

Review of Loggerhead Sea Turtle Recovery Plan by J. Seminoff

Page vii, Current Status of Northern Recovery Unit – a 1.6 % annual decline has been ongoing since when?

Page ix

- This section seems to lack a sufficient preamble that provides a context for how recovery is achieved and elucidated.
- For 1.a.(1), does this mean that recovery can not be declared for at least one generation (50 yrs)? If so, this would seem to not take into account the fact that other sea turtle populations have exceeded population growth rates that would be expected within one generation based on conventional wisdom about biological potential of sea turtles (eg. Chaloupka et al. 2007 – recovery of megaherbivore populations, Marcovaldi et al. 2007 – hawksbills and loggerheads in Brazil, etc.).
- Also re: NRU, do we have data that suggest this area was EVER important for the overall NWA loggerhead stock?
- For Greater Caribbean RU, can there not be a numerical criterion as is the case of other units? This would seem prudent since the Yucatan RU was once a major rookery complex. Or are we talking about Yucatan state only and not the entire peninsula (in which case more clarity is needed and better description for the Quintana Roo RU).
- Also, for this RU, since there is no (2), then the (1) notation should be removed.

Page x

- Recovery criteria for 2. Trends in abundance on foraging grounds seems vague. Can this be elaborated upon to talk about types of studies that would ideally be done to determine population abundance changes?
- The ability to monitor population changes in the oceanic seems a near impossibility based on current resources.

Page xi

- 3.a. where is the foot note or end note for superscript 1? Seems it should be at a foot note.
- 4.b. the mention of delisting in absence of a qualifier suggests that delisting is a foregone conclusion. Best to restate.

Page 2

- Line 2, insert >eastern< in front of Australia (since no reliable numbers are available for western Aust).

Page 3

- We don't have reliable data for western Australia to be able to unequivocally say it has over 1000 females.

Page 7

- Is this graph (fig 3) corrected for effort? If not, its important that the caveats are discussed explicitly

Page 24

- Line 1 – lack of oceanic diet study may be true for atl, but see Parker et al. for pacific information. Polovina’s work also alludes to specific diet items.
- Growth rates, second line. The 5.4 cm / yr growth rate is for what size classes?

Page 25

- Survival probabilities – line 7 – be explicit about which longline fishery we’re speaking of.

Page 41

- First line. How are eggs ‘injured’. Worth more detail.

Page 51

- 4th PP, the Lutcavage 1997 citation’s use to suggest seismic survey data are not available seems a bit out of date. Has nothing been done in the 11 years since this book chapter?? I seem to recall there are new data for waters of West Africa.

Page 53

- Salvage operations – while this may cause impacts, this is one that left me scratching my head. Is it really that big of an issue?

Page 71

- Efforts to Conduct in-water monitoring – I think it would be worth mentioning the NMFS pound net monitoring that occurs in NC. This is not dedicated in-water fisheries independent research per se, but it does address in-water population status, trends, threats, etc.