, and most of the actual measured leatherbacks were immature, although the size of leatherbacks that were too large to bring on board were only estimated, and are therefore unreliable (Wetherall 1997). These rough mortality estimates for a single fishing season provide only a narrow glimpse of the past impacts of the driftnet fishery on sea turtles. A full assessment of impacts would consider the turtle mortality generated by the driftnet fleets over their entire history and geographical range. Unfortunately, comprehensive data are lacking, but the observer data does indicate the possible magnitude of past turtle mortality, given the best information available. Wetherall et al. (1993) speculate that "the minimum total turtle mortality in the North Pacific high-seas driftnet fisheries may have been on the order of 2,500 turtles per year during the late 1980s. The actual mortality was probably greater than this, but less than the estimated total driftnet bycatch of perhaps 9,000 turtles per year. Based on 1990 observer data, most of the mortalities would have been loggerheads taken in the Japanese and Taiwanese large-mesh fisheries."

While a comprehensive, quantitative assessment of the impacts of the North Pacific driftnet fishery on turtles is impossible without a better understanding of turtle population abundance, stock origins, exploitation history and population dynamics, it is likely that the mortality inflicted by the driftnet fisheries in 1990 and in prior years was significant (Wetherall et al. 1993), and the effects may still be evident in sea turtle populations today. The high mortality of juvenile, pre-reproductive adults and reproductive adults in the high-seas driftnet fishery has potentially altered the current age structure (especially if certain age groups were more vulnerable to driftnet fisheries) and therefore diminished or limited the reproductive potential of affected sea turtle populations.

Japanese tuna longliners in the Pacific Ocean and South China Sea - historical perspective
Historically, incidental bycatch of sea turtles has been an on-going threat to sea turtle populations in the Pacific Ocean (NMFS and USFWS 1998c). Based on turtle sightings and capture rates reported in a survey of fisheries research and training vessels and extrapolated to total longline fleet effort by the Japanese fleet in 1978, Nishimura and Nakahigashi (1990) estimated that 21,200 turtles, including greens, leatherback turtles, loggerheads, olive ridleys and

hawksbills, were captured annually by Japanese tuna longliners in the Western Pacific and South China Sea, with a reported mortality of approximately 12,300 turtles per year. Using commercial tuna longline logbooks, research vessel data and questionnaires, Nishimura and Nakahigashi (1990) estimated that for every 10,000 hooks in the Western Pacific and South China Sea, one turtle is captured, with a mortality rate of 42 percent. Although species-specific information is not available, vessels reported sightings of turtles in locations which overlap with commercial fishing grounds in the following proportions: loggerhead - 36 percent; green turtle - 19 percent; leatherback - 13.7 percent; hawksbill - 10.3 percent; olive ridley - 1.7 percent; and unknown - 19 percent. Caution should be used in interpreting the results of Nishimura and Nakahigashi (1990), including estimates of sea turtle take rate (per number of hooks) and resultant mortality rate, and estimates of annual take by the fishery, for the following reasons: (1) the data collected was based on observations by training and research vessels, logbooks and a questionnaire (i.e. hypothetical), and do not represent actual, substantiated logged or observed catch of sea turtles by the fishery; (2) the authors assumed that turtles were distributed homogeneously; and (3) the authors used only one year (1978) to estimate total effort and distribution of the Japanese tuna longline fleet. Although the data and analyses provided by Nishimura and Nakahigashi (1990) are conjectural, longliners fishing in the Pacific have had, and probably continue to have significant impacts on sea turtle populations.

Japanese Pacific Ocean tuna longliners - recent
Bycatch information for Japanese tuna longliners is based on data collected during 2000. At a bycatch working group meeting of the Inter-America Tropical Tuna Convention (IATTC), held in Kobe, Japan in 2004, a member of the Japanese delegation stated that based on preliminary data from 2000, the Japanese tuna longline fleet was estimated to take approximately 6,000 turtles, with 50 percent mortality. Little information on species composition was given; however, all species of Pacific sea turtles were taken (NMFS 2005).

Japanese coastal fisheries
Off the coast of Japan, gillnets and pound nets are very common. In addition, there is an intense trawl fishery for anchovy operated off-shore.

Taiwan Coastal setnet and gillnet fishery
Taiwanese have harvested sea turtles for many years for their meat, their bones for use in Chinese medicine, and eggs for profit. In Taiwan, sea turtle bycatch in fisheries occurs, although little quantitative information is available for fisheries operating in the Pacific Ocean (Cheng 2002).

Researchers investigated the incidental capture of sea turtles by the coastal setnet and gillnet fisheries in the eastern waters of Taiwan from 1991 through 1995. Setnets used in the coastal waters off Taiwan are near-shore sedentary trap nets, and rarely extend below 20 meters. During the time of the study, there were 107 setnets in Taiwan, and they provided the second largest total fish yields, after gillnets. According to interviews with fishermen, incidentally caught sea turtles are either sold to dealers in the market or are butchered for meat (subsistence). Fishing grounds including set nets and gillnets were observed from 1991 through 1992, and the fish market was visited once or twice per month from 1991 through 1995 to corroborate bycatch data (Cheng and Chen 1997).

Of the sea turtles caught, 82% were caught in setnets, and of these, all were alive. Green turtles accounted for 70% of the sea turtles taken, and captured turtles represented all age classes (large juvenile, subadult and adults) (Cheng and Chen 1997). Most captured loggerheads were either sub adults or adult females (only one male was unidentified), and most of the captured olive ridleys were sub adults. The one captured leatherback was released alive. Not surprisingly, bycatch rate also increased with fishing effort, and most of the turtles taken were sold to temples for "religious release" later. Of all captured turtles, 88% were sold to temples for Chinese religious ceremonies, 8% were stuffed or butchered, and 3% were released at the site (Cheng and Chen 1997).

Philippines

Near the Turtle Islands, a variety of fisheries interact with sea turtles, and Cruz (2002) reported an increasing number of floating dead turtles observed in this area since 1999, most likely attributable to an increasing number of fishing vessels operating in the area, including purse seiners, shrimp trawlers, and hulbot-hulbot (demersal drive-in net). These vessels originate primarily from Sabah, Malaysia, and Manila, Philippines. There was also an increasing number of fishing vessels operating in Philippine waters originated from China. Aside from fishing illegally, the Chinese vessels are also catching sea turtles. In January, 2002, more than 58 sea turtles, primarily green turtles were discovered on four Chinese vessels in Tabbataha Marine Park, a UNESCO Natural Heritage Park, located in the Sulu Sea (Cruz 2002).

Malaysia

Sea turtles are caught a variety of fisheries in Malaysia, ranging from driftnets, lift nets, ray nets (similar to sunken driftnets with a large mesh to target rays and sharks), trawl nets, and purse seines.

Distant Water Fishing Nations Longline Fishing in the EEZ around the Federated States of Micronesia

Heberer (1997) summarized the results of 51 distant-water fishing nation (DWFN) longline trips observed by Micronesian Maritime Authority fisheries observers from 1993 through 1995. Vessels from China, Taiwan, and Japan captured a total of 34 sea turtles. These turtles were reported as 15 olive ridleys, 8 green turtles, and 11 unidentified sea turtles. Thirty of the 34 turtles were released alive and the remainder were dead when landed (11.8% mortality rate). Data on hooking location or entanglement was not reported, nor was the condition of each turtle by species. Observer coverage is historically low in this area and the overall magnitude of impact to sea turtles unclear, however it is likely sea turtles are taken in the longline fishery when it occurs in this area.

Foreign tuna fisheries in the western and central Pacific Ocean

The western and central Pacific Ocean (area west of 150 degrees W longitude, and between 10 degrees N and 45 degrees S) contains the largest industrial tuna fishery in the world. Much of the effort takes place in the EEZs of Pacific-Island counties, in the western tropical Pacific area. Observers have been placed on both purse seiners and longliners in this area, and have operated and reported to the Oceanic Fisheries Programme of the Secretariat of the Pacific Community.

While observers have covered most of the fleets, three fleets have not been observed: the Japanese and Korean distant-water longline fleets operating in the eastern areas and the Australian swordfish fishery operating off eastern Australia.

There is low observer coverage (<1%) for the longline fishery, but patterns of sea turtle observed interactions have shown that sea turtles are more likely to encounter gear in tropical waters and that they are much more likely to encounter gear that is shallow-set (by an order of magnitude) versus deep-set (for longline fishery). When encountered on deep-set gear, sea turtles were likely to be taken on the shallowest hooks. From available observer data, the longline fishery operating in the western and central Pacific has previously been estimated to take 2,182 sea turtles per year, with 500-600 expected to die as a result of the encounter. From observer data, 1,490 are estimated taken by offshore/fresh tuna vessels using shallow-night sets, 129 are estimated taken by offshore/fresh tuna vessels on deep-day sets, and 564 are estimated taken by distant water freezer vessels on deep-day sets. The composition of species observed taken include (ranked by highest occurrence first): olive ridley, green, leatherback, loggerhead and hawksbill. Given the low observer coverage, this estimate has very wide confidence intervals.

Chile

Although data on the incidental take of sea turtles in the Chilean swordfish fisheries are sparse, both green and leatherback turtles have been confirmed taken and killed, and olive ridleys and loggerheads may also be taken incidentally by the fishery (Weidner and Serrano 1997). The Chilean swordfish fishery was comprised primarily of artisanal fishermen, averaging 500 boats (mainly driftnetters) from 1989 to 1991, and decreasing in numbers after 1991. Large industrial (i.e. commercial) boats have fished swordfish in Chile, the effort is comprised of gillnets, pelagic longliners and boats that switch gear.

Effort by the artisanal driftnet fishery for swordfish appears to have been relatively constant through 1996, as shown in Table 9. Given the total sea turtle take estimate from the 1988-89 season, and combining it with the total effort (days-at-sea) data from 1988-1996, and assuming effort was constant and in the same general area during all years, a simple calculation can be made to estimate the incidental take of turtles by the Chilean artisanal driftnet fishery for swordfish during subsequent years. Turtles reportedly began appearing in Chilean markets in 1987, just as the swordfish driftnet fishery was expanding, and Chilean observers have reported occasional individual sets with leatherback mortalities (in Weidner and Serrano 1997). Assuming an artisanal driftnet fishing effort equivalent to 1996 and assuming the proportion of species taken is equivalent to data collected from the 1988-89 fishing season, this fishery would have taken an estimated 39 greens, 76 leatherback turtles, 4 loggerheads, and 29 olive ridleys annually through 2002. However, this was an approximation, as the artisanal fleet had declined to maybe a third of its size sometime after 1996.

During 1996, there was a substantial expansion of Chilean longline fishing in offshore areas, but as there was no collection of data on this fishery at that time (Weidner and Serrano 1997), the effects on sea turtle stocks as a result in this change in fishing strategy are not known. In addition to the swordfish fishery, Chile also has had a substantial purse seine fleet (Weidner and Serrano 1997).

Peru
Since 1995, Peruvian law has prohibited the capture, trade, and consumption of sea turtles. Despite the law, sea turtles continue to be caught alive in artisanal fisheries as bycatch and are nearly always killed for "bushmeat."

Peruvian commercial longline fleets have had limited success in fishing for swordfish, so there is probably very little incidental catch of sea turtles in this fishery. Peruvian artisanal fishermen, however, also target fish species normally taken in commercial longline fisheries (especially shark) and have been more successful than the commercial longline fleet, so more turtles may be caught incidental to these artisanal fisheries (Weidner and Serrano 1997).

From 1997-1999, the government agency IMARPE estimated that 8.02 tons of turtles were captured (Alfaro-Shigueto et al. 2004). Kelez et al. (2003) report that sea turtles are commonly caught incidentally by artisanal fisherman, entangled by gillnets and hook-and-line. In general, fishermen from the smaller villages may release a turtle that is alive; however, if it is dying they will kill it. In the larger towns, fishermen will nearly always kill an incidentally caught turtle because of the demand for its meat. The carapaces of sea turtles are also sold in the department of Tumbes and in the northern part of the department of Piura, due to the tourist industry (Kelez et al. 2003). From January, 2001 through February, 2003, observers sampled eight ports in Peru to document sea turtle bycatch. During this time, observed turtle bycatch was 1,630 individuals, with total estimated bycatch to be 2,025 turtles (after extrapolation for days not observed).

Foreign longline fleets are also active and extensive off Peru and the bycatch of sea turtles in these foreign fisheries has been considered significant (Weidner and Serrano 1997). From September 2003 to November 2004, observers were placed on artisanal longline vessels operating out of the port of Ilo, home to one of the largest year-round artisanal longline fleets. The fleet used surface longlines. During the observation period, 588 sets were observed during 60 trips, and 154 sea turtles were taken as bycatch. Loggerheads were the species most often caught (73.4%), followed by green turtles (18.2%), olive ridleys (3.8%), and leatherbacks (2.6%). Species were most often entangled (74%); the rest were hooked. Of the loggerheads taken, 68% were entangled, 32% were hooked. Of the two fisheries, sea turtle bycatch was highest during the mahi mahi season, with 0.597 turtles/1,000 hooks, while the shark fishery caught 0.356 turtles/1,000 hooks (Alfaro-Shigueto et al. 2008). Sea turtles are rarely released into the sea after being caught as bycatch in this fishery; therefore, the mortality rate in this artisanal longline fishery is likely high because sea turtles are retained for future consumption or sale.

Central American Shrimp Fishery
Shrimp fishery operations were initiated throughout Central America during the mid-1950s. Arauz (1996) estimated that over 60,000 sea turtles were taken by shrimp trawlers on the Pacific coast of Central America. Mortality rates were not estimated. Olive ridleys were the species most commonly taken, and foraging grounds for these turtles overlap with shrimp trawling grounds. Table 1 shows the estimated turtle catch by shrimp trawlers in Central America, by country, for 1993.

Table 1. Estimated turtle catch by shrimp trawlers for the Pacific coast of central America, 1993

Country	# Vessels	Total CPUE Turtles/hr	Turtles/year
Guatemala	58	?	(10,000)
El Salvador	70	0.0511	21.280
Nicaragua	21	?	(8,000)
Costa Rica	55	0.0899	20,762
Total	204		60,042

Note: figures in parenthesis are estimated. Source: Arauz, 1996.

Costa Rica

Sea turtles are impacted by Costa Rican fisheries and by interaction with human activities. Several studies have been undertaken in recent years in order to document the incidental capture of sea turtles in Costa Rican longline fisheries. Two studies in 1997 and 1998 on two longline fishing cruises (one experimental) documented a high incidental take of sea turtles. On one cruise, a total of 34 turtles (55% olive ridleys and 45% east Pacific green turtles) were taken on two sets containing 1,750 hooks (1.42 turtles per 100 hooks). One additional set caught two leatherbacks. The second cruise documented the incidental take of 26 olive ridleys, with 1,804 hooks deployed (Arauz et al. 2000). An observer program was put in place from August, 1999 through February, 2000. Seventy seven longline sets were observed on 9 cruises. Of the nearly 40,000 hooks deployed, turtles represented 7.6% of the total catch, with a catch per unit effort of 6.364 turtles/1,000 hooks.

Mexican (Baja California) fisheries

Sea turtles have been protected in Mexico since 1990, when a federal law decreed the prohibition of the "extraction, capture and pursuit of all species of sea turtle in federal waters or from beaches within national territory ... [and a requirement that] ... any species of sea turtle incidentally captured during the operations of any commercial fishery shall be returned to the sea, independently of its physical state, dead or alive" (Garcia-Martinez and Nichols 2002).

Although there are no solid estimates of fisheries-related sea turtle mortality rates for the region, sea turtles are known to interact with (and be killed by) several fisheries in the area. As in other parts of the world, shrimp trawling off Baja California is a source of sea turtle mortality, although since 1996, shrimp fishermen are required to use turtle excluder devices.

Tuna Purse Seine Fishery in the Eastern Tropical Pacific

The international fleet represents the majority of the fishing effort and carrying capacity in the Eastern Tropical Pacific (ETP) tuna fishery, with much of the total capacity consisting of purse seiners greater than 400 short tons (st). These large vessels comprised nearly 70 percent of the total fishing capacity operating in the ETP in 1996 (IATTC 2002). An average of 122 foreign vessels with a carrying capacity greater than 400 st fished each year in the ETP during 1996 to 2001. In addition to these larger vessels, the foreign fleet contains smaller vessels less than 400 st that target tuna in the ETP. From 1996 to 2001, an average of 59 foreign vessels ranging from 45 to 400 st carrying capacity fished in the ETP each year (IATTC 1999); IATTC 2001). Recent

information from the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission (IATTC) shows that the number of active purse seiners of all sizes is 236 vessels, with Mexico and Ecuador comprising the majority of the fleet (65 and 85 vessels, respectively) (Source: IATTC 2007 (www.iattc.org)).

Data from the IATTC indicate that between approximately 17 and 172 total sea turtles per year were killed by vessels over 400 st (364 mt) in the ETP purse seine fishery from 1993-2004. The primary species taken were olive ridleys (M. Hall, IATTC 2006), likely because they are proportionately more abundant than any other sea turtle species in the ETP and they have been observed to have an affinity for floating objects (Arenas and Hall 1991). The numbers of sea turtles killed by the fishery dropped significantly in 2002, and the years following, likely as a result of increased awareness by fishermen through educational seminars given by the IATTC and conservation measures implemented through Resolutions adopted by the IATTC. Given the passing of a recent IATTC Resolution on Bycatch, sea turtle mortalities should continue to decrease.

As mentioned, the U.S. fleet (large vessels only) has 100 percent observer coverage; therefore, the fate of every sea turtle taken is documented. Because the U.S. fleet does not set on dolphins, sea turtles are taken in school sets and log/Fish Aggregating Devices (FAD) sets. The fate of sea turtles that interact with the U.S. purse seine fleet during such sets may only be comparable to the non-U.S. fleet that sets on logs/FADs and tuna schools. Similar to the entire purse seine fleet, the majority of the sea turtles taken by the fishery are olive ridleys, and most sea turtles are released unharmed (M. Hall, IATTC 2005).

Since 1999, seminars have been given by the IATTC to skippers and their crews to educate them on, among other issues, status of sea turtles, and handling and recovery of turtles taken by purse seiners in the ETP. Purse seine fishermen are required to promptly release unharmed, to the extent practicable, all sea turtles and crews are required to be trained in techniques for handling turtles to improve survival after release.

Purse seine fisheries in the western tropical Pacific Ocean (WTP)
There are nearly 400 active purse seine vessels originating from a variety of countries and operating nearly exclusively in tropical waters of the central and western Pacific Ocean. The purse seine fishery in the WTP is observed, and observer effort generally covers the extent of the fleet's activity. Although there has been less than 5% observer coverage for the entire fishery, the U.S. fleet has maintained up to 20% coverage since the mid-1990s. For the purse seine fisheries operating in the WTP, an estimated 105 sea turtles are taken per year, with approximately 17% mortality rate. The species included green turtles, hawksbills and most often olive ridleys. Encounters with sea turtles appeared to be more prevalent in the western areas of the WTP, where log sets are more prevalent. However, observer data for both the Philippines and Indonesia, which both fish in the east, were unavailable. These countries have purse seiners and ring-net fleets that fish predominantly on a variety of anchored FADs in this area (Oceanic Fisheries Programme 2001); therefore, the sea turtle take estimate in this fishery is likely underestimated and incomplete.

NMFS expects that 14 green, and 14 hawksbill turtles per year may be incidentally taken as a result of the U.S. western and central Pacific Ocean (WCPO) purse seine fishery. The nature of the take from encirclement and/or capture in the fishery may result in harassment and temporary harm. The best available data do not indicate that take in the form of mortality is likely to result to any sea turtle species due to interactions with the U.S. WCPO purse seine fishery (NMFS 2006).

Hawaii-based and American Samoa-based longline fishery
The area fished ranges as close as 25 miles from Hawaii to thousands of miles from port. These Hawaii based longline vessels compete with foreign distant water fishing fleets operating on the high seas. In 2001, 101 Hawaii–based longline vessels made 1,034 trips, almost all of which targeted tunas. Swordfish was a major target species of this fishery prior to 2001, but due to conservation measures to protect sea turtles this segment of the Hawaii-based longline fishery was phased out completely by the end of 2001.

The Western Pacific Pelagics Fishery Management Plan (Pelagics FMP) covers the Hawaii-based deep-set longline fishery, the Hawaii-based shallow-set longline fishery, the American Samoa longline fishery, and several non-longline pelagic fisheries (trolling, handline, etc.). Section 7 consultation was completed for all fisheries in the Pelagics FMP on February 23, 2004. Reinitiation of consultation on the HI-based deep-set fishery was completed on October 4, 2005. The current incidental take statements (ITS) for these fisheries are shown in Tables 15–17 below. The ITS for the American Samoa longline fishery was exceeded in 2006, thus reinitiation of consultation was completed 2010. Also, the proposed expansion of the HI-based shallow-set longline fishery required reinitiation of consultation, and was completed in 2009 (NMFS 2009).

Mexico
Sea turtles have been protected in Mexico since 1990 under federal law (Garcia-Martinez and Nichols 2002). Despite the ban on their extraction and capture, studies have shown that sea turtles continue to be caught or "harvested," both indirectly in fisheries and by a directed harvest of eggs, immatures, and adults.

Peru and Ecuador
The Ministerio de Pesqueria (MIPE), which is the Peruvian agency responsible for fisheries, prohibited the taking of all leatherback turtles and green turtles less than or equal to 80 cm in length through a resolution in January, 1977 (Weidner and Serrano 1997). In 1995, the Peruvian government prohibited the capture, trade, and consumption of green turtles, leatherbacks, olive ridleys, and hawksbills. However, in many ports of Peru, this decree was and is poorly enforced, and sea turtles were widely caught for human consumption. Noted Peruvian ports included Pisco, Chincha, Pucusana, Callao, and Chimbote (Alfaro-Shigueto et al. 2002).

Peru conducted directed commercial turtle harvests throughout the 1980s, and, as recently as 1990, over 100 metric tons of turtles were taken (FAO, Yearbook of Fishery Statistics, 1994, in Weidner and Serrano 1997). Species-specific information was not available. Researchers from the Peruvian Centre for Coastal Research also opportunistically collected data on sea turtle captures while collecting data on dolphin mortality. They present data on sea turtle mortality in two ports, Cerro Azul and Chimbote in 1993 and 1994, and compile data on leatherback capture

along the Peruvian coast from 1984-1999. Sea turtles, particularly olive ridleys and green turtles, are commonly taken with "animaleros," which are large mesh drift gillnets targeting sharks and rays, but take dolphins and sea turtles as bycatch. Researchers provided a minimum estimate of 77 turtles taken in 11 months (1993) and 45 turtles taken in 8 months (1994) in Cerro Azul. In Chimbote, researchers estimated a minimum of 133 turtles taken in approximately 7 months (1993). Species composition of observed turtles taken included both olive ridleys and greens (83.2%) and leatherbacks (16.18%) (Alfaro-Shigueto et al. 2002).

Vietnam

In Vietnam, there has been a high demand for sea turtle products in the market, and as a result, green turtles and hawksbills have been harvested heavily to supply this demand. Direct harvest of sea turtles is common among the coastal communities, where turtles forage and breed. In addition, sea turtle eggs are collected for food. Poverty in the country and a lack of awareness of the conservation of resources are partially to blame for this exploitation; in addition, there are no regulations and little government support for sea turtle research and conservation efforts (Hien 2002). Unfortunately, no quantitative estimates are available on the level of sea turtle mortality or the number of eggs taken.

Australasia (Bali, Torres Strait)

Bali has a large trade in live green turtles. Reports from World Wildlife Fund/International Union for the Conservation of Nature (Dermawan 2002) indicate that green turtles have been collected from all over Indonesia in order to supply Bali with up to 30,000 turtles. Turtles have been used as a standard source of food and in religious festivities in southern Bali (within the Balinese-Hindu culture) for many years, and as of 2002 the demand was increasing (Dermawan 2002). While traditional religious ceremonies require the use of sea turtle meat, Hindu high priests have estimated that only 300 to 500 turtles annually should serve that purpose (Dethmers and Broderick 2003). The average demand for sea turtles in Bali alone is approximately 17,000 per year, although the government only permitted the harvest and slaughter of up to 3,000 turtles per year. With green turtles foraging near and nesting on Bali decreasing, the sea turtle fishery out of Bali has had to expand to more distant foraging and nesting populations throughout the Indonesian archipelago. This has required larger vessels and a network of hunters, traders, and shippers (Dethmers and Broderick 2003).

In the Torres Strait, both a commercial fishery and a subsistence fishery has operated, taking substantially fewer turtles than the Balinese fishery. In the subsistence fishery, Islanders use small aluminum dinghies and deploy small nets or use traditional gear, typically within a day's journey from their village. Sea turtles are consumed for subsistence or used in traditional feasts. In the late 1980s, the commercial fishery was estimated to take 5,000 and 10,000 sea turtles annually and was marketed through Daru in Papua New Guinea (Limpus and Parmenter 1986; Groombridge and Luxmoore 1989; Dethmers and Broderick 2003).

Based on analysis of genetic data collected from green turtles from the Bali and Torres Strait region as well as a feeding aggregation in Aru, researchers analyzed the extent of the fisheries' impact on genetic stocks. There are 17 genetic stocks throughout the Australasian region. Researchers found that the Bali fishery is impacting several green turtle stocks throughout the

region, with few stocks unaffected, while the Torres Strait fishery, having a more local focus, affects the NGBR almost exclusively (Dethmers and Broderick 2003).

Fiji

Of the main threats to sea turtle populations around Fiji, mortalities due to the traditional harvesting of adults for ceremonial purposes, and subsistence and commercial harvesting of adults, eggs, and shells are significant. For example, approximately 30,000 hawksbill shells were exported during the 1980s, with approximately 2,000 kilograms of shells exported in just 1989. In addition, eggs have also been harvested for subsistence and commercial purposes. Hunting for sea turtles in Fiji has historically been relatively easy because it is generally unregulated and uncoordinated. Fijians have been prohibited from taking turtles and their eggs during the breeding season (December through March), and there was a moratorium on the killing of turtles and poaching of eggs (including trade of turtle meat and eggs) through December 2000. As of 2002, the Department of Fisheries was hoping to extend this moratorium (Rupeni et al. 2002), and an amendment to the Fisheries Act in 2004 continued the moratorium until the end of 2008 (Laveti and MacKay 2009).

Australia

Green turtles are the primary species harvested by Aboriginal/Torres Strait Islander people in the Great Barrier Reef, and although we do not have accurate records of the total number of green turtles harvested, anecdotal information indicates that the number of traditionally harvested turtles per annum is probably in the low hundreds (Dobbs pers. comm. 2008).

Philippines

Despite a significant increase in conservation awareness, turtles are still killed and sold for their meat and eggs are also taken and sold.

Other Federal Activities

The U.S. Department of the Interior established a National Wildlife Refuge in and around Palmyra in 2001, thus placing the atoll under the jurisdiction of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). Including most of Palmyra Atoll and its surrounding marine ecosystem out to 12 nautical miles, the PANWR was established to protect and preserve the natural character of fish, wildlife, plants, coral reef communities, and other resources associated with the emergent, tidal, and submerged lands and waters of the atoll. In recent years Palmyra has been uninhabited except for management or research personnel, including members of the multi-institutional Palmyra Atoll Research Consortium (PARC), which carries out integrative studies of biodiversity and environmental physics along the Atoll. However, when the U.S. Government and others occupied the Atoll during World War II, Palmyra was heavily altered to improve its utility as a military base. Extensive dredging and connection of the islets that made up the Atoll into causeways changed the hydrological and oceanographic features of the Atoll.

Vessel Activities

Potential sources of adverse effects from federal vessel operations in the action area and throughout the range of sea turtles include operations of the U.S. Navy (USN) and Coast Guard (USCG), which maintain the largest Federal vessel fleets, the Environmental Protection Agency, the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA), and the Army Corps of

Engineer (COE). NMFS has conducted formal consultations with the USCG, the USN, and NOAA on their vessel operations. Through the section 7 process, where applicable, NMFS has and will continue to establish conservation measures for all these agency vessel operations to avoid or minimize adverse effects to listed species. At the present time, however, they present the potential for some level of interaction.

Private and commercial vessel operations also have the potential to interact with sea turtles. For example, shipping traffic in Massachusetts Bay is estimated at 1,200 ship crossings per year with an average of three per day. Similar traffic may exist in many other areas where sea turtles occur. The invention and popularization of new technology resulting in high speed catamarans for ferry services and whale watch vessels operating in congested coastal areas contributes to the potential for impacts from privately-operated vessels. In addition to commercial traffic and recreational pursuits, private vessels participate in high speed marine events concentrated in the southeastern United States that are a particular threat to sea turtles. The magnitude of these marine events is not currently known. The sea turtle stranding network (STSSN) also reports many records of vessel interaction (propeller injury) with sea turtles off coastal states such as New Jersey and Florida, where there are high levels of vessel traffic.

Other Military Activities

Potential sources of adverse effects to sea turtles from Federal vessel operations in the action area include operations of the U.S. Navy (USN), U.S. Coast Guard (USCG), Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), Army Corps of Engineers (ACOE), and NOAA to name a few. NMFS has previously conducted formal consultations with the USN, USCG, and NOAA on their vessel-based operations. NMFS has also conducted section 7 consultations with the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE), Federal Energy Regulatory Commission (FERC), and Maritime Administration (MARAD) on vessel traffic related to energy projects in the Northeast Region and has implemented conservation measures. Through the section 7 process, where applicable, NMFS has and will continue to identify conservation measures for all these agency vessel operations to avoid or minimize adverse effects to listed species.

Several Opinions for the USN contain details on the scope of vessel operations for these agencies and the conservation measures that are being implemented as standard operating procedures. NMFS has conducted section 7 consultations on USN explosive ordnance disposal, mine warfare, sonar testing (e.g., AFAST, SURTASS LFA), and other major training exercises (e.g., bombing, Naval gunfire, combat search and rescue, anti-submarine warfare, and torpedo and missile exercises) in the Pacific Ocean. These consultations have determined that the proposed USN activities may adversely affect but would not jeopardize the continued existence of ESA-listed sea turtles (NMFS 2012a, NMFS 2012b).

Similarly, operations of vessels by other Federal agencies within the action area (NOAA, EPA, and ACOE) may adversely affect ESA-listed sea turtles. However, vessel activities of those agencies are often limited in scope, as they operate a limited number of vessels or are engaged in research/operational activities that are unlikely to contribute a large amount of risk.

Navigation Channel Dredging and Maintenance
The construction and maintenance of federal navigation channels has also been identified as a source of sea turtle mortality. Entrainment is the most imminent danger for sea turtles during hopper dredging operations. The National Research Council's Committee on Sea Turtle Conservation (1990) estimated that dredging mortalities, along with boat strikes, were second only to fishery interactions as a source of probable lethal takes of sea turtles. Experience has shown that injuries sustained by sea turtles entrained in hopper dredge dragheads are usually fatal. Mortality in hopper dredging operations most often occurs when turtles are sucked into the dredge draghead, pumped through the intake pipe and then killed as they cycle through the centrifugal pump and into the hopper.

The number of interactions between dredge equipment and sea turtles seems to be best associated with the volume of material removed, which is closely correlated to the length of time dredging takes, with a greater number of interactions associated with a greater volume of material removed and a longer duration of dredging. The number of interactions is also heavily influenced by the time of year dredging occurs (with more interactions correlated to times of year when more sea turtles are present in the action area) and the type of dredge plant used (sea turtles are apparently capable of avoiding pipeline and mechanical dredges as no takes of sea turtles have been reported with these types of dredges). The number of interactions may also be influenced by the terrain in the area being dredged, with interactions more likely when the draghead is moving up and off the bottom frequently. Interactions are also more likely at times and in areas when sea turtle forage items are concentrated in the area being dredged, as sea turtles are more likely to be spending time on the bottom while foraging.

Oil and Gas Exploration
The COE and the Bureau of Ocean Energy Management, Regulation and Enforcement (BOEMRE) authorize oil and gas exploration, well development, production, and abandonment/rig removal activities that may adversely affect sea turtles. Both of these agencies have consulted numerously with the NMFS on these types of activities. NMFS anticipates incidental takes of sea turtles from vessel strikes, noise, marine debris, and the use of explosives to remove oil and gas structures. The impacts of oil contamination on the environment are further discussed under Environmental Contamination to the Baseline.

Electrical Generating Plants
Another action with federal oversight (the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission and the Nuclear Regulatory Agency) impacting sea turtles is the operation of electrical generating plants. Sea turtles entering coastal or inshore areas have been affected by impingement or entrainment in the cooling-water systems of electrical generating plants, though it is important to note that many of the turtles impinged can be released alive, depending on how frequently trash racks are monitored (NMFS 2000; NMFS 2006).

State or Private Actions

State Fisheries
Various fishing methods used in state fisheries, including trawling, pot fisheries, fly nets, and gillnets are known to incidentally take listed species, but information on these fisheries is sparse

(NMFS SEFSC 2001). Although few of these state regulated fisheries are currently authorized to incidentally take listed species, several state agencies have approached NMFS to discuss applications for a section 10(a)(1)(B) incidental take permit. Since NMFS' issuance of a section 10(a)(1)(B) permit requires formal consultation under section 7 of the ESA, the effects of these activities are considered in section 7 consultation. Any fisheries that come under a section 10(a)(1)(B) permit in the future will likewise be subject to section 7 consultation. In 2002, the State of Hawaii applied for an incidental take permit for listed sea turtles in their inshore marine fisheries. Although the past and current effects of these fisheries on listed species is currently not determinable, NMFS believes that ongoing state fishing activities may be responsible for seasonally high levels of observed strandings of sea turtles. Most of the state data are based on extremely low observer coverage or sea turtles were not part of data collection; thus, these data provide insight into gear interactions that could occur but are not indicative of the magnitude of the overall problem. In addition to the lack of interaction data, there is another issue that complicates the analysis of impacts to sea turtles from these fisheries. Certain gear types may have high levels of sea turtle takes, but very low rates of serious injury or mortality. For example, the hook and line takes rarely result in death, but trawls and gillnets frequently do. Leatherbacks seem to be susceptible to a more restricted list of fisheries, while the hard shelled turtles, particularly loggerheads, seem to appear in data on almost all of the state fisheries.

Recreational Fisheries

Recreational fishermen have reported hooking turtles when fishing from boats, piers, and beach, banks, and jetties. Commercial fishermen fishing for reef fish and for sharks with both single rigs and bottom longlines have also reported hooked turtles (NMFS 2001). A detailed summary of the known impacts of hook and line incidental captures to loggerhead sea turtles can be found in the TEWG reports (1998, 2000).

Vessel Traffic

Commercial traffic and recreational pursuits can adversely affect sea turtles through propeller and boat strikes. Turtles swimming or feeding at or just beneath the surface of the water are particularly vulnerable to boat and vessel strikes, which can result in serious propeller injuries and death (Hazel et al. 2007). Boat collisions may pose a threat to sea turtles in the action area although NMFS is unclear to what extent. The magnitude of these marine events is not currently known.

Other Potential Sources of Impacts in the Baseline

Significant anthropogenic impacts threaten nesting populations of all species in areas within as well as outside of the U.S. These impacts include poaching of eggs, immature and adult sea turtles as well as beach development problems. The impacts from these activities are difficult to measure.

Habitat Loss

Loss or degradation of nesting habitat resulting from erosion control through beach nourishment and armoring, beachfront development, artificial lighting, and non-native vegetation is a serious threat affecting nesting females and hatchlings. Although beach nourishment, or placing sand on beaches, may provide more sand, the quality of that sand, and hence the nesting beach, may be

less suitable than pre-existing natural beaches. Sub-optimal nesting habitat may cause decreased nesting success, place an increased energy burden on nesting females, result in abnormal nest construction, and reduce the survivorship of eggs and hatchlings (Mann 1977; Ackerman 1980; Mortimer 1990).

Beach armoring (e.g., bulkheads, seawalls, soil retaining walls, rock revetments, sandbags, and geotextile tubes) can impede a turtle's access to upper regions of the beach/dune system, thereby limiting the amount of available nesting habitat (Mazaris et al. 2009). Impacts also can occur if structures are installed during the nesting season. For example, unmarked nests can be crushed or uncovered by heavy equipment, nesting turtles and hatchlings can get caught in construction debris or excavations, and hatchlings can get trapped in holes or crevices of exposed riprap and geotextile tubes. In many areas of the world, sand mining (removal of beach sand for upland construction) seriously reduce or degrade/destroy sea turtle nesting habitats or interfere with hatchling movement to sea (NMFS 2003).

Artificial lighting on or near the beach adversely affects both nesting and hatchling sea turtles. Specifically, artificial lighting may deter adult female turtles from emerging from the ocean to nest and can disorient or misorient emerging hatchlings away from the ocean (Ehrhart 1983; Salmon and Witherington 1994). Hatchlings have a tendency to orient toward the brightest direction, which on natural, undeveloped beaches is commonly toward the broad open horizon of the sea. However, on developed beaches, the brightest direction is often away from the ocean and toward lighted structures. Hatchlings unable to find the ocean, or delayed in reaching it, are likely to incur high mortality from dehydration, exhaustion, or predation (Peters and Verhoeven 1994). Hatchlings lured into lighted parking lots or toward streetlights can get crushed by passing vehicles. The extent to which these activities reduce sea turtle nesting and hatchling production is unknown. However, more and more coastal counties are adopting stringent protective measures to protect hatchling sea turtles from the disorienting effects of beach lighting.

Marine Debris

Ingestion of marine debris can be a serious threat to sea turtles. Sea turtles living in the pelagic (open ocean) environment commonly ingest or become entangled in marine debris (e.g., tar balls, plastic bags, plastic pellets, balloons, and ghost fishing gear) as they feed along oceanographic fronts, where debris and their natural food items converge (Bugoni et al. 2001; Pichel et al. 2007). This is especially problematic for turtles that spend all or significant portions of their life cycle in the pelagic environment (e.g., leatherbacks, juvenile loggerheads, and juvenile green turtles). Some types of marine debris may be directly or indirectly toxic to sea turtles on their migration to (and potentially within) the action area, such as oil. Turtles can become entangled in derelict gillnets, pound nets, and the lines associated with longline and trap/pot fishing gear. Turtles entangled in these types of fishing gear may drown and often suffer serious injuries to their flippers from constriction by the lines or ropes.

Environmental Contamination

Coastal runoff and river discharges carry large volumes of petrochemical and other contaminants from agricultural activities, cities and industries into the oceans. Marina and dock construction, dredging, aquaculture, oil and gas exploration and extraction, increased under water noise and

boat traffic can degrade marine habitats used by sea turtles (Colburn et al. 1996). The development of marinas and docks in inshore waters can negatively impact nearshore habitats. An increase in the number of docks built increases boat and vessel traffic. Fueling facilities at marinas can sometimes discharge oil, gas, and sewage into sensitive estuarine and coastal habitats. Although these contaminant concentrations do not likely affect the more pelagic waters, the species of turtles analyzed in this Opinion travel between near shore and offshore habitats and may be exposed to and accumulate these contaminants during their life cycles.

Petrochemicals can impact wildlife directly through three primary pathways: ingestion – when animals swallow oil particles directly or consume prey items that have been exposed to oil, absorption – when animals come into direct contact with oil, and inhalation – when animals breathe volatile organics released from oil or from "dispersants" applied by response teams (spill) in an effort to increase the rate of degradation of the oil in seawater. Several aspects of sea turtle biology and behavior place them at particular risk, including the lack of avoidance behavior, indiscriminate feeding in convergence zones, and large predive inhalations (Milton et al. 2003). When large quantities of oil enter a body of water, chronic effects such as cancer, and direct mortality of wildlife becomes more likely (Lutcavage et al. 1997). Oil spills in the vicinity of nesting beaches just prior to or during the nesting season could place nesting females, incubating egg clutches, and hatchlings at significant risk (Fritts and McGehee 1982, Lutcavage et al. 1997, Witherington 1999). Continuous low-level exposure to oil in the form of tarballs, slicks, or elevated background concentrations also challenge animals facing other natural and anthropogenic stresses. Types of trauma can include skin irritation, altering of the immune system, reproductive or developmental damage, and liver disease (Keller et al. 2004, Keller et al. 2006). Chronic exposure may not be lethal by itself, but it may impair a turtle's overall fitness so that it is less able to withstand other stressors (Milton et al. 2003).

The earlier life stages of living marine resources are usually at greater risk from an oil spill than adults, especially true for hatchlings, since they spend a greater portion of their time at the sea surface than adults, their risk of exposure to floating oil slicks is increased (Lutcavage et al. 1995). One of the reasons might be the simple effects of scale: for example, a given amount of oil may overwhelm a smaller immature organism relative to the larger adult. The metabolic machinery an animal uses to detoxify or cleanse itself of a contaminant may not be fully developed in younger life stages. Also, in early life stages, animals may contain proportionally higher concentrations of lipids, to which many contaminants such as petroleum hydrocarbons bind. Most reports of oiled hatchlings originate from convergence zones, ocean areas where currents meet to form collection points for material at or near the surface of the water. Sixty-five of 103 post-hatchling loggerheads in convergence zones off Florida's east coast were found with tar in the mouth, esophagus or stomach (Loehefener et al. 1989). Thirty-four percent of post-hatchlings captured in Sargassum off the Florida coast had tar in the mouth or esophagus and more than 50% had tar caked in their jaws (Witherington 1994). These zones aggregate oil slicks, such as a Langmuir cell, where surface currents collide before pushing down and around, and represents a virtually closed system where a smaller weaker sea turtle can easily become trapped (Carr 1987). Lutz (1989) reported that hatchlings have been found apparently starved to death, their beaks and esophagi blocked with tarballs. Hatchlings sticky with oil residue may have a more difficult time crawling and swimming, rendering them more vulnerable to predation.

Frazier (1980) suggested that olfactory impairment from chemical contamination could represent a substantial indirect effect in sea turtles, since a keen sense of smell apparently plays an important role in navigation and orientation. A related problem is the possibility that an oil spill impacting nesting beaches may affect the locational imprinting of hatchlings, and thus impair their ability to return to their natal beaches to breed and nest (Milton et al. 2003). Whether hatchlings, juveniles, or adults, tarballs in a turtle's gut are likely to have a variety of effects – starvation from gut blockage, decreased absorption efficiency, absorption of toxins, effects of general intestinal blockage (such as local necrosis or ulceration), interference with fat metabolism, and buoyancy problems caused by the buildup of fermentation gases (floating prevents turtles from feeding and increases their vulnerability to predators and boats), among others. Also, trapped oil can kill the seagrass beds that turtles feed upon.

There are studies on organic contaminants and trace metal accumulation in multiple species of sea turtles (Aguirre et al. 1994; Caurant et al. 1999; Corsolini et al. 2000; Gardner et al. 2006). McKenzie et al. (1999) measured concentrations of chlorobiphenyls and organochlorine pesticides in sea turtles tissues collected from the Mediterranean (Cyprus, Greece) and European Atlantic waters (Scotland) between 1994 and 1996. Omnivorous loggerhead turtles had the highest organochlorine contaminant concentrations in all the tissues sampled, including those from green and leatherback turtles (Storelli et al. 2008). It is thought that dietary preferences were likely to be the main differentiating factor among species. Decreasing lipid contaminant burdens with turtle size were observed in green turtles, most likely attributable to a change in diet with age. Sakai et al. (1995) found the presence of metal residues occurring in loggerhead turtle organs and eggs. Storelli et al. (1998) analyzed tissues from twelve loggerhead sea turtles stranded along the Adriatic Sea (Italy) and found that characteristically, mercury accumulates in sea turtle livers while cadmium accumulates in their kidneys, as has been reported for other marine organisms like dolphins, seals and porpoises (Law et al. 1991). No information on detrimental threshold concentrations are available, and little is known about the consequences of exposure of organochlorine compounds to sea turtles. Research is needed on the short- and long-term health and fecundity effects of chlorobiphenyl, organochlorine, and heavy metal accumulation in sea turtles.

Nutrient loading from land-based sources, such as coastal communities and agricultural operations, are known to stimulate plankton blooms in closed or semi-closed estuarine systems. The effects on larger embayments are unknown. An example is the large area of the Louisiana continental shelf with seasonally-depleted oxygen levels (<2mg/i) is caused by eutrophication from both point and non-point sources. Most aquatic species cannot survive at such low oxygen levels and these areas are known as "dead zones." The oxygen depletion, referred to as hypoxia, begins in late spring, reaches a maximum in midsummer, and disappears in the fall. Since 1993, the average extent of mid-summer bottom-water hypoxia in the northern GOM has been approximately 16,000 km2, approximately twice the average size measured between 1985 and 1992. The hypoxic zone attained a maximum measured extent in 2002, when it was about 22,000 km2 which is largest than the state of Massachusetts (USGS 2005). The hypoxic zone has impacts on the animals found there, including sea turtles, and the ecosystem-level impacts continue to be investigated.

Disease
A disease known as fibropapilloma (FP) is a major threat to green turtles in some areas of the world. FP is characterized by tumorous growths, which can range in size from very small to extremely large, and are found both internally and externally. Large tumors can interfere with feeding and essential behaviors, and tumors on the eyes can cause permanent blindness (Foley et al. 2005). FP was first described in green turtles in the Florida Keys in the 1930s. Since then it has been recorded in many green turtle populations around the world, most notably present in green turtles of Hawaii, Florida, and the Caribbean. In Florida, up to 50% of the immature green turtles captured in the Indian River Lagoon are infected, and there are similar reports from other sites in Florida, including Florida Bay, as well as from Puerto Rico and the U.S. Virgin Islands. In addition, scientists have documented FP in populations of loggerhead, olive ridley, and leatherback turtles (Huerta et al. 2002). Incidences of FP have been observed in green turtles in Australia and Indonesia (Adnyana et al. 1997; Aguirre et al. 2000). The effects of FP at the population level are not well understood and could be a serious threat to their recovery. The cause of the disease remains unknown. Research to determine the cause of this disease is a high priority and is underway.

Impacts from non-native species introductions
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, feral hogs, dogs and an increased presence of native species (e.g. raccoons, armadillos, and opossums) which raid and feed on turtle eggs. Non-native vegetation has invaded many coastal areas and often out-competes native species. Non-native vegetation is usually less-stabilizing and can lead to increased erosion and degradation of suitable nesting habitat. Non-native vegetation may also form impenetrable root mats that can prevent proper nest cavity excavation, invade and desiccate eggs, or trap hatchlings. In light of these issues, conservation and long-term protection of sea turtle nesting and foraging habitats is an urgent and high priority need.

Acoustic impacts
Acoustic impacts to sea turtles can include habituation, and disruption of other normal behavior patterns, or, depending on the turtle’s proximity to the source, temporary or permanent injury. There are other more indirect factors; for a complete list, refer to NMFS SEFSC (2001). NMFS and the USN have been working cooperatively to establish a policy for monitoring and managing acoustic impacts from anthropogenic sound sources in the marine environment.

International
For sea turtle species in the Pacific, international activities, particularly fisheries, are significant factors impacting populations. NMFS estimates that, each year, thousands of sea turtles of all species are incidentally caught and a proportion of them killed incidentally or intentionally by international activities. The impact of international fisheries is a significant factor in the baseline inhibiting sea turtle recovery. Additional information on the impacts of international fisheries is found in Lewison et al. (2004).

Global climate change
There is a large and growing body of literature on past, present, and future impacts of global climate change induced by human activities. Some of the likely effects commonly mentioned' are

sea level rise, increased frequency of severe weather events, and change in air and water temperatures. The EPA's climate change webpage provides basic background information on these and other measured or anticipated effects (see www.epa.gov/climatechange/index.html). Activities in the action area that may have contributed to global warming include the combustion of fossil fuels by vessels. The effects of global climate change on sea turtles is typically viewed as being detrimental to the species (NMFS and USFWS 2007a; 2007b). It is believed that increases in sea level, approximately 4.2 mm per year until 2080, have the potential to remove available nesting beaches, particularly on narrow low lying coastal and inland beaches and on beaches where coastal development has occurred (Fish et al. 2005; Baker et al. 2006; IPCC 2007; Mazaris et al. 2009). Additionally, global climate change may affect the severity of extreme weather (e.g., hurricanes), with more intense storms expected, which may result in the loss/erosion of or damage to shorelines, and therefore, the loss of potential sea turtle nests and/or nesting sites (Goldenberg et al. 2001; IPCC 2007). The cyclical loss of nesting beaches resulting from extreme storm events may then result in a decrease in hatching success and hatchling emergence (Martin 1996; Ross 2005; Pike and Stiner 2007; Prusty et al. 2007). However, there is evidence that, depending on the species, sea turtles species with lower nest site fidelity (i.e., leatherbacks) would be less vulnerable to storm related threats than those with a higher site fidelity (i.e., loggerheads). In fact, it has been reported that sea turtles in Guiana are able to maintain successful nesting despite the fact that between nesting years some beaches they once nested on have disappeared, suggesting that sea turtle species may be able to behavioral adapt to such changes (Girondot and Fretey 1996; Rivalan et al. 2006; Kelle et al. 2007; Pike and Stiner 2007).

Changes in water temperature are also expected as a result of global climate change. Changes in water temperature are expected affect water circulation patterns perhaps even to the extent that the Gulf Stream is disrupted, which would have profound effects on every aspect of sea turtle life history from hatching success, oceanic migrations at all life stages, foraging, and nesting (Rahmstorf 1997; 1999; Gagosian 2003; NMFS and USFWS 2007a, b). Thermocline circulation patterns are expected to change in intensity and direction with changes in temperature and freshwater input at the poles (Rahmstorf 1997), which will potentially affect not only hatchlings, which rely on passive transport in surface currents for migration and dispersal but also pelagic adults (i.e., leatherbacks) and juveniles, which depend on current patterns and major frontal zones in obtaining suitable prey, such as jellyfish (Hawkes et al. 2007; 2009). Changes in water temperature may also affect prey availability for species of sea turtles. Herbivorous species, such as the green sea turtle, depend primarily on seagrasses as their forage base. Seagrasses could ultimately be negatively affected by increased temperatures, salinities, and acidification of coastal waters (Short and Neckles 1999; Bjork et al. 2008), as well as increased runoff due the expected increase in extreme storm events as a result of global climate change. These alterations of the marine environment due to global climate change could ultimately affect the distribution, physiology, and growth rates of seagrasses, potentially eliminating them from particular areas. However, the magnitude of these effects on seagrass beds, and therefore green sea turtles, are difficult to predict, although some populations of green sea turtles appear to specialize in the consumption of algae (Bjorndal 1997) and mangroves (Limpus and Limpus 2000) and as such, green sea turtles may be able to adapt their foraging behavior to the changing availability of seagrasses in the future. Omnivorous species, such as Kemp's ridley and loggerhead sea turtles, may face changes to benthic communities as a result of changes to water temperature; however,

these species are probably less likely to suffer shortages of prey than species with more specific diets (i.e., green sea turtles) (Hawkes et al. 2009).

Several studies have also investigated the effects of changes in sea surface temperature and air temperatures on turtle reproductive behavior. For loggerhead sea turtles, warmer sea surface temperatures in the spring have been correlated to an earlier onset of nesting (Weishampel et al. 2004; Hawkes et al. 2007), shorter internesting intervals (Hays et al. 2002), and a decrease in the length of the nesting season (Pike et al. 2006). Green sea turtles also exhibited shorter internesting intervals in response to warming water temperatures (Hays et al. 2002). Air temperatures also play a role in sea turtle reproduction. In marine turtles, sex is determined by temperature in the middle third of incubation with female offspring produced at higher temperatures and males at lower temperatures within a thermal tolerance range of 25-35°C (Ackerman 1997). Based on modeling done of loggerhead sea turtles, a 2°C increase in air temperature is expected to result in a sex ratio of over 80% female offspring for loggerhead nesting beaches in the vicinity of Southport, NC. Farther to the south at Cape Canaveral, Florida, a 2°C increase in air temperature would likely result in production of 100% females while a 3°C increase in air temperature would likely exceed the thermal threshold of turtle clutches (i.e., greater than 35° C) resulting in death (Hawkes et al. 2007). Glen et al. (2003) also reported that, for green sea turtles, incubation temperatures also appeared to affect hatchling size with smaller turtles produced at higher incubation temperatures; however, it is unknown whether this effect is species specific and what impact it has on the survival of the offspring. Thus changes in air temperature as a result of global climate change may alter sex ratios and may reduce hatchling production in the most southern nesting areas of the U.S. (Hawkes et al. 2007; Hamann et al. 2007). Given that the south Florida nesting group is the largest loggerhead nesting group in the Atlantic (in terms of nests laid), a decline in the success of nesting as a result of global climate change could have profound effects on the abundance and distribution of the loggerhead species in the Atlantic, however; variation of sex ratios to incubation temperature between individuals and populations is not fully understood and as such, it is unclear whether sea turtles will (or can) adapt behaviorally to alter incubation conditions to counter potential feminization or death of clutches associated with water temperatures (e.g., choosing nest sites that are located in cooler areas, such as shaded areas of vegetation or higher latitudes; nesting earlier or later during cooler periods of the year) (Hawkes et al. 2009).

Ocean acidification related to global warming would also reasonably be expected to negatively affect sea turtles. The term "ocean acidification" describes the process of ocean water becoming corrosive as a result of carbon dioxide (C02) having been absorbed from the atmosphere. The absorption of atmospheric CO2 into the ocean lowers the pH of the waters. Evidence of corrosive water caused by the ocean's absorption of C02 was found less than 20 miles off the West coast of North America during a field study from Canada to Mexico in the summer of 2007 (Feely et al. 2008). This was the first time "acidified" ocean water was found on the continental shelf of western North America. While the ocean's absorption of C02 provides a great service to humans by significantly reducing the amount of greenhouse gases in the atmosphere and decreasing the effects of global warming, the resulting change in ocean chemistry could adversely affect marine life, particularly organisms with calcium carbonate shells such as corals, mussels, mollusks, and small creatures in the early stages of the food chain (e.g., plankton). A number of these organisms serve as important prey items for sea turtles.

Although potential effects of climate change on sea turtle species are currently being addressed, fully understanding the effects of climate change on listed species of sea turtles will require development of conceptual and predictive models of the effects of climate change on sea turtles, which to date are still being developed and will depend greatly on the continued acquisition and maintenance of long-term data sets on sea turtle life history and responses to environmental changes. Until such time, the type and extent of effects to sea turtles as a result of global climate change are will continue to be speculative and as such, the effects of these changes on sea turtles cannot, for the most part, be accurately predicted at this time.

Other ESA Section 10 Sea Turtle Permits

Regulations developed under the ESA allow for the issuance of permits allowing take of certain ESA-listed species for the purposes of scientific research under Section 10(a)(1)(A) of the ESA. In addition, the ESA allows for the NMFS to enter into cooperative agreements with states developed under Section 6 of the ESA, to assist in recovery actions of listed species. Prior to issuance of these authorizations, the proposal must be reviewed for compliance with Section 7 of the ESA.

Sea turtles are the focus of research activities authorized by a Section 10 permit under the ESA. As of September 2013, there were 2 active NMFS scientific research permits (including the current permit the applicant holds, No. 15661) issued for the target sea turtle species in the central Pacific. In the past, nesting marine turtles have been the focus of research surveys in the Mariana Islands (Pultz et al. 1999). Sea turtles in water have been studied through transect surveys and sightings (Kolinski et al. 2001; Kolinski et al. 2006). Nesting studies are conducted and permitted by USFWS, the agency which has jurisdiction for sea turtles while on land. NMFS has jurisdiction for permitting sea turtle research conducted in the marine environment. This proposed research project would not target the same sea turtles (i.e., nesting females or hatchlings) that may be targeted by a nesting activity survey.

Authorized activities range from photographing, weighing, and tagging sea turtles incidentally taken in fisheries, blood sampling, tissue sampling (biopsy), lavage, and carapace marking/etching on intentionally captured turtles. The number of authorized takes varies widely depending on the research and species involved but may involve the taking of hundreds of turtles annually. Most of takes authorized under these permits are expected to be non-lethal. Before any research permit is issued, the proposal must be reviewed under the permit regulations. However, it should be noted that while research permits may result in minor (relative to other activities such as fisheries) negative impacts to targeted individuals, these permits also yield positive impacts to these species by aiding the conservation, recovery and management of sea turtles.

In addition, since issuance of the permit is a federal activity, issuance of the permit by the NMFS must also be reviewed for compliance with section 7(a)(2) of the ESA to ensure that issuance of the permit does not result in jeopardy to the species. However, despite these safeguards research activity may result in cumulative effects on sea turtle populations.

Conservation and Recovery Actions Shaping the Environmental Baseline

NMFS has implemented a series of regulations aimed at reducing potential for incidental mortality of sea turtles from commercial fisheries in the action area. In addition to regulations, outreach programs have been established and data on sea turtle interactions with recreational fisheries has been collected through the Marine Recreational Fishing Statistical Survey (MRFSS). The summaries below discuss all of these measures in more detail.

Baja, Mexico
Wildcoast is an international conservation team that conducts sea turtle workshops with fishermen, students and local citizens to raise sea turtle conservation awareness, discourage consumption of sea turtles, and help stop poaching.

Costa Rica
A contract has been developed with the Ostional National Wildlife Refuge in Costa Rica to help refuge managers to convene workshops to reduce sea turtle mortalities in longline fisheries based in Costa Rica. NMFS has provided funding to support leatherback nesting beach work on the eastern Pacific coast of this country to evaluate nesting and to reduce the loss of nests due to poaching of eggs. These efforts are also benefitting green and olive ridley turtles that use these same beaches.

Sea Turtle Handling and Resuscitation Techniques
NMFS published a final rule (66 FR 67495, December 31, 2001) detailing handling and resuscitation techniques for sea turtles that are incidentally caught during scientific research or fishing activities. Persons participating in fishing activities or scientific research are required to handle and resuscitate (as necessary) sea turtles as prescribed in the final rule. These measures help to prevent mortality of hard-shelled turtles caught in fishing or scientific research gear.

Outreach and Education, Sea Turtle Entanglements, and Rehabilitation
There is an extensive network of Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network participants along the Atlantic and Gulf of Mexico coasts who not only collect data on dead sea turtles, but also rescue and rehabilitate any live stranded sea turtles.

A final rule (70 FR 42508) published on July 25, 2005, allows any agent or employee of NMFS, the USFWS, the U.S. Coast Guard, or any other federal land or water management agency, or any agent or employee of a state agency responsible for fish and wildlife, when acting in the course of his or her official duties, to take endangered sea turtles encountered in the marine environment if such taking is necessary to aid a sick, injured, or entangled endangered sea turtle, or dispose of a dead endangered sea turtle, or salvage a dead endangered sea turtle that may be useful for scientific or educational purposes. NMFS already affords the same protection to sea turtles listed as threatened under the ESA [50 CFR 223.206(b)].

Other Actions
A recovery plan for the loggerhead sea turtle was published December 2008 (74 FR 2995). A draft revised recovery plan for the Kemp's ridley sea turtle was published March 2010 (75 FR 12496). Recovery teams comprised of sea turtle experts have been convened and are currently

working towards revising these plans based upon the latest and best available information. Five-year status reviews have been completed for green, hawksbill, Kemp's ridley, leatherback, and loggerhead sea turtles. These reviews were conducted to comply with the ESA mandate for periodic status evaluation of listed species to ensure that their threatened or endangered listing status remains accurate. Each review determined that no delisting or reclassification of a species status (i.e., threatened or endangered) was warranted at this time. However, further review of species data for the green, hawksbill, and leatherback was recommended, to evaluate whether distinct population segments (DPS) should be established for these species (NMFS and USFWS 2007a; b). The final rule to list nine distinct population segments of Loggerhead sea turtles under the ESA was published September 22 2011(76 FR 58868).

Effects of the Proposed Action

Pursuant to Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA, federal agencies are directed to ensure that their activities are not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of any listed species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. Direct adverse effects of the permitted activities on listed species that are within the action area would include disruption of feeding, breeding, resting, and other behaviors. Some displacement may result from these activities. The duration of the behavioral disruptions and displacements are expected to vary by species and type of disturbance.

In this section, we describe the potential physical, chemical or biotic stressors associated with the proposed action, the probability of individuals of listed species being exposed to these stressors based on the best scientific and commercial evidence available, and the probable responses of those individuals (given probable exposures) based on the available evidence. As described in the Approach to the Assessment section, for any responses that would be expected to reduce an individual's fitness (i.e., growth, survival, annual reproductive success, and lifetime reproductive success), the assessment would consider the risk posed to the viability of the population(s) those individuals comprise and to the listed species those populations represent.

For this consultation, we are particularly concerned about behavioral disruptions that may result in listed sea turtles that fail to feed or breed successfully or fail to complete their life history because these responses are likely to have population-level consequences. The proposed permit would authorize non-lethal "takes" by harassment of listed species during activities. The ESA does not define harassment nor has NMFS defined the term pursuant to the ESA through regulation. For this Opinion, harass is defined by USFWS 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 that are essential to sea turtles' life history or its contribution to the population the animal represents.

The purpose of this assessment is, then, to determine if it is reasonable to expect that the research, as conducted under the permits, can be expected to have direct or indirect effects on threatened or endangered sea turtle species that appreciably reduce their likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild or result in the destruction or adverse modification of critical habitat. Including assessing the direct and indirect effect of the proposed action on threatened and endangered species or critical habitat, together with the effects of other activities that are

interrelated or interdependent (50 CFR 402.02). Indirect effects are those that are caused later in time, but are still reasonable certain to occur.

Interrelated actions are those that are part of a larger action and depend upon the larger action for their justification. Interdependent actions are those that have no independent utility apart from the action under consideration (50 CFR 402.02). Jeopardy analyses compare reductions in a species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild associated with a *specific* action with the species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild that was established in the *Status of the Species* section of an Opinion. Jeopardy analyses also consider the importance of the importance of the action area to a listed species and the effects of other human actions and natural phenomena (that were summarized in the *Environmental Baseline*) on a species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild. As a result, jeopardy analyses in Biological Opinions distinguish between the effects of a specific action on a species' likelihood of surviving and recovering given the full set of human actions and natural phenomena that threaten a species.

This section will assess the types of effects that are expected from the proposed action, the extent of those effects, and the overall impact of those effects on sea turtle populations.

Standards Used in Effects Analysis

The analyses in this Opinion are based on an implicit understanding that the listed sea turtle species considered in this Opinion are threatened or endangered with local or global extinction by a wide array of human activities and natural phenomena. We have outlined many of those activities in the Status of the Species section of this Opinion. NMFS also recognizes that such species will not recover without addressing the full range of human activities and natural phenomena such as patterns of beach erosion, predation on turtle eggs, and turtle captures, injuries, and deaths in other domestic and international fisheries and other State, federal, and private activities that could cause these animals to become extinct in the foreseeable future.

Nevertheless, this Opinion focuses solely on whether the direct or indirect effects of the proposed action can be expected to appreciably reduce the listed sea turtles' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild by reducing their reproduction, numbers, or distribution or would result in a direct or indirect alteration that appreciably diminishes the value of critical habitat for both the survival and recovery of a listed species. Jeopardy analyses in Biological Opinions distinguish between the effects of a specific action on a species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild and a species' background likelihood of surviving and recovering given the full set of human actions and natural phenomena that threaten a species.

This Opinion treats sea turtle populations in the Atlantic Ocean as distinct from the Pacific Ocean populations for the purposes of this consultation. This approach is also consistent with traditional jeopardy analyses: the loss of sea turtle populations in the Atlantic basin would result in a significant gap in the distribution of each turtle species, which makes these populations biologically significant. Finally, the loss of these sea turtle populations in the Atlantic basin would dramatically reduce the distribution and abundance of these species and would, by itself, appreciably reduce the entire species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild.

Conservative Decisions—Providing the Benefit of the Doubt to the Species

The analysis in this section is based upon the best available commercial and scientific data on sea turtle biology and the effects of the proposed action. However, there are instances where there is limited information upon which to make a determination. In those cases, in keeping with the direction from the U.S. Congress to provide the "benefit of the doubt" to threatened and endangered species [House of Representatives Conference Report No. 697, 96th Congress, Second Session, 12 (1979)], we will generally make determinations which provide the most conservative outcome for listed species.

Exposure Analyses

Exposure analyses identify the co-occurrence of ESA-listed species within the action's effects in space and time, and identify the nature of that co-occurrence. They identify as possible, the number, age or life-stage, and gender of the individuals likely to be exposed to the action's effects and the population(s) or subpopulation(s) those individuals represent. Individuals exposed may be of either sex or of any age.
The proposed action will expose listed sea turtle species to disturbance from boat, capture, sampling and collection activities. The applicant has requested authorization to annually sample green and hawksbill sea turtles within nearshore habitats off the NMI. Animals are currently captured by hand, measured, weighed, flipper and PIT tagged, tissue sampled, shell etched, a subset telemetry tagged, and released; the applicant is requesting authority to blood sample and scute scrape an additional subset of captured sea turtles. Since these species are highly mobile, and because the proposed activities are to take place at multiple times of the year, individual listed species may suffer repeated exposures.

Response Analyses

As discussed in the Approach to the Assessment section of this Opinion, response analyses determine how listed resources are likely to respond after being exposed to an action's effects on the environment or directly listed animals themselves. For the purposes of consultation, our assessments try to detect potential lethal, sub-lethal (or physiological), or behavioral responses that might reduce the fitness of individuals. Ideally, response analyses would consider and weigh evidence of adverse consequences as well as evidence suggesting the absence of such consequences. The proposed activities have the potential to produce disturbances that may affect listed sea turtles.

The responses by animals to human disturbance are similar to their responses to potential predators (Beale and Monaghan 2004; Frid 2003; Frid and Dill 2002; Gill and Sutherland 2001; Harrington and Veitch 1992; Lima 1998; Romero 2004). These responses include interruptions of essential behavior and physiological processes such as feeding, mating, resting, digestion, etc. This can result in stress, injury and increased susceptibility to disease and predation (Frid and Dill 2002; Romero 2004; Walker et al. 2006).

The Opinion prepared for the issuance of the original permit analyzed the effects of research activities (captured by hand, measured, weighed, flipper and PIT tagged, tissue sampled, shell etched, a subset telemetry tagged, and released) on green and hawksbill sea turtles (NMFS 2012). In this Response Analysis, we are analyzing those research activities in addition to the

request for scute scraping and blood sampling, since upon capture, an individual sea turtle could potentially have all of those research procedures performed on it.

Capture
Turtles may exhibit respiratory and metabolic stress, particularly if turtle is chased and/or forced to remain submerged (swimming or evasive behavior to avoid capture). Metabolic changes that can impair a sea turtle's ability to function can occur within minutes of a forced submergence. While most voluntary dives appear to be aerobic, showing little if any increases in blood lactate and only minor changes in acid-base status, the effects are quite different in forcibly submerged turtles where oxygen stores are rapidly consumed, anaerobic glycolysis is activated, and acid-base balance is disturbed, sometimes to lethal levels (Lutcavage and Lutz 1997). Forced submergence of Kemp's ridley sea turtles in shrimp trawls resulted in an acid-base imbalance after just a few minutes (times that were within the normal dive times for the species) (Stabenau et al. 1991) and recovery times for acid-base levels to return to normal may be prolonged as long as 20 hours or more (Henwood and Stuntz 1987). This effect is expected to be worse for sea turtles that are recaptured before metabolic levels have returned to normal. Respiratory and metabolic stress due to forced submergence is also correlated with additional factors such as size and activity of the turtle, water temperatures, and biological and behavioral differences between species.

Capture by hand or scoop net can result in raised levels of stressor hormones. The harassment of individual turtles during capture and handling could disrupt their normal activities (e.g., foraging cycle). However, these capture methods are simple and not invasive. The turtles would be held in a manner to minimize the stress to them. If done correctly, with minimal pursuing of the animals in chase, the effects are of hand capture or scoop net would be expected to be minimal. NMFS expects that individual turtles would experience no more than short-term stresses during these types of capture activities and that these stresses would dissipate within a short period of time. Only one turtle would be captured at a time. Researchers would not chase or wrestle the turtles to avoid prolonged submergence or stress on the animal. NMFS expects no mortalities or serious injuries from these capture activities.

Measuring, Photographing and Weighing
These procedures are simple and not invasive. Measuring will be done using a calipers and tape measure. Turtles will be weighed by placing them in a net and weighing them with a spring scale.
NOAA Fisheries does not expect that individual turtles will experience more than short-term stresses during the measuring, weighing, or photographing process. No injury is expected from these activities. As discussed above, turtles will be worked up as quickly as possible to minimize stresses resulting from their capture. The applicant will also be required to follow procedures designed to minimize the risk of either introducing a new pathogen into a population or amplifying the rate of transmission from animal to animal of an endemic pathogen when handling animals.

Handling, measuring, photographing, and weighing can result in raised levels of stressor hormones in sea turtles. The additional on-board holding time imposes an additional stressor on these already acidotic turtles (Hoopes et al. 2000). It has been suggested that the muscles used by

sea turtles for swimming might also be used during lung ventilation (Butler et al. 1984). Thus, an increase in breathing effort in negatively buoyant animals may have heightened lactate production. However, the handling, measuring, photographing, carapace painting and weighing procedures are simple, non-invasive, with a relatively short time period and NMFS does not expect that individual turtles would normally experience more than short-term stresses as a result of these activities. No injury is expected from these activities, and turtles will be worked up as quickly as possible to minimize stresses resulting from their capture.

Shell Etching and Painting

Because the keratin layer has no nerve endings or blood vessels, shallow shell etchings would not be expected to result in bleeding, discomfort or pain to the turtle. Etched areas would grow back within a year or so (Balazs and Chaloupka 2004b). After etching, researchers would spray the etched area with a nontoxic white spray paint about 10cm in circumference. Dozens of sea turtle researchers have used painting successfully for many years with no visible effects to turtles. In the case of paint, it would be non-toxic, would not contain xylene or toluene, and would not generate heat as it cures. Previous permit holders, such as Dr. Wyneken (Permit No. 1397), reported that paint marks wore off of the shell within weeks and showed no evidence of any problems associated with it. NMFS does not expect that individual turtles would normally experience more than short-term stresses as a result of these activities. No injury is expected from these activities, and turtles will be worked up as quickly as possible to minimize stresses resulting from the shell etching and painting.

Flipper Tagging and Injection of PIT Tags

Tagging activities are minimally invasive and all tag types have negatives associated with them, especially concerning tag retention. Plastic tags can become brittle, break and fall off underwater, and titanium tags can bend during implantation and thus not close properly, leading to tag loss. Tag malfunction can result from rusted or clogged applicators or applicators that are worn from heavy use (Balazs 1999). Turtles that have lost external tags must be re-tagged if captured again at a later date, which subjects them to additional effects of tagging. Turtles can experience some discomfort during the tagging procedures and these procedures will produce some level of pain. The discomfort is usually short and highly variable between individuals (Balazs 1999). Most barely seem to notice, while a few others exhibit a marked response. However, NMFS expects the stresses to be minimal and short-term and that the small wound-site resulting from a tag applied to the flipper should heal completely in a short period of time. Similarly, turtles that must be re-tagged should also experience minimal short-term stress and heal completely in a short period of time. Re-tagging is not expected to appreciably affect these turtles.

PIT tags have been used with a wide variety of animal species that include fish (Clugston 1996; Skalski et al. 1998; Dare 2003), amphibians (Thompson 2004), reptiles (Cheatwood et al. 2003; Germano and Williams 2005), birds (Boisvert and Sherry 2000; Green et al. 2004), and mammals (Wright et al. 1998; Aguirre et al. 2002). PIT tags have the advantage of being encased in glass, which makes them inert, and are positioned inside the turtle where loss or damage due to abrasion, breakage, corrosion or age over time is virtually non-existent (Balazs 1999; Braun-McNeill et al. 2003). Also with PIT tagging, there is a lower rate of loss than with conventional methods, possibly leading to less retagging, and hence reduced interference as well as data of

increased reliability and scientific value (Broderick and Godley 1999). When PIT tags are inserted into animals that have large body sizes relative to the size of the tag, empirical studies have generally demonstrated that the tags have no adverse effect on the growth, survival, reproductive success, or behavior of individual animals (Skalski et al. 1998). However, over time PIT tags can migrate within body tissue (van Dam and Diez 1997; Wyneken et al. 2010) making it necessary to scan the entire surface of the implantation area.

NMFS expects the stresses to be minimal and short-term, and that the small wound resulting from the insertion of the tag would heal completely in a short period of time. NMFS does not expect that individual turtles would experience more than short term stresses during the application of the PIT tags. The proposed tagging methods have been regularly employed in sea turtle research with little lasting impact on the individuals tagged and handled (Balazs 1999). No problems with tagging have been reported by any of the NMFS permit holders. In the many years that the NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center has been PIT-tagging turtles, turtle discomfort was observed to be temporary, as the turtles exhibit normal behavior shortly after tagging and swim normally after release. The applicant will also be required to follow procedures designed to minimize the risk of either introducing a new pathogen into a population or amplifying the rate of transmission from animal to animal of an endemic pathogen when handling animals.

Blood, Carapace and Tissue Sampling

The permit would contain conditions to mitigate adverse impacts to turtles. The applicant would be required to follow procedures designed to minimize the risk of either introducing a new pathogen into a population or amplifying the rate of transmission from animal to animal of an endemic pathogen during handling and sampling.

It is not expected that individual turtles would experience more than short-term stresses during tissue sampling. SEFSC researchers who examined turtles caught 2 to 3 weeks after sample collection noted the sample collection site was almost completely healed (NMFS SEFSC 2008). During more than 5 years of tissue biopsying using sterile techniques, NMFS SEFSC researchers have encountered no infections or mortality resulting from this procedure (NMFS SEFSC 2008). During the more than 5 years of tissue biopsying using sterile techniques, NMFS Southeast Fisheries Science Center researchers have encountered no infections or mortality resulting from this procedure (NMFS 2006). Bjorndal et al. (2010) found that turtles exhibited rapid healing at the tissue sampling site with no infection or scarring, and that the sampling did not adversely impact turtle physiology or health.

NMFS does not expect that individual turtles will experience more than short-term stresses during blood sampling. Taking a blood sample from the sinuses in the dorsal side of the neck is now a routine procedure (Owens 1999), is a non-lethal and is not expected to have any sub-lethal effects. According to Owens (1999), with practice, it is possible to obtain a blood sample 95% of the time and the sample collection time should be about 30 seconds in duration. Sample collection sites are always sterilized with alcohol or other antiseptic, prior to sampling and attempts will be limited. The permit would be conditioned to limit volume of blood sampled to only a conservative amount. Once the blood is collected, direct pressure would be applied to the site to ensure clotting and prevent subsequent blood hemorrhaging (Stoskopf 1993).

Additionally, all of the researchers responsible for obtaining these samples will have received extensive experience in the procedure.

NMFS does not expect that individual turtles would experience more than short-term stress during scute sampling. Scute sampling is a minimally invasive procedure that involves collecting a small amount of keratin from the outermost edge of the scutes of the carapace. Because the keratin layer has no nerve endings or blood vessels, scute scraping would not be expected to result in bleeding, discomfort or pain to the turtle.

As stated above, these procedures are non-lethal and we do not expect these methods to have sub-lethal effects. We acknowledge that pain, handling discomfort, possible hemorrhage at the site or risk of infection could occur, but procedure mitigation efforts (such as pressure and disinfection) lessen those possibilities. We believe that drawing blood or tissue biopsy in the manner described appears to have little probability of harming or producing sub-lethal effects as long as the procedure is conducted by an experienced biologist.

NMFS expects that the collection of a blood or scute sample would cause minimal additional stress or discomfort to the turtle beyond that experienced during capture, collection of measurements, tissue sampling, tagging, etc.

Transmitters and Epoxy Attachment

Carapace-mounted transmitters would be attached to the turtles' scutes. A low-heat-producing marine epoxy or fiberglass resin and cloth would be used to attach equipment in order to prevent harm to the animal. Attachment of satellite, sonic, or radio tags with epoxy is a commonly used and permitted technique by NMFS. The permit would also require that the researchers provide adequate ventilation around the turtle's head during the attachment of all transmitters. To prevent skin or eye injury due to the chemicals in the resin, transmitter attachment procedures would not take place in the water.

In previous studies with these types of techniques, the actual attachment of the sonic tags has shown that that turtles would likely experience some small additional stress from attaching the transmitters, but not significant increases in stress or discomfort to the turtle beyond what was experienced during other research activities. Recaptured turtles previously tagged show very minimal to no signs of injury from the attachments (Keinath et al. 1989). The energetic costs of swimming for an instrumented turtle may be increased, resulting in major effects on activity, behavior, metabolism, habitat selection, and other key aspects of the animals' life history.

Transmitters, as well as biofouling of the tag, attached to the carapace of turtles increase hydrodynamic drag and affect lift and pitch. For example, Watson and Granger (1998) performed wind tunnel tests on a full-scale juvenile green turtle and found that, at small flow angles representative of straight-line swimming, a transmitter mounted on the carapace increased drag by 27 to 30 percent, reduced lift by less than 10 percent, and increased pitch moment by 11 to 42 percent. It is likely that this type of transmitter attachment would negatively affect the swimming energetics of the turtle. However, based on the results of hardshell sea turtles equipped with this tag setup, NMFS is unaware of transmitters resulting in any serious injury to these species. These tags are unlikely to become entangled due to their streamlined profile and will typically be shed after about 1 year, posing no long-term risks to the turtle. The permits, if

issued, would require the researchers to streamline the attachment materials so that neither buoyancy nor drag would affect the turtle's swimming ability, in addition to reducing the risk of entanglement. There would be no gap allowed between the transmitter and the turtle. All transmitters would be attached in the most hydrodynamic manner possible, minimizing the epoxy footprint. Removal of the transmitters at the end of the experiment is a non-invasive procedure and is not expected to result in any significant stress above that which has occurred during recapture. The transmitter attachment (ties) will break away and release the sonic tag after its life is finished in case, for some unexpected reason, the researchers are unable to recapture an animal to remove it.

Sonic tags/transponders emit a moderate to high frequency sonic pulse detectable using an underwater directional hydrophone (Yano and Tanaka 1991). Triangulation of the acoustic signal allows researchers to determine turtle locations. The sonic transmitters would have a frequency of approximately 50 to 80 kHz. This frequency level is not expected to adversely affect turtles. Sea turtles have low-frequency hearing sensitivity and are potentially affected by sound energy in the band below 1,000 Hz (Lenhardt 2003). Bartol et al. (1999) found the effective bandpass of the loggerhead sea turtle to be between at least 250 and 1,000 Hz. Ridgeway et al. (1969) found the maximum sensitivity of green sea turtle hearing to fall within 300- 500 Hz with a sharp decline at 750 Hz. Since the sonic tags authorized for sea turtle tracking research would be well above this hearing threshold, these tags would not be heard by the turtles. NMFS would not expect the transmitters to interfere with turtles‟ normal activities after they are released.

Another important consideration is whether the sounds emitted by the sonic transmitters would attract potential predators, primarily sharks. Unfortunately, hearing data on sharks is limited. Casper and Mann (2004) examined the hearing abilities of the nurse shark (*Ginglymostoma cirratum*), and results showed that this species detects low-frequency sounds from 100 to 1,000 Hz, with best sensitivity from 100 to 400 Hz. Myrberg (2001) explained that audiograms have been published on elasmobranchs. Although we do not have hearing information for all the sharks that could potentially prey on sea turtles, estimates for hearing sensitivity in available studies provided ranges of 25 to 1,000 Hz. In general, these studies found that shark hearing is not as sensitive as in other tested fishes, and that sharks are most sensitive to low-frequency sounds (Casper et al. 2003). Thus, it appears that the sonic transmitters would not attract potential shark predators to the turtles, because the frequency of the sonic tags is well above the 1,000-Hz threshold.

Effects of Holding

Given the precautions that would be taken by the researchers to ensure the safety of the turtles and the permit conditions relating to holding, NMFS believes that any holding of the animals would have minimal and insignificant effects on the animals.

Boat Strikes, Noise and Visual Disturbance

There is a potential for boat strikes, noise and visual disturbance to listed species resulting from the proposed activities. However, because of the trained research personnel, maneuverability and slow operating speeds of the research vessels, boat strikes are extremely unlikely and noise and visual disturbance would be discountable. As a result, any risk of boat related disturbances to

listed species is highly unlikely and no reduction in the fitness of any individual listed sea turtle is expected.

Summary of Effects
The short-term stresses resulting from capture, handling, measuring, photographing, weighing, biological sampling (blood, tissue, and scute scraping), shell etching, flipper and PIT tagging, and transmitter attachment are expected to be minimal. The modified Permit would contain conditions to mitigate adverse impacts to turtles from these activities, as well as the additional research activities of blood and carapace sampling requested in this modification. As discussed above, turtles would be worked up as quickly as possible to minimize stresses resulting from the research and the applicant would also be required to follow procedures designed to minimize the risk of either introducing a new pathogen into a population or amplifying the rate of transmission from animal to animal of an endemic pathogen when handling animals. The applicant would be required to exercise care when handling animals to minimize any possible injury. An experienced veterinarian or veterinarian technician would be named by the applicant for emergencies. During release, turtles would be lowered as close to the water's surface as possible, to prevent potential injuries.

Species' Response to Effects of the Proposed Action
Actions that result in mortality affect listed species through the impact of the loss of individual turtles and also through the loss of the reproductive potential of each turtle to its respective population. Similarly, serious injuries to listed species due to an action that result in an animal's inability to reproduce affects a listed species due to the loss of that animal's reproductive potential. These effects have the potential to reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of species.

Mortality and serious injury under the research as described under the proposed actions are not expected. The effects of the proposed from capture, handling, measuring, photographing, weighing, biological sampling (blood, tissue, and scute sampling), flipper and PIT tagging, shell etching, temporarily marking, and transmitter attachment have been determined to have the potential to elicit short-term changes in sea turtle behavior, but are not likely to result in long-term effects on these individuals or populations. Therefore, NMFS does not expect the research procedures that would be authorized under the proposed action to result in more than short-term effects on individual animals due to the conditions concerning research procedures and placed on the applicant. In addition, NMFS does not expect any delayed mortality of turtles following their release as a direct result of the research based on past research efforts by other researchers and adherence to certain protocols identified in the proposed action. The data generated by the applicant over the duration of this study will provide beneficial information that will be important to the management and recovery of threatened and endangered species. The information collected as a direct result of permit issuance will be available to implement the goals identified in the Recovery Plans for green and hawksbill sea turtles.

Based on the above, NMFS believes it is reasonable to assume that issuance of the proposed permit modification will have beneficial effects for green or hawksbill sea turtles. Issuance of this permit is not likely to appreciably reduce the numbers, distribution, or reproduction of green

or hawksbill sea turtles in the wild that would appreciably reduce the likelihood of survival and recovery of these species.

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 Opinion. Future Federal actions, including research authorized under ESA Section 10(a)(1)(A), that are unrelated to the proposed action are not considered in this section because they require separate consultation pursuant to section 7 of the ESA. After reviewing available information, NMFS is not aware of effects from any additional future non-federal activities in the action area that would not require federal authorization or funding and are reasonably certain to occur during the foreseeable future.

NMFS expects the natural phenomena in the action area (e.g., oceanographic features, storms, and natural mortality) will continue to influence listed sea turtles as described in the Environmental Baseline. We also expect current anthropogenic effects will also continue, including vessel traffic and scientific research. Potential future effects from climate change on sea turtles in the action area are not definitively known. However, climatic variability has the potential to affect these species in the future, including indirectly by affecting sex ratios.

As the size of human communities increase, there is an accompanying increase in habitat alterations resulting from an increase in housing, roads, commercial facilities and other infrastructure. This results in increased discharge of sediments and pollution into the marine environment. These activities are expected to continue to degrade the habitat of sea turtles as well as that of the food items on which they depend. However, it is the combination and extent to which these natural and human-induced phenomena will affect sea turtles that remains unknown.

Integration and Synthesis of Effects

As explained in the Approach to the Assessment section, risks to listed individuals are measured using changes to an individual's "fitness", i.e., the individual's growth, survival, annual reproductive success, and lifetime reproductive success. When listed plants or animals exposed to an action's effects are not expected to experience reductions in fitness, we would not expect the action to have adverse consequences on the viability of the population(s) those individuals represent or the species those populations comprise (Brandon 1978; Mills and Beatty 1979; Stearns 1992; Anderson 2000). As a result, if the assessment indicates that listed plants or animals are not likely to experience reductions in their fitness, we conclude our assessment.

The narrative that follows integrates and synthesizes the information contained in the Status of the Species, the Environmental Baseline, and the Effects of the Action sections of this Opinion to assess the risk the proposed activities pose to green sea turtles. There are known cumulative effects (i.e., from future state, local, tribal, or private actions) that fold into our risk assessment for this species. This section provides an integration and synthesis of the information presented in the Status of the Species, Environmental Baseline, Cumulative Effects, and Effects of the Action sections of this Opinion. The intent of the following discussion is to provide a basis for

determining the additive effects of the take authorized in the permit on green and hawksbill sea turtles, in light of their present and anticipated future status.

While the loss of any turtle, including eggs, has likely adversely affected the ability of the green and hawksbill sea turtle populations considered in this Opinion to maintain or increase their numbers by limiting the number of individuals in these populations, the loss of reproductive adults results in reductions in future reproductive output. Species with delayed maturity such as sea turtles are demographically vulnerable to increases in mortality, particularly of juveniles and subadults, those stages with higher reproductive value. The potential for an egg to develop into a hatchling, into a juvenile, and finally into a sexually mature adult sea turtle varies among species, populations, and the degree of threats faced during each life stage. Each juvenile that does not survive to reproduce will be unable to contribute to the maintenance or improvement of the species' status. Reproducing females that are prematurely killed due the threats mentioned in the above sections, while possibly having contributed something before being removed from the population, will not be allowed to realize their reproductive potential. Similarly, reproductive males prematurely removed from the population will be unable to make their reproductive contribution to the species' population.

As described in the Effects of the Action section of this Opinion, the research activities that would take place under the modified Permit 15661-01, are not expected to result in mortality or injury to any green and hawksbill sea turtles. The capture, handling, measuring, photographing, weighing, biological sampling (blood, tissue, and scute scraping), shell etching, temporary marking, flipper and PIT tagging, and transmitter attachment sampling activities will only result in temporary stress to the animal and are not expected to have more than short-term effects on individual green or hawksbill sea turtles. These non-lethal interactions will not affect the turtle's ability to reproduce and contribute to the maintenance or recovery of the species. These effects are expected to be short-term because the take is non-lethal and previous experience with the type of proposed research activities has demonstrated that it is reasonable to expect that effects will be minimal. This research will affect the turtles by harassing individual turtles during the research thus raising levels of stressor hormones, and the turtle may experience some discomfort during from capture, handling, measuring, photographing, weighing, biological sampling (blood, tissue, and scute scraping), flipper and PIT tagging, and transmitter attachment procedures. Based on past observations of similar research, these effects are expected to dissipate within approximately a day. Based on this prior information and experience, and conditions placed on the Permit Holder, NMFS does not expect the applicant's proposal to conduct the research as described above to result in more than short-term effects on the individual animals. NMFS also does not expect any delayed mortality of any turtles following their release as a direct result of the research based on past research efforts by other researchers and adherence to certain protocols identified in the proposed action.

Although some degree of stress or pain is likely for individual turtles from capture, handling, measuring, photographing, weighing, biological sampling (blood, tissue, and scute scraping), shell etching, temporary marking, transmitter attachment, and flipper and PIT tagging (which will result in tissue injuries), none of the research procedures are expected to result in mortality or reduced fitness of individuals. The proposed permit is not expected to affect the population's reproduction, distribution, or numbers. Because the proposed action is not likely to reduce the

particular population's likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild, it is not likely to reduce the species' likelihood of surviving and recovering in the wild.

NMFS does not expect the proposed research activities to appreciably reduce the green and hawksbill sea turtles likelihood of survival and recovery in the wild by adversely affecting their birth rates, death rates, or recruitment rates. In particular, NMFS does not expect the proposed modified research Permit to affect adult, female turtles in a way that appreciably reduces the number of animals born in a particular year; the reproductive success of adult female turtles; the survival of young turtles; or the number of young turtles that annually recruit into the adult, breeding populations of any population of green and hawksbill sea turtles.

The proposed actions are not expected to have more than short-term effects on either green or hawksbill sea turtle populations. The data generated by the applicant regarding these populations over the duration of these studies will provide beneficial information that will be important to the management and recovery of threatened and endangered species. The information collected as a direct result of the Permit modification issuance will be used to implement the goals identified in the Recovery Plans for the U.S. Pacific Ocean Populations of sea turtles. As discussed above, NMFS believes it is reasonable to assume that issuance of the proposed Permit will have beneficial effects for the Pacific Ocean populations of green and hawksbill sea turtles.

Conclusion

After reviewing the current status of the green and hawksbill sea turtles, the environmental baseline for the action area, the effects of the take authorized in this permit, and probable cumulative effects, it is NMFS' Biological Opinion that issuance of the permit modification, as proposed, will not reduce the likelihood of the survival and recovery of their populations in the wild by reducing their numbers, distribution, or reproduction, and therefore is not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of these species or result in the destruction or adverse modification of designated critical habitat.

INCIDENTAL TAKE STATEMENT

Section 9 of the ESA and Federal regulation pursuant to section 4(d) of the ESA prohibit the take of endangered and 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 NMFS 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 USFWS 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, the carrying out of 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 taking under the ESA provided that such taking is in compliance with the terms and conditions of this Incidental Take Statement.

Amount or Extent of Take

The permit is for the directed take, for research purposes, of listed green and hawksbill sea turtles; no incidental take of other listed species is anticipated or authorized.

This Opinion does not authorize any take of other listed species or immunize any actions from the prohibitions of section 9(a) of the ESA. Take is authorized by section 10(a)(1)(A) as specified in the permit.

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.

The following conservation recommendations would provide information that would improve the level of protections afforded in future consultations involving proposals to issue permit for research on the listed sea turtle species:

1. *Estimation of actual levels of "take."* Before authorizing any additional permits for activities similar to those contained in the proposed permit, F/PR1 should review the annual reports and final reports submitted by researchers that have conducted research on sea turtles as well as any data and results that can be obtained from the permit holders. This should be used to estimate the numbers of sea turtles killed and harassed by these investigations, and how the harassment affects the life history of individual animals. The results of the study should be provided to F/PR5 for use in the consultations of future research activities.

RENITIATION NOTICE

This concludes formal consultation and conference on the proposal to issue a modification to scientific research permit 15661-01. 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 proposed 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. In instances where the amount or extent of authorized take is exceeded, NMFS Office of Protected Resources – Permits and Conservation Division must immediately request reinitiation of section 7 consultation.

Works Cited

Ackerman, R. A. 1980. Physiological and ecological aspects of gas exchange by sea turtle eggs. American Zoologist 20:575-584.

Ackerman, R. A. 1997. The nest environment and the embryonic development of sea turtles. Pages 83-106 in P. L. Lutz and J. A. Musick, editors. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton.

Adnyana, W., P. W. Ladds, and D. Blair. 1997. Observations of fibropapillomatosis in green turtles (Chelonia mydas) in Indonesia. Australian Veterinary Journal 75:736-742.

Aguirre, A. A., G. H. Balazs, B. Zimmerman, and F. D. Galey. 1994. Organic contaminants and trace metals in the tissues of green turtles (Chelonia mydas) afflicted with fibropapillomas in the Hawaiian Islands. Marine Pollution Bulletin 28:109-114.

Aguirre, A. A., R. K. Bonde, and J. A. Powell. 2002. Biology, movements and health assessment of free-ranging manatees in Belize. Page 135 51st Annual Wildlife Disease Association Conference, Humboldt State University, Arcata, CA.

Aguirre, A. A., C. J. Limpus, T. R. Spraker, and G. H. Balazs. 2000. Survey of fibropapillomatosis and other potential diseases in marine turtles from Moreton Bay, Queensland, Australia. Page 36 in H. J. Kalb and T. Wibbels, editors. Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Alfaro-Shigueto, J., P. H. Dutton, J. Mangel, and D. Vega. 2004. First confirmed occurrence of loggerhead turtles in Peru. Marine Turtle Newsletter 103:7-11.

Alfaro-Shigueto, J., J. Mangel, P. Diaz, J. Seminoff, and P. Dutton. 2008. Longlines and sea turtle bycatch in Peru. Page 98 in H. J. Kalb, A. Rohde, K. Gayheart, and K. Shanker, editors. Twenty-Fifth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Alfaro-Shigueto, J., M.-F. van Bressem, D. Montes, K. Onton, D. Vega, and K. van Waerebeek. 2002. Turtle mortality in fisheries off the coast of Peru. Pages 86-88 in A. Mosier, A. Foley, and B. Brost, editors. Twentieth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Anderson, J. J. 2000. A vitality-based model relating stressors and environmental properties to organism survival. Ecological Monographs 70:445-470.

Arauz, R., O. Rodriguez, R. Vargas, and A. Segura. 2000. Incidental capture of sea turtles by Costa Rica's longline fleet. Pages 62-64 in H. J. Kalb and T. Wibbels, editors. Nineteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Arauz, R. M. 1996. A description of the Central American shrimp fisheries with estimates of incidental capture and mortality of sea turtles. Pages 5-9 in J. A. Keinath, D. E. Barnard,

J. A. Musick, and B. A. Bell, editors. Proceedings of the Fifteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Arenas, P. and M. Hall. 1991. The association of sea turtles, and other pelagic fauna with floating objects in the eastern tropical Pacific Ocean. Pages 7-10 in M. Salmon and J. Wyneken, editors. Eleventh Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Baker, J., C. Littnan, and D. Johnston. 2006. Potential effecfs of sea-level rise on terrestrial habitat and biota of the northwestern Hawaiian Islands. Page 3 20th Annual Meeting Society for Conservation Biology Conference, San Jose, California.

Balazs, G. H. A review of basic biological data on the green turtle in the northwestern Hawaiian Islands.in R. W. Grigg and R. T. Pfund, editors. Symposium on the Status of Resource Investigations In the Northwestern Hawaiian Islands.

Balazs, G. H. 1976. Green turtle migrations in the Hawaiian Archipelago. Biological Conservation 9:125-140.

Balazs, G. H. 1980. Status of sea turtles in the Hawaiian Islands. University of Hawaii.

Balazs, G. H. 1994. Homeward bound: satellite tracking of Hawaiian green turtles from nesting beaches to foraging pastures. Pages 205-208 in B. A. Schroeder and B. E. Witherington, editors. Thirteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Balazs, G. H. 1999. Factors to consider in the tagging of sea turtles in K. L. Eckert, K. A. Bjorndal, F. A. Abreu-Grobois, and M. Donnelly editors. Research and Management Techniques for the Conservation of Sea Turtles. IUCN/SSC

Balazs, G. H. and M. Chaloupka. 2004a. Spatial and temporal variability in somatic growth of green sea turtles (Chelonia mydas) resident in the Hawaiian Archipelago. Marine Biology 145:1043-1059.

Balazs, G. H. and M. Chaloupka. 2004b. Thirty-year recovery trend in the once depleted Hawaiian green sea turtle stock. Biological Conservation 117:491-498.

Balazs, G. H., P. Craig, B. R. Winton, and R. K. Miya. 1994. Satellite telemetry of green turtles nesting at French Frigate Shoals, Hawaii, and Rose Atoll, American Samoa. Pages 184-187 in K. A. Bjorndal, A. B. Bolten, D. A. Johnson, and P. J. Eliazar, editors. Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Balazs, G. H. and D. M. Ellis. 1996. Satellite telemetry of migrant male and female green turtles breeding in the Hawaiian Islands. Pages 281-283 16th Symposium Proceedings Supplement.

Balazs, G. H., R. G. Forsyth, and A. K. H. Kam. 1987. Preliminary assessment of habitat utilization by Hawaiian green turtles in their resident foraging pastures. NOAA Technical Memorandum, NMFS, NOAA-TM-NMFS-SWFC-71.

Bartol, S. M., J. A. Musick, and M. Lenhardt. 1999. Evoked potentials of the loggerhead sea turtle (Caretta caretta). Copeia 1999:836-840.

Beale, C. M. and P. Monaghan. 2004. Behavioural responses to human disturbance: A matter of choice? Animal Behaviour 68:1065-1069.

Björk et al., 2008 M. Björk, F.T. Short, E. McLeod, S. Beer Managing Seagrasses for Resilience to Climate Change IUCN, Gland, Switzerland (2008)

Bjorndal, K. 1985. Nutritional ecology of sea turtles. Copeia 1985:736-751.

Bjorndal, K. A. 1997. Foraging ecology and nutrition of sea turtles. Pages 199–231 The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Bjorndal, K. A., A. B. Bolten, and M. Y. Chaloupka. 2000. Green turtle growth rates: evidence for a density-dependent effect and Caribbean-Pacific differences. Page 52 in F. A. Abreu-Grobois, R. Briseno-Duenas, R. Marquez, and L. Sarti, editors. Eighteenth International Sea Turtle Symposium.

Bjorndal, K. A., K. J. Reich, and A. B. Bolten. 2010. Effect of repeated tissue sampling on growth rates of juvenile loggerhead turtles Caretta caretta. Diseases of Aquatic Organisms 88:271-273.

Boulon Jr., R. H. 1994. Growth rates of wild juvenile hawksbill turtles, Eretmochelys imbricata, in St. Thomas, United States Virgin Islands. Copeia 1994:811-814.

Bowen, B. W. 1995. Molecular genetic studies of marine turtles. Pages 585-587 in K. A. Bjorndal, editor. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles, revised edition. Smithsonian Institution Press. Washington, D.C.

Brandon, R. 1978. Adaptation and evolutionary theory. Studies in the History and Philosophy of Science 9:181-206.

Braun-McNeill, J., L. Avens, and S. Epperly. 2003. Estimated tag retention rates for PIT and inconel tags in juvenile loggerhead (Caretta caretta) sea turtles. Page 104 in J. A. Seminoff, editor. Twenty-Second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Broderick, A. and B. Godley. 1999. Effect of tagging marine turtles on nesting behaviour and reproductive success. Animal Behaviour 58:5.

Bugoni, L., L. Krause, and M. V. Petry. 2001. Marine debris and human impacts on sea turtles in southern Brazil. Marine Pollution Bulletin 42:1330-1334.

Butler, P. J., W. K. Milsom, and A. J. Woakes. 1984. Respiratory cardio vascular and metabolic adjustments during steady state swimming in the green turtle Chelonia mydas. Journal of Comparative Physiology B. Biochemical Systemic and Environmental Physiology 154:167-174.

Carr, A. 1987. Impact of nondegradable marine debris on the ecology and survival outlook of sea turtles. Marine Pollution Bulletin 18:352-356.

Carr, A. F. 1952. Handbook of Turtles: The Turtles of the United States, Canada and Baja California. Comstock Publishing Associates, Ithaca, New York.

Carr, A. F., M. H. Carr, and A. B. Meylan. 1978. The ecology and migrations of sea turtles. The western Caribbean green turtle colony. Bulletin of the American Museum of Natural History 162:1-46.

Casper, B. M., P. S. Lobel, and H. Y. Yan. 2003. The hearing sensitivity of the little skate, Raja erinacea: A comparison of two methods. Environmental Biology of Fishes 68:371-379.

Casper, B. M. and D. Mann. 2004. The hearing abilities of the nurse shark, Ginglymostoma cirratum, and the yellow stingray, Urobatis jamaicensis. American Elasmobranch Society Meeting, University of South Florida, College of Marine Science, St. Petersburg, Florida.

Caurant, F., P. Bustamante, M. Bordes, and P. Miramand. 1999. Bioaccumulation of cadmium, copper and zinc in some tissues of three species of marine turtles stranded along the French Atlantic coasts. Marine Pollution Bulletin 38:1085-1091.

Chaloupka, M. 2002. Stochastic simulation modelling of southern Great Barrier Reef green turtle population dynamics. Ecological Modelling 148:79-109.

Chaloupka, M., K. A. Bjorndal, G. H. Balazs, A. B. Bolten, L. M. Ehrhart, C. J. Limpus, H. Suganuma, S. Troeeng, and M. Yamaguchi. 2008. Encouraging outlook for recovery of a once severely exploited marine megaherbivore. Global Ecology and Biogeography 17:297-304.

Chaloupka, M. and C. J. Limpus. 1997. Robust statistical modeling of hawksbill sea turtle growth rates (Southern Great Barrier Reef). Marine Ecology Progress Series 146:1-8.

Cheng, I.-J. 2002. Current sea turtle research and conservation in Taiwan. Pages 185-190 in I. Kinan, editor. Western Pacific Sea Turtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Cheng, I. J. and T. H. Chen. 1997. The incidental capture of five species of sea turtles by coastal setnet fisheries in the Eastern waters of Taiwan. Biological Conservation 82:235-239.

Cliffton, K. 1982. Preservation of the East Pacific green turtle, Chelonia mydas agassizi. Final Report on Project 1812. Submitted to World Wildlife Fund - U.S. on March 18, 1982.

Clugston, J. P. 1996. Retention of T-bar anchor tags and passive integrated transponder tags by Gulf sturgeons. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 16:4.

CNMI Division of Fish and Wildlife (DFW). 2009. Population dynamics of sea turtles at the Northern Marianas. Annual Report to NMFS PIRO: October 1, 2008 to September 30, 2009. Grant Number NA08NMF4540613.

CNMI Division of Fish and Wildlife (DFW)b. Hunting Regulations. http://www.dfw.gov.mp/Enforcement/Hunting%20Regulations.html. Accessed 9/10/2010.

Colburn T, Dumanoski D, Myers JP. Our stolen future: are we threatening our fertility, intelligence, and survival?—A scientific detective story. NY, NY7 Penguin Books; 1996. 306 pp.

Cornelius, S. E. 1982. Status of sea turtles along the Pacific Coast of Middle America. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles:211-220.

Corsolini, S., S. Aurigi, and S. Focardi. 2000. Presence of polychlorobiphenyls (PCBs) and coplanar congeners in the tissues of the Mediterranean loggerhead turtle Caretta caretta. Marine Pollution Bulletin 40:952-960.

Crabbe, M. James C. "Climate change, global warming and coral reefs: Modelling the effects of temperature." Computational Biology and Chemistry 32.5 (2008): 311-314.

Craig, P., D. Parker, R. E. Brainard, M. Rice, and G. H. Balazs. 2004. Migrations of green turtles in the central South Pacific. Biological Conservation 116:433-438.

Crouse, D. 1999a. The consequences of delayed maturity in a human-dominated world. American Fisheries Society Symposium:195-202.

Crouse, D. T. 1999b. Population modeling and implications for Caribbean hawksbill sea turtle management Chelonian Conservation and Biology 3:185-188.

Cruz, R. D. 2002. Marine turtle distribution in the Phillipines. Pages 57-65 in I. Kinan, editor. Western Pacific SeaTurtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop. Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Dare, M. R. 2003. Mortality and Long-Term Retention of Passive Integrated Transponder Tags by Spring Chinook Salmon. North American Journal of Fisheries Management 23:1015-1019.

Dermawan, A. 2002. Marine Turtle Management and Conservation in Indonesia.in I. Kinan, editor. Western Pacific Sea Turlte Cooperative Research and Management Workshop. . Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Dethmers, K. and D. Broderick. 2003. Green turtle fisheries in Australasia: assessing the extent of their impact using mtDNA markers. Pages 41-43 in J. A. Seminoff, editor. Twenty-Second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR). 2004. Guam Sea Turtle Recovery Annual Progress Report. March 1, 2004 – August 31, 2004. Grant Progress Report to NMFS PIRO. 9pp.

Division of Aquatic and Wildlife Resources (DAWR). 2009. Final Annual Progress Report for the Guam Sea Turtle Recovery Project. Award Period 8/1/2006 – 7/31/2008. NOAA Fisheries Grant number NA06NMF4540214. 25 pp.

Division of Marine and Aquatic Resources, American Samoa. 1995. Fishing and Hunting Regulations for American Samoa, Amended Version. 16pp.

Dutton, P. 2003. Molecular ecology of Chelonia mydas in the Eastern Pacific Ocean. Page 69 in J. A. Seminoff, editor. Twenty-Second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Dutton, P. H., G. H. Balazs, R. A. LeRoux, S. K. K. Murakawa, P. Zarate, and L. S. Martines. 2008. Composition of Hawaiian green turtle foraging aggregations: mtDNA evidence for a distinct regional population. Endangered Species Research 5:37-44.

Eckert, K. L. 1993. The Biology and Population Status of Marine Turtles in the Nothern Pacific Ocean. National Marine Fisheries Service.

Ehrhart, L. M. 1983. Marine Turtles of the Indian River Lagoon System. Florida Scientist, Quarterly Journal of the Florida Academy of Sciences 46:337-346.

Feely, R. A., C. L. Sabine, J. M. Hernandez-Ayon, D. Ianson, and B. Hales. 2008. Evidence for upwelling of corrosive "acidified" water onto the continental shelf. Science 320:1490-1492.

Fish, M. R., I. M. Cote, J. A. Gill, A. P. Jones, S. Renshoff, and A. R. Watkinson. 2005. Predicting the impact of sea-level rise on Caribbean sea turtle nesting habitat. Conservation Biology 19:482-491.

Fleming, E. H. 2001. Swimming against the tide; recent surveys of exploitation, trade, and management of marine turtles in the Northern Caribbean.

Foley, A. M., B. A. Schroeder, A. E. Redlow, K. J. Fick-Child, and W. G. Teas. 2005. Fibropapillomatosis in stranded green turtles (Chelonia mydas) from the eastern United States (1980-98): trends and associations with environmental factors. journal of wildlife diseases 41:29-41.

Frazier, J. G. 1980. Marine turtles and problems in coastal management. Pages 2395-2411 in B. L. Edge, editor. Coastal Zone '80: Proceedings of the Second Symposium on Coastal and Ocean Management. American Society of Civil Engineers, United States of America.

Frid, A. 2003. Dall's sheep responses to overflights by helicopter and fixed-wing aircraft. Biological Conservation 110:387-399.

Frid, A. and L. Dill. 2002. Human-caused disturbance stimuli as a form of predation risk. Conservation Ecology 6.

Fritts, T. H. and M. A. McGehee. 1982. Effects of petroleum on the development and survival of marine turtle embryos. USFWS, Gulf of Mexico Outer Continental Shelf Regional Office, Belle Chasse, Louisiana.

Gagosian, R. B. 2003. Abrupt climate change: Should we be worried? , WHOI, Woods Hole, Massachussetts.

Garcia-Martinez, S. and W. J. Nichols. 2002. Sea turtle conservation and the assessment of the demand and supply of sea turtles in Bahia Magdalena, Baja California Sur, Mexico. Pages 226-228 in A. Mosier, A. Foley, and B. Brost, editors. Twentieth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation,.

Gardner, S. C., S. L. Fitzgerald, B. A. Vargas, and L. M. Rodriguez. 2006. Heavy metal accumulation in four species of sea turtles from the Baja California Peninsula, Mexico. Biometals 19:91-99.

Gill, J. A. and W. J. Sutherland. 2001. Predicting the consequences of human disturbance from behavioral decisions. Pages 51-64 in L. M. Gosling and W. J. Sutherland, editors. Behavior and Conservation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge.

Girondot, M. and J. Fretey. 1996. Leatherback turtles, Dermochelys coriacea, nesting in French Guiana, 1978-1995. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 2:204-208.

Glen, F., A. C. Broderick, B. J. Godley, and G. C. Hays. 2003. Incubation environment affects phenotype of naturally incubated green turtle hatchlings. Journal of the Marine Biological Association of the United Kingdom 83:1183-1186.

Goldenberg, S., C. Landsea, A. Mestas-Nunez, and W. Gray. 2001. The recent increases in Atlantic hurricane activity: Causes and implications. Science 293:474-479.

Grant, G. S., P. Craig, and G. H. Balazs. 1997. Notes on Juvenile Hawksbill and Green Turtles in American Samoa. Pacific Science 51:6.

Grimm, G. and J. Farley. 2008. Sea turtle nesting activity on Navy lands, Guam 2007-2008. U.S. Navy, Pacific Fleet, Marianas Environmental, Guam.

Groombridge, B. 1982. The IUCN Amphibia - Reptilia Red Data Book. Part 1. Testudines, Crocodylia, Rhynchocephalia. International Union Conservation Nature and Natural Resources.

Groombridge, B. and R. Luxmoore. 1989. The green turtle and hawksbill (Reptilia: Cheloniidae): world status, exploitation and trade. Secretariat of the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora, Lausanne, Switzerland.

Hamann, Mark, Colin J. Limpus, and Mark A. Read. "Vulnerability of marine reptiles in the Great Barrier Reef to climate change." (2007).

Harrington, F. H. and A. M. Veitch. 1992. Calving success of woodland caribou exposed to low-level jet fighter overflights. Arctic 45:213-218.

Hawkes, L. A., A. C. Broderick, M. H. Godfrey, and B. J. Godley. 2007. Investigating the potential impacts of climate change on a marine turtle population. Global Change Biology 13:1-10.

Hawkes, L. A., A. C. Broderick, M. H. Godfrey, and B. J. Godley. 2009. Climate change and marine turtles. Endangered Species Research 7:137-154.

Hays, G. C., A. C. Broderick, F. Glen, B. J. Godley, J. D. R. Houghton, and J. D. Metcalfe. 2002. Water temperature and internesting intervals for loggerhead (Caretta caretta) and green (Chelonia mydas) sea turtles. Journal of Thermal Biology 27:429-432.

Henwood, T. A. and W. E. Stuntz. 1987. Analysis of sea turtle captures and mortalities during commercial shrimp trawling. Fishery Bulletin 85:813-817.

Heberer, Craig F. Estimation of bycatch and discard rates for pelagic fish species captured in the tuna longline fishery of the Federated States of Micronesia. Diss. University of Puerto Rico, Mayagüez Campus, 1997.

Hien, T. M. 2002. Status of sea turtle conservation in Vietnam. Pages 191-194 in I. Kinan, editor. Western Pacific Sea Turtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Hilbert, S. C., S. C. Gardner, W. J. Nichols, L. M. Campbell, H. A. Schoonover, J. Ward, and K. Zilinskas. 2002. Feeding habits of black turtles (Chelonia mydas agassizii) in the Magdalena Bay Region, Baja California Peninsula, Mexico. Pages 143-145 in A. Mosier, A. Foley, and B. Brost, editors. Twentieth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation,.

Hillis, Z. M. and A. L. Mackay. 1989. Buck Island Reef National Monument Sea Turtle Program, 1987-1988. Pages 235-237 in S. A. Eckert, K. L. Eckert, and T. H. Richardson, editors. Ninth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology.

Hirth, H. F. 1980. Some aspects of the nesting behavior and reproductive biology of sea turtles. Presented at: Symposium on Behavioral and Reproductive Biology of Sea Turtles Tampa, FL (USA) 27 Dec 1979. American Zoologist 20:507-523.

Hoopes, L. A., A. M. Landry Jr., and E. K. Stabenau. 2000. Physiological effects of capturing Kemp's ridley sea turtles, Lepidochelys kempii, in entanglement nets. Canadian Journal of Zoology 78:1941-1947.

Huerta, P., H. Pineda, A. Aguirre, T. Spraker, L. Sarti, and A. Barragan. 2002. First confirmed case of fibropapilloma in a leatherback turtle (Dermochelys coriacea). Page 193 in A. Mosier, A. Foley, and B. Brost, editors. Twentieth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

IATTC. 1999. Annual report of the Inter-American Tropical Tuna Commission 1997. Inter American Tropical Tuna Commission, La Jolla, CA.

Ilo, L., G.P. Camacho, and C. Alepuyo. 2005. 2005 Sea turtle nesting and in-water assessment report for the Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana southern inhabitant islands of Saipan, Tinian, and Rota. CNMI Division of Fish and Wildlife Report. 23 pp.

Ilo, L. and J. Mangolona. 2002. Sea Turtle Assessment Report for the Island Anatahan. Sept. 27, 2002. CNMI DFW unpublished report.

IPCC. 2007. Climate Change 2007: The Physical Science Basis: Summary for Policymakers. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change.

Katahira, L. K., C. M. Forbes, A. H. Kikuta, G. H. Balazs, and M. Bingham. 1994. Recent findings and management of hawksbill turtle nesting beaches in Hawaii. Page 69 in K. A. Bjorndal, A. B. Bolten, D. A. Johnson, and P. J. Eliazar, editors. Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Keinath, J. A., R. A. Byles, and J. A. Musick. 1989. Satellite telemetry of loggerhead turtles in the western North Atlantic. Pages 75-76 Ninth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology, .

Kelez, S., X. Velez-Zuazo, and C. M. Bravo. 2003. Current status of sea turtles along the northern coast of Peru: preliminary results. Pages 264-265 in J. A. Seminoff, editor. Twenty-Second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Kelle, L., N. Gratiot, I. Nolibos, J. Thérése, R. Wongsopawiro, and B. de Thoisy. 2007. Monitoring of nesting leatherback turtles (Dermochelys coriacea): Contribution of remote sensing for real-time assessment of beach coverage in French Guiana. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 6:142-147.

Keller, J. M., J. R. Kucklick, M. A. Stamper, C. A. Harms, and P. D. McClellan-Green. 2004. Associations between organochlorine contaminant concentrations and clinical health parameters in loggerhead sea turtles from North Carolina, USA. Environmental Health Perspectives 112:1074-1079.

Keller, J. M., P. D. McClellan-Green, J. R. Kucklick, D. E. Keil, and M. M. Peden-Adams. 2006. Effects of organochlorine contaminants on loggerhead sea turtle immunity: comparison of a correlative field study and in vitro exposure experiments. Environmental Health Perspectives 114:70-76.

Kolinski, S. P. 2001. Sea turtles and their marine habitats at Tinian and Aguijan, with projections on resident turtle demographics in the southern arc of the Commonwealth of the northern Mariana Islands. National Marine Fisheries Service.

Kolinski, S. P., R. K. Hoeke, S. R. Holzwarth, L. I. Ilo, E. F. Cox, R. C. O'Conner, and P. S. Vroom. 2006. Nearshore distribution and an abundance estimate for green sea turtles, Chelonia mydas, at Rota Island, commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Pacific Science 60:509-522.

Kolinski, S. P., D. M. Parker, L. I. Ilo, and J. K. Ruak. 2001. An assessment of the sea turtles and their marine and terrestrial habitats at Saipan, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. Micronesica 34:55-72.

Landsberg, J. H., G. H. Balazs, K. A. Steidinger, D. G. Baden, T. M. Work, and D. J. Russell. 1999. The Potential Role of Natural Tumor Promoters in Marine Turtle Fibropapillomatosis. Journal of Aquatic Animal Health 11:12.

Laveti, Merewalesi, and Kenneth T. MacKay. "Does Fiji's turtle moratorium work." Marine Turtle Newsletter 123 (2009): 12-15.

Law, R. J., C. F. Fileman, A. D. Hopkins, J. R. Baker, J. Harwood, D. B. Jackson, S. Kennedy, A. R. Martin, and R. J. Morris. 1991. Concentrations of trace metals in the livers of marine mammals (seals, porpoises and dolphins) from waters around the British Isles. Marine Pollution Bulletin 22:183-191.

Lenhardt, M. L. 2003. Effects of noise on sea turtles. First International Conference on Acoustic Communication by Animals, University of Maryland.

León, Y. M. and K. A. Bjorndal. 2002. Selective feeding in the hawksbill turtle, an important predator in coral reef ecosystems. Marine Ecology Progress Series 245:249-258.

Lewison, R. L., S. A. Freeman, and L. B. Crowder. 2004. Quantifying the effects of fisheries on threatened species: the impact of pelagic longlines on loggerhead and leatherback sea turtles. Ecology Letters 7:221-231.

Lima, S. L. 1998. Stress and decision making under the risk of predation: recent developments from behavioral, reproductive, and ecological perspecitves. Advances in the Study of Behavior 27:215-290.

Limpus, C. J. 1982. The status of Australian sea turtle populations. Pages 297-303 in K. A. Bjorndal, editor. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.

Limpus, C. J. 1992. The hawksbill turtle, Eretmochelys imbricata, in Queensland: population struture within a southern Great Barrier Reef feeding ground. Australian Wildlife Research 19:489-506.

Limpus, C. J. 1995. Global overview of the status of marine turtles: a 1995 viewpoint. Pages 605–609 in K. A. Bjorndal, editor. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles, Revised Edition. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC, USA.

Limpus, C. J. and M. Y. Chaloupka. 1997. Nonparametric regression modelling of green sea turtle growth rates (southern Great Barrier Reef). Marine Ecology Progress Series 149:23-34.

Limpus, C. J. and D. J. Limpus. 2000. Mangroves in the diet of Chelonia mydas in Queensland, Australia. Marine Turtle Newsletter 89:13-15.

Limpus, C. J., J. D. Miller, V. Baker, and E. McLachlan. 1983. The hawksbill turtle, Eretmochelys imbricata (L.), in North-eastern Australia: The Campbell Island Rookery. Australian Wildlife Research 10:185-197.

Limpus, C. J. and C. J. Parmenter. 1986. The sea turtle resources of the Torres Strait region. Pages 95-107 in A. K. Haines, G. C. Williams, and D. Coates, editors. Torres Strait Fisheries Seminar, Port Moresby.

Loehefener, R. R., W. Hoggard, C. L. Roden, K. D. Mullin, and C. M. Rogers. 1989. Petroleum structures and the distribution of sea turtles. In: Proc. Spring Ternary Gulf of Mexico Studies Meeting, Minerals Management Service, U.S. Department of the Interior, New Orleans, La.

Loop, K. A., J. D. Miller, and C. J. Limpus. 1995. Nesting by the hawksbill turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata) on Milman Island, Great Barrier Reef, Australia. Wildlife Research 22:241-252.

Lutcavage, M. E. and P. L. Lutz. 1997. Diving physiology. Pages 277-295 The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, Boca Raton, Florida.

Lutcavage, M. E., P. L. Lutz, G. D. Bossart, and D. M. Hudson. 1995. Physiologic and clinicopathologic effects of crude oil on loggerhead sea turtles. Archives of Environmental Contamination and Toxicology 28:417-422.

Lutcavage, M. E., P. Plotkin, B. E. Witherington, and P. L. Lutz. 1997. Human impacts on sea turtle survival. Pages 387-409 in P. L. Lutz and J. A. Musick, editors. The Biology of Sea Turtles. CRC Press, New York, New York.

Lutz, P. L. and M. E. Lutcavage. 1989. The effects of petroleum on sea turtles: Applicability to Kemp's ridley. Pages 52-54 in C. W. Caillouet Jr. and J. A. M. Landry, editors. First International Symposium on Kemp's Ridley Sea Turtle Biology, Conservation and Management.

Mann, T. M. 1977. Impact of developed coastline on nesting and hatchling sea turtles in southeastern Florida. Florida Atlantic University, Boca Raton, Florida.

Marquez Millan, R. and M. A. Carrasco A. 2003. The investigation and conservation of the black turtle in Mexico: the first years. Pages 80-81 in J. A. Seminoff, editor. Twenty-Second Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Márquez, M. R. 1990. Sea turtles of the world. An annotated and illustrated catalogue of sea turtle species known to date.

Martin, E. 1996. Storm impacts on loggerhead turtle reproductive success. Marine Turtle Newsletter 73:10-12.

Mazaris, A. D., G. Matsinos, and J. D. Pantis. 2009. Evaluating the impacts of coastal squeeze on sea turtle nesting. Ocean & Coastal Management 52:139-145.

McKenzie, C., B. J. Godley, R. W. Furness, and D. E. Wells. 1999. Concentrations and patterns of organochlorine contaminants in marine turtles from Mediterranean and Atlantic waters. Marine Environmental Research 47:117-135.

McKeown, A. 1977. Marine turtles of the Solomon Islands. Ministry of Natural Resources, Fisheries Division, Honiara

Mendilaharsu, M. L., S. C. Gardner, and J. A. Seminoff. 2003. Chelonia mydas agassizii (East Pacific green seaturtle). Diet. Herpetological Review 34:139-140.

Meylan, A. 1988. Spongivory in hawksbill turtles: A diet of glass. Science 239:393-395.

Meylan, A. 1989. Status report of the hawksbill turtle. Pages 101-115 in L. Ogren, F. Berry, K. Bjorndal, H. Kumpf, R. Mast, G. Medina, H. Reichart, and R. Witham, editors. Second Western Atlantic Turtle Symposium.

Meylan, A. 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 3:200-224.

Meylan, A. B. 1999a. International movements of immature and adult hawksbill turtles (Eretmochelys imbricata) in the Caribbean region. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 3:189-194.

Meylan, A. B. 1999b. Status of the hawksbill turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata) in the Caribbean region. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 3:177-184.

Mills, S. K. and J. H. Beatty. 1979. The propensity interpretation of fishes. Philosophy of Science 46:263-286.

Milton, S. L., P. L. Lutz, and G. Shigenaka. 2003. Oil toxicity and impacts on sea turtles. Pages 35-47 in G. Shigenaka, editor. Oil and Sea Turtles: Biology, Planning, and Response. NOAA, National Ocean Service, Office of Response and Restoration, Seattle.

Mortimer, J. A. 1990. Influence of beach sand characteristics on nesting behavior and clutch survival in green turtles. Pages 153-156 in T. H. Richardson, J. I. Richardson, and M. Donnelly, editors. Tenth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Mrosovsky, N. 1995. Temperature and sex ratio. Pages 597-598 in K. A. Bjorndal, editor. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles (Revised Edition). Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, DC.

Myrberg Jr, A. A. 2001. The acoustical biology of elasmobranchs. Environmental Biology of Fishes 60:16.

Niethammer, K. R., G. H. Balazs, J. S. Hatfield, G. Nakai, and J. L. Megyesi. 1997. Reproductive Biology of the Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas) at Tern Island French Frigate Shoals, Hawaii. Pacific Science 51:36-47.

Nishimura, W., and S. Nakahigashi. 1990. Incidental capture of sea turtles by Japanese research and training vessels: results of a questionnaire. Marine Turtle Newsletter 51:1–4.

NMFS. 1997. Biological opinion on Navy activities off the southeastern United States along the Atlantic coast. National Marine Fisheries Service, Office of Protected Resources and the Southeast Regional Office. 58p.

NMFS 2000. Biological opinion on the Operation of the Cooling Water Intake System at the Brunswick Steam Electric Plant Carolina Power and Light Company. NMFS Southeast Regional Office. 42p.

NMFS 2005. Biological opinion on the Hawaii-based pelagic, deep-set longline fishery based on the Fishery Management Plan for Pelagic Fisheries of the Western Pacific Region. NMFS Pacific Islands Regional Office. 187p.

NMFS 2006. Biological opinion on Formal Consultation on the Continued Operation of the Diablo Canyon Nuclear Power Plant and San Onofre Nuclear Generating Station. NMFS Southwest Regional Office. 59p.

NMFS. 2012. Biological opinion on the proposal to issue permits No. 15661 and 15685, and a modification to the existing permit No. 10027-04 which would characterize the population structure, movements and spatial distribution of green and hawksbill sea turtles in nearshore habitats off the Northern Mariana Islands (NMI), the Hawaiian Islands, and Palmyra Atoll pursuant to Section 10(a)(1)(A) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973. Silver Spring, MD. 112p.

NMFS 2012a. Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation biological and conference opinion on the U.S. Navy conduct of training exercises in the Hawai'i Range Complex from January 2012 to January 2014 Letter of Authorization to the U.S. Navy to "take" marine mammals incidental to the conduct of training exercises in the Hawai'i Range Complex January 2012 to January 2014. Silver Spring, MD. 306p.

NMFS 2012b. Endangered Species Act Section 7 consultation biological opinion on the U.S. Navy's proposed military readiness activities on the Southern California Range Complex from January 2012 to January 2014 NMFS' 2012 Letter of Authorization to authorize the U.S. Navy to "take" marine mammals incidental to military readiness activities on the Southern California Range Complex January 2012 to January 2014. Silver Spring, MD. 295p.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998a. Recovery Plan for the U.S. Pacific Populations of the Leatherback Turtles (Dermochelys coriacea). Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998b. Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the East Pacific Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas). National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998c. Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Green Turtle (Chelonia mydas). Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998d. Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Hawksbill Turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata). Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS and USFWS. 1998e. Recovery Plan for U.S. Pacific Populations of the Loggerhead Turtle (Caretta caretta). Silver Spring, Maryland.

NMFS and USFWS. 2007a. Green Sea Turtle (Chelonia mydas) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Silver Spring, MD.

NMFS and USFWS. 2007b. Hawksbill Sea Turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata) 5-Year Review: Summary and Evaluation National Marine Fisheries Service and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

NRC. 1990. Decline of the sea turtles: Causes and prevention. National Research Council, Washington, D.C.

Parmenter, C. J. 1982. Reproductive migration in the hawksbill turtle (Eretmochelys imbricata). Copeia 1983:271-273.

Parsons, J. J. 1972. The hawksbill turtle and the tortoise shell trade. Pages 45-60 Études de géographie tropicale offertes a Pierre Gourou. Mouton, Paris, France.

Peters, A. and K. J. F. Verhoeven. 1994. Impact of Artificial Lighting on the Seaward Orientation of Hatchling Loggerhead Turtles. Journal of Herpetology 28:112-114.

Pichel, W. G., J. H. Churnside, T. S. Veenstra, D. G. Foley, K. S. Friedman, R. E. Brainard, J. B. Nicoll, Q. Zheng, and P. Clemente-Colon. 2007. Marine debris collects within the North Pacific Subtropical Convergence Zone. Marine Pollution Bulletin 54:1207-1211.

Pike, D. A., R. L. Antworth, and J. C. Stiner. 2006. Earlier nesting contributes to shorter nesting seasons for the loggerhead seaturtle, Caretta caretta. Journal of Herpetology 40:91-94.

Pike, D. A. and J. C. Stiner. 2007. Sea turtle species vary in their susceptibility to tropical cyclones. Oecologia 153:471-478.

Pritchard, P. C. H. 1982. Marine turtles of the South Pacific. Pages 253-262 in K. A. Bjorndal, editor. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington D.C.

Pritchard, P. C. H. 1995. Marine turtles of the South Pacific. Pages 253-262 in K. A. Bjorndal, editor. Biology and Conservation of Sea Turtles. Smithsonian Institution Press, Washington, D.C.

Pritchard, P. C. H., P. Bacon, F. H. Berry, A. Carr, J. Feltemyer, R. M. Gallagher, S. Hopkins, R. Lankford, M. R. Marquez, L. H. Ogren, W. Pringle, Jr., H. Reichart, and R. Witham. 1983. Manual of sea turtle research and conservation techniques, 2nd ed. K. A. Bjorndal and G. H. Balazs (eds.). Center for Environmental Education, Washington, DC.

Pritchard, P. C. H. and P. Trebbau. 1984a. Family Cheloniidae Gray, 1825: sea turtles. Pages 269-375 Turtles of Venezuela. Society of the Study of Amphibian and Reptiles.

Pritchard, P. C. H. and P. Trebbau. 1984b. The turtles of Venezuela. SSAR Contribution to Herpetology No. 2.

Prusty, G., S. Dash, and M. P. Singh. 2007. Spatio-temporal analysis of multi-date IRS imageries for turtle habitat dynamics characterization at Gahirmatha coast, India. International Journal of Remote Sensing 28:871-883.

Pultz, S., D. O'Daniel, S. Krueger, H. McSharry, and G. H. Balazs. 1999. Marine turtle survey on Tinian, Mariana Islands. Micronesica 32:85-94.

Rahmstorf, Stefan. 1999. "Shifting seas in the greenhouse?." Nature 399.6736: 523-524.

Rahmstorf, Stefan. 1997. "Risk of sea-change in the Atlantic." Nature 388.6645: 825-826.

Richardson, J. I., R. Bell, and T. H. Richardson. 1999. Population ecology and demographic implications drawn from an 11-year study of nesting hawksbill turtles, Eretmochelys imbricata, at Jumby Bay, Long Island, Antigua, West Indies. Chelonian Conservation and Biology 3:244-250.

Ridgeway, S. H., E. G. Wever, J. G. McCormick, J. Palin, and J. H. Anderson. 1969. Hearing in the Giant Sea Turtle, Chelonia mydas. Proceedings of the National Academy of Science 64:884-890.

Rivalan, P., P. H. Dutton, E. Baudry, S. E. Roden, and M. Girondot. 2006. Demographic scenario inferred from genetic data in leatherback turtles nesting in French Guiana and Suriname. Biological Conservation 130:1-9.

Romero, L. M. 2004. Physiological stress in ecology: lessons from biomedical research. Trends in Ecology & Evolution 19:249-255.

Ross, J. P. 2005. Hurricane effects on nesting Caretta caretta. Marine Turtle Newsletter 108:13-14.

Rupeni, E., S. Mangubhai, K. Tabunakawai, and P. Blumel. 2002. Establishing replicable community-based turtle conservation reserves in Fiji. Pages 119-124 in I. Kinan, editor. Western Pacific Sea Turtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop. Western Pacific Regional Fishery Management Council, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Sakai, H., H. Ichihashi, H. Suganuma, and R. Tatsukawa. 1995. Heavy metal monitoring in sea turtles using eggs. Marine Pollution Bulletin 30:347-353.

Salmon, M. and B. E. Witherington. 1994. Misorientation, moonlight, and the seafinding behavior of loggerhead hatchlings. Pages 277-278 in K. A. Bjorndal, A. B. Bolten, D. A. Johnson, and P. J. Eliazar, editors. Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Seminoff, J. A. 2002a. Global status of the green turtle (Chelonia mydas): a summary of the 2001 Status Assessment for the IUCN Red List Programme. Pages 197-211 in I. Kinan, editor. Western Pacific Sea Turtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Seminoff, J. A. 2002b. Marine Turtle Specialist Group Review. 2002 IUCN Red List Global Status Assessment. Green turtle (Chelonia mydas). Marine Turtle Specialist Group, The World Conservation Union (IUCN), Species Survival Commission, Red List Programme.

Seminoff, J. A. 2004. 2004 global status assessment: Green turtle (Chelonia mydas). IUCN Marine Turtle Specialist Group Review.

Short, Frederick T., and Hilary A. Neckles. "The effects of global climate change on seagrasses." Aquatic Botany 63.3 (1999): 169-196.

Skalski, J., S. Smith, R. Iwamoto, J. Williams, and A. Hoffmann. 1998. Use of passive integrated transponder tags to estimate survival of migrant juvenile salmonids in the Snake and Columbia rivers. Canadian Journal of Fisheries and Aquatic Sciences 55:10.

Stabenau, E. K., T. A. Heming, and J. F. Mitchell. 1991. Respiratory, acid-base and ionic status of Kemp's ridley sea turtles (Lepidochelys kempi) subjected to trawling. Comparative Biochemistry and Physiology - Part A: Molecular & Integrative Physiology 99A:107-111.

Stapleton, S. and C. Stapleton. 2006. Tagging and nesting research on hawksbill turtles (Eretmochelys imbricata) at Jumby Bay, Long Island, Antigua, West Indies: 2005 annual report. Jumby Bay Island Company, Ltd.

Stearns, S. C. 1992. The Evolution of Life Histories. Oxford Press, Oxford. 249.

Stinson, M. 1984. Biology of sea turtles in San Diego Bay, California and the Northeastern Pacific Ocean. MSc. San Diego State University, San Diego, California.

Storelli, M. M., G. Barone, A. Storelli, and G. O. Marcotrigiano. 2008. Total and subcellular distribution of trace elements (Cd, Cu and Zn) in the liver and kidney of green turtles (Chelonia mydas) from the Mediterranean Sea. Chemosphere 70:908-913.

Storelli, M. M. and E. M. Ceci, G.O. 1998. Distribution of Heavy Metal Residues in Some Tissues of Caretta caretta (Linnaeus) Specimen Beached Along the Adriatic Sea (Italy). Bulletin of Environmental Contamination and Toxiocology 60:546-552.

Tagarino, A., K.S. Saili, and R. Utzurrum. 2008. Investigations into the Status of Marine Turtles in American Samoa, with Remediation of Identified Threats and Impediments to Conservation and Recovery of Species. NOAA Grant Award No. NA04NMF4540126. FINAL REPORT (01 October 2004 to 30 September 2008), 44pp.

Tagarino, A. and R. Utzurrum. 2010. Investigations into the Status of Marine Turtles in American Samoa: Assessment of Threat to Nesting Activities and Habitat in Swains Island. NOAA Grant Award No. NA08NMF4540506. FINAL REPORT (01 October 2008 to 30 September 2009), 14pp.

Tuato'o-Bartley, N., T. E. Morrell, and P. Craig. 1993. Status of sea turtles in American Samoa in 1991. Pacific Science 47:215-221.

USFWS. 1999. South Florida Multi-Species Recovery Plan Atlanta, Georgia. 2172p.

Utzurrum, R. 2002. Sea turtle conservation in America Samoa. Pages 33-36 in I. Kinan, editor. Western Pacific Sea Turtle Cooperative Research and Management Workshop, Honolulu, Hawaii.

van Dam, R. P. 1997. Ecology of hawksbill turtles on feeding grounds at Mona and Monito Islands, Puerto Rico. Universiteit van Amsterdam, The Netherlands.

van Dam, R. P. and C. E. Diez. 1997. Preliminary evaluation of plastic tag performance on Caribbean hawksbill turtles. Marine Turtle Newsletter 76:11-12.

Vogt, S. 2009. Wildlife surveys on military leased lands, Tinian, Commonwealth of the Northern Mariana Islands. U.S. Navy, Pacific Fleet, Honolulu, Hawaii.

Walker, B. G., P. D. Boersma, and J. C. Wingfield. 2006. Habituation of adult Magellanic penguins to human visitation as expressed through behavior and corticosterone secretion. Conserv Biol 20:146-154.

Watson, K. P. and R. A. Granger. 1998. Hydrodynamic effect of a satellite transmitter on a juvenile green turtle (Chelonia mydas). Journal of Experimental Biology 201:2497-2505.

Weidner, D., & Serrano, J. (1997). World swordfish fisheries. NOAA Tech. Memo. NMFS-F/SPO-26 Vol. IV.Weishampel, J. F., D. A. Bagley, and L. M. Ehrhart. 2004. Earlier nesting by loggerhead sea turtles following sea surface warming. Global Change Biology 10:1424-1427.

Wetherall, J. A. 1997. Mortality of sea turtles in the Hawaii longline fishery: a preliminary assessment of population impacts. Administrative Report H-97-07.

Wetherall, J. A., G. H. Balazs, R. A. Tokunaga, and M. Y. Y. Young. 1993. Bycatch of marine turtles in morth Pacific high-seas driftnet fisheries and impacts on the stocks. Unpublished Manuscript.

Witherington, B. E. 1994. Flotsam, jetsam, post-hatchling loggerheads, and the advecting surface smorgasbord. Pages 166-168 in K. A. Bjorndal, A. B. Bolten, D. A. Johnson, and P. J. Eliazar, editors. Fourteenth Annual Symposium on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation.

Witherington, B. E. 1999. Reducing threats to nesting habitat. Pages 179-183 in K. L. Eckert, K. A. Bjorndal, F. A. Abreu-Grobois, and M. Donnelly, editors. Research and Management Techniques for the Conservation of Sea Turtles.

Witzell, W. N. 1983. Synopsis of biological data on the hawksbill sea turtle, Eretmochelys imbricata (Linnaeus, 1766). Food and Agricultural Organization of the United Nations, Rome.

Wright, I. E., S. D. Wright, and J. M. Sweat. 1998. Use of passive integrated transponder (PIT) tags to identify manatees (Trichechus manatus latirostris). Marine Mammal Science 14:641-645.

Wyneken, J., S. P. Epperly, B. Higgins, E. McMichael, C. Merigo, and J. P. Flanagan. 2010. PIT tag migration in sea turtle flippers. Herpetological Review 41:448-454.

Yano, K. and S. Tanaka. 1991. Diurnal swimming patterns of loggerhead turtles during their breeding period as observed by ultrasonic telemetry. Nippon Suisan Gakkaishi 57:1669-1678.

Zug, G. R., G. H. Balazs, J. A. Wetherall, D. M. Parker, and S. K. K. Murakawa. 2002. Age and growth of Hawaiian green seaturtles (Chelonia mydas): an analysis based on skeletochronology. Fishery Bulletin 100:117-127.