

GUIDELINES FOR MANAGING RECREATIONAL ACTIVITIES IN PIPING PLOVER BREEDING HABITAT ON THE U.S. ATLANTIC COAST TO AVOID TAKE UNDER SECTION 9 OF THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT

Northeast Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
April 15, 1994

The following information is provided as guidance to beach managers and property owners seeking to avoid potential violations of Section 9 of the Endangered Species Act (16 U.S.C. 1538) and its implementing regulations (50 CFR Part 17) that could occur as the result of recreational activities on beaches used by breeding piping plovers along the Atlantic Coast. These guidelines were developed by the Northeast Region, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service), with assistance from the U.S. Atlantic Coast Piping Plover Recovery Team. The guidelines are advisory, and failure to implement them does not, of itself, constitute a violation of the law. Rather, they represent the Service's best professional advice to beach managers and landowners regarding the management options that will prevent direct mortality, harm, or harassment of piping plovers and their eggs due to recreational activities.

Some land managers have endangered species protection obligations under Section 7 of the Endangered Species Act (see section I below) or under Executive Orders 11644 and 11989¹ that go beyond adherence to these guidelines. Nothing in this document should be construed as lack of endorsement of additional piping plover protection measures implemented by these land managers or those who are voluntarily undertaking stronger plover protection measures.

This document contains four sections: (I) a brief synopsis of the legal requirements that afford protection to nesting piping plovers; (II) a brief summary of the life history of piping plovers and potential threats due to recreational activities during the breeding cycle; (III) guidelines for protecting piping plovers from recreational activities on Atlantic Coast beaches; and (IV) literature cited.

I. LEGAL CONSIDERATIONS

Section 9 of the Endangered Species Act (ESA) prohibits any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States from harassing, harming, pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting listed wildlife species. It is also unlawful to attempt such acts, solicit another to commit such acts, or cause such acts to be committed. A "person" is defined in Section 3 to mean "an individual, corporation, partnership, trust, association, or any other private entity; or any officer, employee, agent, department, or instrumentality of the Federal Government, of any State, municipality, or political subdivision of a State, or of any foreign government; any State, municipality, or political subdivision of a State; or any other entity subject to the jurisdiction of the United States." Regulations implementing the ESA (50 CFR 17.3) further define "harm" to include significant habitat modification or degradation that results

¹ Executive Order 11644, Use of Off-Road Vehicles on the Public Lands and Executive Order 11989, Off-Road Vehicles on Public Lands pertain to lands under custody of the Secretaries of Agriculture, Defense, and Interior (except for Indian lands) and certain lands under the custody of the Tennessee Valley Authority.

in the killing or injury of wildlife by significantly impairing essential behavioral patterns including breeding, feeding, or sheltering. "Harass" means an intentional or negligent act or omission which creates the likelihood of injury to wildlife by annoying it to such an extent as to significantly disrupt normal behavioral patterns which include, but are not limited to, breeding, feeding, or sheltering. Penalties for violations of Section 9 are provided in Section 11 of the ESA; for threatened species, these penalties include fines of up to \$25,000, imprisonment for not more than six months, or both.

Section 10 of the ESA and related regulations provide for permits that may be granted to authorize acts prohibited under Section 9, for scientific purposes or to enhance the propagation or survival of a listed species. States that have Cooperative Agreements under Section 6 of the ESA, may provide written authorization for take that occurs in the course of implementing conservation programs. For example, State agencies have authorized certain biologists to construct predator enclosures for piping plovers. It is also legal for employees or designated agents of certain Federal or State agencies to take listed species without a permit, if the action is necessary to aid sick, injured, or orphaned animals or to salvage or dispose of a dead specimen.

Section 10 also allows permits to be issued for take that is "incidental to, and not the purpose of, carrying out an otherwise lawful activity" if the Service determines that certain conditions have been met. An applicant for an incidental take permit must prepare a conservation plan that specifies the impacts of the take, steps the applicant will take to minimize and mitigate the impacts, funding that will be available to implement these steps, alternative actions to the take that the applicant considered, and the reasons why such alternatives are not being utilized.

Section 7 of the ESA may be pertinent to beach managers and landowners in situations that have a Federal nexus. Section 7 requires Federal agencies to consult with the Service (or National Marine Fisheries Service for marine species) prior to authorizing, funding, or carrying out activities that may affect listed species. Section 7 also requires that these agencies use their authorities to further the conservation of listed species. Section 7 obligations have caused Federal land management agencies to implement piping plover protection measures that go beyond those required to avoid take, for example by conducting research on threats to piping plovers. Other examples of Federal activities that may affect piping plovers along the Atlantic Coast, thereby triggering Section 7 consultation, include permits for beach nourishment or disposal of dredged material (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers) and funding of beach restoration projects (Federal Emergency Management Authority).

Piping plovers, as well as other migratory birds such as least terns, common terns, American oystercatchers, laughing gulls, herring gulls, and great black-backed gulls, their nests, and eggs are also protected under the Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712). Prohibited acts include pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, collecting, or attempting such conduct. Violators may be fined up to \$5000 and/or imprisoned for up to six months.

Almost all States within the breeding range of the Atlantic Coast piping plover population list the species as State threatened or endangered (Northeast Nongame Technical Committee 1993). Various laws and regulations may protect State-listed species from take, but the Service has not ascertained the adequacy of the guidelines presented in this document to meet the requirements of any State law.

II. LIFE HISTORY AND THREATS FROM HUMAN DISTURBANCE

Piping plovers are small, sand-colored shorebirds that nest on sandy, coastal beaches from South Carolina to Newfoundland. Since 1986, the Atlantic Coast population has been protected as a threatened species under provisions of the U.S. Endangered Species Act of 1973 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1985). The U.S. portion of the population was estimated at 875 pairs in 1993 (U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service 1993). Many characteristics of piping plovers contribute to their susceptibility to take due to human beach activities.

LIFE HISTORY

Piping plovers begin returning to their Atlantic Coast nesting beaches in mid-March (Coutu et al. 1990, Cross 1990, Goldin 1990, MacIvor 1990, Hake 1993). Males establish and defend territories and court females (Cairns 1982). Eggs may be present on the beach from mid-April through late July. Clutch size is generally four eggs, and the incubation period² usually lasts for 27-28 days. Piping plovers fledge only a single brood per season, but may reneest several times if previous nests are lost. Chicks are precocial³ (Wilcox 1959, Cairns 1982). They may move hundreds of yards from the nest site during their first week of life (see Table 1, Summary of Chick Mobility Data). Chicks remain together with one or both parents until they fledge (are able to fly) at 25 to 35 days of age. Depending on date of hatching, flightless chicks may be present from mid-May until late August, although most fledge by the end of July (Patterson 1988, Goldin 1990, MacIvor 1990, Howard et al. 1993).

Piping plover nests are situated above the high tide line on coastal beaches, sand flats at the ends of sandspits and barrier islands, gently sloping foredunes, blowout areas behind primary dunes, and washover areas cut into or between dunes. They may also nest on areas where suitable

² "Incubation" refers to adult birds sitting on eggs, to maintain them at a favorable temperature for embryo development.

³ "Precocial" birds are mobile and capable of foraging for themselves within several hours of hatching.

dredge material has been deposited. Nest sites are shallow scraped depressions in substrates ranging from fine grained sand to mixtures of sand and pebbles, shells or cobble (Bent 1929, Burger 1987a, Cairns 1982, Patterson 1988, Flemming et al. 1990, MacIvor 1990, Strauss 1990). Nests are usually found in areas with little or no vegetation although, on occasion, piping plovers will nest under stands of American beachgrass (*Ammophila breviligulata*) or other vegetation (Patterson 1988, Flemming et al. 1990, MacIvor 1990). Plover nests may be very difficult to detect, especially during the 6-7 day egg-laying phase when the birds generally do not incubate (Goldin 1994).

Plover foods consist of invertebrates such as marine worms, fly larvae, beetles, crustaceans or mollusks (Bent 1929, Cairns 1977, Nicholls 1989). Feeding areas include intertidal portions of ocean beaches, washover areas, mudflats, sandflats, wrack lines⁴, and shorelines of coastal ponds, lagoons or salt marshes (Gibbs 1986, Coutu et al. 1990, Hoopes et al. 1992, Loegering 1992, Goldin 1993). Studies have shown that the relative importance of various feeding habitat types may vary by site (Gibbs 1986, Coutu et al. 1990, McConnaughey et al. 1990, Loegering 1992, Goldin 1993, Hoopes 1993) and by stage in the breeding cycle (Cross 1990). Adults and chicks on a given site may use different feeding habitats in varying proportion (Goldin et al. 1990). Feeding activities of chicks may be particularly important to their survival. Cairns (1977) found that piping plover chicks typically tripled their weight during the first two weeks post-hatching; chicks that failed to achieve at least 60% of this weight gain by day 12 were unlikely to survive. During courtship, nesting, and brood rearing, feeding territories are generally contiguous to nesting territories (Cairns 1977), although instances where brood-rearing areas are widely separated from nesting territories are not uncommon (see Table 1). Feeding activities of both adults and chicks may occur during all hours of the day and night (Burger 1993) and at all stages in the tidal cycle (Goldin 1993, Hoopes 1993).

THREATS FROM NONMOTORIZED BEACH ACTIVITIES

Sandy beaches that provide nesting habitat for piping plovers are also attractive recreational habitats for people and their pets. Nonmotorized recreational activities can be a source of both direct mortality and harassment of piping plovers. Pedestrians on beaches may crush eggs (Burger 1987b, Hill 1988, Shaffer and Laporte 1992, Cape Cod National Seashore 1993, Collazo et al. 1994). Unleashed dogs may chase plovers (McConnaughey et al. 1990), destroy nests (Hoopes et al. 1992), and kill chicks (Cairns and McLaren 1980).

Pedestrians may flush incubating plovers from nests (see Table 2, Summary of Data on Distances at Which Plovers React to Disturbance), exposing eggs to avian predators or causing excessive cooling or heating of eggs. Repeated exposure of shorebird eggs on hot days may cause overheating, killing the embryos (Bergstrom 1991). Excessive cooling may kill embryos or retard their development, delaying hatching dates (Welty 1982). Pedestrians can also displace unfledged chicks (Strauss 1990, Burger 1991, Hoopes et al. 1992, Loegering 1992, Goldin

⁴ Wrack is organic material including seaweed, seashells, driftwood and other materials deposited on beaches by tidal action.

1993). Fireworks are highly disturbing to piping plovers (Howard et al. 1993). Plovers are particularly intolerant of kites, compared with pedestrians, dogs, and vehicles; biologists believe this may be because plovers perceive kites as potential avian predators (Hoopes et al. 1992).

THREATS FROM MOTOR VEHICLES

Unrestricted use of motorized vehicles on beaches is a serious threat to piping plovers and their habitats. Vehicles can crush eggs (Wilcox 1959; Tull 1984; Burger 1987b; Patterson et al. 1991; *United States of America v. Breezy Point Cooperative, Inc.*, U.S. District Court, Eastern District of New York, Civil Action No. CV-90-2542, 1991; Shaffer and Laporte 1992), adults, and chicks. In Massachusetts and New York, biologists documented 14 incidents in which 18 chicks and 2 adults were killed by vehicles between 1989 and 1993 (Melvin et al. 1994). Goldin (1993) compiled records of 34 chick mortalities (30 on the Atlantic Coast and 4 on the Northern Great Plains) due to vehicles. Many biologists that monitor and manage piping plovers believe that many more chicks are killed by vehicles than are found and reported (Melvin et al. 1994). Beaches used by vehicles during nesting and brood-rearing periods generally have fewer breeding plovers than available nesting and feeding habitat can support. In contrast, plover abundance and productivity has increased on beaches where vehicle restrictions during chick-rearing periods have been combined with protection of nests from predators (Goldin 1993; S. Melvin, pers. comm., 1993).

Typical behaviors of piping plover chicks increase their vulnerability to vehicles. Chicks frequently move between the upper berm or foredune and feeding habitats in the wrack line and intertidal zone. These movements place chicks in the paths of vehicles driving along the berm or through the intertidal zone. Chicks stand in, walk, and run along tire ruts, and sometimes have difficulty crossing deep ruts or climbing out of them (Eddings et al. 1990, Strauss 1990, Howard et al. 1993). Chicks sometimes stand motionless or crouch as vehicles pass by, or do not move quickly enough to get out of the way (Tull 1984, Hoopes et al. 1992, Goldin 1993). Wire fencing placed around nests to deter predators (Rimmer and Deblinger 1990, Melvin et al. 1992) is ineffective in protecting chicks from vehicles because chicks typically leave the nest within a day after hatching and move extensively along the beach to feed (see Table 1).

Vehicles may also significantly degrade piping plover habitat or disrupt normal behavior patterns. They may harm or harass plovers by crushing wrack into the sand and making it unavailable as cover or a foraging substrate, by creating ruts that may trap or impede movements of chicks, and by preventing plovers from using habitat that is otherwise suitable (MacIvor 1990, Strauss 1990, Hoopes et al. 1992, Goldin 1993).

III. GUIDELINES FOR PROTECTING PIPING PLOVERS FROM RECREATIONAL DISTURBANCE

The Service recommends the following protection measures to prevent direct mortality or harassment of piping plovers, their eggs, and chicks.

MANAGEMENT OF NONMOTORIZED RECREATIONAL USES

On beaches where pedestrians, joggers, sun-bathers, picnickers, fishermen, boaters, horseback riders, or other recreational users are present in numbers that could harm or disturb incubating plovers, their eggs, or chicks, areas of at least 50 meter-radius around nests above the high tide line should be delineated with warning signs and symbolic fencing⁵. Only persons engaged in rare species monitoring, management, or research activities should enter posted areas. These areas should remain fenced as long as viable eggs or unfledged chicks are present. Fencing is intended to prevent accidental crushing of nests and repeated flushing of incubating adults, and to provide an area where chicks can rest and seek shelter when large numbers of people are on the beach.

Available data indicate that a 50 meter buffer distance around nests will be adequate to prevent harassment of the majority of incubating piping plovers. However, fencing around nests should be expanded in cases where the standard 50 meter-radius is inadequate to protect incubating adults or unfledged chicks from harm or disturbance. Data from various sites distributed across the plover's Atlantic Coast range indicates that larger buffers may be needed in some locations (see Table 2). This may include situations where plovers are especially intolerant of human presence, or where a 50 meter-radius area provides insufficient escape cover or alternative foraging opportunities for plover chicks.⁶

In cases where the nest is located less than 50 meters above the high tide line, fencing should be situated at the high tide line, and a qualified biologist should monitor responses of the birds to passersby, documenting his/her observations in clearly recorded field notes. Providing that birds are not exhibiting signs of disturbance, this smaller buffer may be maintained in such cases.

On portions of beaches that receive heavy human use, areas where territorial plovers are observed should be symbolically fenced to prevent disruption of territorial displays and courtship. Since nests can be difficult to locate, especially during egg-laying, this will also prevent accidental crushing of undetected nests. If nests are discovered outside fenced areas, fencing should be extended to create a sufficient buffer to prevent disturbance to incubating adults, eggs, or unfledged chicks.

Pets should be leashed and under control of their owners at all times from April 1 to August 31

⁵ "Symbolic fencing" refers to one or two strands of light-weight string, tied between posts to delineate areas where pedestrians and vehicles should not enter.

⁶ For example, on the basis of data from an intensive three year study that showed that plovers on Assateague Island in Maryland flush from nests at greater distances than those elsewhere (Loegering 1992), the Assateague Island National Seashore established 200 meter buffers zones around most nest sites and primary foraging areas (Assateague Island National Seashore 1993). Following a precipitous drop in numbers of nesting plover pairs in Delaware in the late 1980's, that State adopted a Piping Plover Management Plan that provided 100 yard buffers around nests on State park lands and included intertidal areas (Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control 1990).

on beaches where piping plovers are present or have traditionally nested. Pets should be prohibited on these beaches from April 1 through August 31 if, based on observations and experience, pet owners fail to keep pets leashed and under control.

Kite flying should be prohibited within 200 meters of nesting or territorial adult or unfledged juvenile piping plovers between April 1 and August 31.

Fireworks should be prohibited on beaches where plovers nest from April 1 until all chicks are fledged.

MOTOR VEHICLE MANAGEMENT

The Service recommends the following minimum protection measures to prevent direct mortality or harassment of piping plovers, their eggs, and chicks on beaches where vehicles are permitted.

Since restrictions to protect unfledged chicks often impede vehicle access along a barrier spit, a number of management options affecting the timing and size of vehicle closures are presented here. Some of these options are contingent on implementation of intensive plover monitoring and management plans by qualified biologists. It is recommended that landowners seek concurrence with such monitoring plans from either the Service or the State wildlife agency.

Protection of Nests

All suitable piping plover nesting habitat should be identified by a qualified biologist and delineated with posts and warning signs or symbolic fencing on or before April 1 each year. All vehicular access into or through posted nesting habitat should be prohibited. However, prior to hatching, vehicles may pass by such areas along designated vehicle corridors established along the outside edge of plover nesting habitat. Vehicles may also park outside delineated nesting habitat, if beach width and configuration and tidal conditions allow. Vehicle corridors or parking areas should be moved, constricted, or temporarily closed if territorial, courting, or nesting plovers are disturbed by passing or parked vehicles, or if disturbance is anticipated because of unusual tides or expected increases in vehicle use during weekends, holidays, or special events.

If data from several years of plover monitoring suggests that significantly more habitat is available than the local plover population can occupy, some suitable habitat may be left unposted if the following conditions are met:

1. The Service OR a State wildlife agency that is party to an agreement under Section 6 of the ESA provides written concurrence with a plan that:

- A. Estimates the number of pairs likely to nest on the site based on the past monitoring and regional population trends.

AND

B. Delineates the habitat that will be posted or fenced prior to April 1 to assure a high probability that territorial plovers will select protected areas in which to court and nest. Sites where nesting or courting plovers were observed during the last three seasons as well as other habitat deemed most likely to be pioneered by plovers should be included in the posted and/or fenced area.

AND

C. Provides for monitoring of piping plovers on the beach by a qualified biologist(s). Generally, the frequency of monitoring should be not less than twice per week prior to May 1 and not less than three times per week thereafter. Monitoring should occur daily whenever moderate to large numbers of vehicles are on the beach. Monitors should document locations of territorial or courting plovers, nest locations, and observations of any reactions of incubating birds to pedestrian or vehicular disturbance.

AND

2. All unposted sites are posted immediately upon detection of territorial plovers.

Protection of Chicks

Sections of beaches where unfledged piping plover chicks are present should be temporarily closed to all vehicles not deemed essential. (See the provisions for essential vehicles below.) Areas where vehicles are prohibited should include all dune, beach, and intertidal habitat within the chicks' foraging range, to be determined by either of the following methods:

1. The vehicle free area should extend 1000 meters on each side of a line drawn through the nest site and perpendicular to the long axis of the beach. The resulting 2000 meter-wide area of protected habitat for plover chicks should extend from the ocean-side low water line to the bay-side low water line or to the farthest extent of dune habitat if no bay-side intertidal habitat exists. However, vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to plover chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, or other naturally-occurring obstacles.

OR

2. The Service OR a State wildlife agency that is party to an agreement under Section 6 of the ESA provides written concurrence with a plan that:

A. Provides for monitoring of all broods during the chick-rearing phase of the breeding season and specifies the frequency of monitoring.

AND

B. Specifies the minimum size of vehicle-free areas to be established in the vicinity of unfledged broods based on the mobility of broods observed on the site in past years and on the frequency of monitoring. Unless substantial data from past years show that broods on a site stay very close to their nest locations, vehicle-free areas should extend at least 200 meters on each side of the nest site during the first week following hatching. The size and location of the protected area should be adjusted in response to the observed mobility of the brood, but in no case should it be reduced to less than 100 meters on each side of the brood. In some cases, highly mobile broods may require protected areas up to 1000 meters, even where they are intensively monitored. Protected areas should extend from the ocean-side low water line to the bay-side low water line or to the farthest extent of dune habitat if no bay-side intertidal habitat exists. However, vehicles may be allowed to pass through portions of the protected area that are considered inaccessible to plover chicks because of steep topography, dense vegetation, or other naturally-occurring obstacles. In a few cases, where several years of data documents that piping plovers on a particular site feed in only certain habitat types, the Service or the State wildlife management agency may provide written concurrence that vehicles pose no danger to plovers in other specified habitats on that site.

Timing of Vehicle Restrictions in Chick Habitat

Restrictions on use of vehicles in areas where unfledged plover chicks are present should begin on or before the date that hatching begins and continue until chicks have fledged. For purposes of vehicle management, plover chicks are considered fledged at 35 days of age or when observed in sustained flight for at least 15 meters, whichever occurs first.

When piping plover nests are found before the last egg is laid, restrictions on vehicles should begin on the 26th day after the last egg is laid. This assumes an average incubation period of 27 days, and provides a 1 day margin of error.

When plover nests are found after the last egg has been laid, making it impossible to predict hatch date, restrictions on vehicles should begin on a date determined by one of the following scenarios:

- 1) With intensive monitoring: If the nest is monitored at least twice per day, at dawn and dusk (before 0600 hrs and after 1900 hrs) by a qualified biologist, vehicle use may continue until hatching begins. Nests should be monitored at dawn and dusk to minimize the time that hatching may go undetected if it occurs after dark. Whenever possible, nests should be monitored from a distance with spotting scope or binoculars to minimize disturbance to incubating plovers.

OR

2) Without intensive monitoring: Restrictions should begin on May 15 (the earliest probable hatch date). If the nest is discovered after May 15, then restrictions should start immediately.

If hatching occurs earlier than expected, or chicks are discovered from an unreported nest, restrictions on vehicles should begin immediately.

If ruts are present that are deep enough to restrict movements of plover chicks, then restrictions on vehicles should begin at least 5 days prior to the anticipated hatching date of plover nests. If a plover nest is found with a complete clutch, precluding estimation of hatching date, and deep ruts have been created that could reasonably be expected to impede chick movements, then restrictions on vehicles should begin immediately.

Essential Vehicles

Because it is impossible to completely eliminate the possibility that a vehicle will accidentally crush an unfledged plover chicks, use of vehicles in the vicinity of broods should be avoided whenever possible. However, the Service recognizes that life-threatening situations on the beach may require emergency vehicle response. Furthermore, some "essential vehicles" may be required to provide for safety of pedestrian recreationists, law enforcement, maintenance of public property, or access to private dwellings not otherwise accessible. On large beaches, maintaining the frequency of plover monitoring required to minimize the size and duration of vehicle closures may necessitate the use of vehicles by plover monitors.

Essential vehicles should only travel on sections of beaches where unfledged plover chicks are present if such travel is absolutely necessary and no other reasonable travel routes are available. All steps should be taken to minimize number of trips by essential vehicles through chick habitat areas. Homeowners should consider other means of access, eg. by foot, water, or shuttle services, during periods when chicks are present.

The following procedures should be followed to minimize the probability that chicks will be crushed by essential (non-emergency) vehicles:

1. Essential vehicles should travel through chick habitat areas only during daylight hours, and should be guided by a qualified monitor who has first determined the location of all unfledged plover chicks.
2. Speed of vehicles should not exceed five miles per hour.
3. Use of open 4-wheel motorized all-terrain vehicles (ATVs) or non-motorized all-terrain bicycles is recommended whenever possible for monitoring and law enforcement

because of the improved visibility afforded operators.

4. A log should be maintained by the beach manager of the date, time, vehicle number and operator, and purpose of each trip through areas where unfledged chicks are present. Personnel monitoring plovers should maintain and regularly update a log of the numbers and locations of unfledged plover chicks on each beach. Drivers of essential vehicles should review the log each day to determine the most recent number and location of unfledged chicks.

Essential vehicles should avoid driving on the wrack line, and travel should be infrequent enough to avoid creating deep ruts that could impede chick movements. If essential vehicles are creating ruts that could impede chick movements, use of essential vehicles should be further reduced and, if necessary, restricted to emergency vehicles only.

SITE-SPECIFIC MANAGEMENT GUIDANCE

The guidelines provided in this document are based on an extensive review of the scientific literature and are intended to cover the vast majority of situations likely to be encountered on piping plover nesting sites along the U.S. Atlantic Coast. However, the Service recognizes that site-specific conditions may lead to anomalous situations in which departures from this guidance may be safely implemented. The Service recommends that landowners who believe such situations exist on their lands contact either the Service or the State wildlife agency and, if appropriate, arrange for an on-site review. Written documentation of agreements regarding departures from this guidance is recommended.

In some unusual circumstances, Service or State biologists may recognize situations where this guidance provides insufficient protection for piping plovers or their nests. In such a case, the Service or the State wildlife agency may provide written notice to the landowner describing additional measures recommended to prevent take of piping plovers on that site.

IV. LITERATURE CITED

- Assateague Island National Seashore. 1993. Piping Plover Management Plan. Assateague Island National Seashore, Berlin, Maryland. 24 pp.
- Bent, A.C. 1929. Life histories of North American shorebirds. Part 2. U.S. National Museum Bulletin No. 146. 412 pp.
- Bergstrom, P.W. 1991. Incubation temperatures of Wilson's plovers and killdeers. *Condor*. 91: 634-641.
- Burger, J. 1987a. Physical and social determinants of nest site selection in piping plover in New Jersey. *Condor*. 98: 811-818.
- Burger, J. 1987b. New Jersey Endangered Beach-Nesting Bird Project: 1986 Research. Unpublished report. New Jersey Department of Environmental Protection, New Jersey. 37 pp.
- Burger, J. 1991. Foraging behavior and the effect of human disturbance on the piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*). *Journal of Coastal Research*, 7(1), 39-52.
- Burger, J. 1993. Shorebird squeeze. *Natural History*. May 1993: 8-14.
- Cairns, W.E. 1977. Breeding biology of Piping Plovers in southern Nova Scotia. M.S. Thesis. Dalhousie University, Halifax, Nova Scotia. 115 pp.
- Cairns, W.E. and I.A. McLaren. 1980. Status of the piping plover on the east coast of North America. *American Birds*. 34: 206-208.
- Cairns, W.E. 1982. Biology and behavior of breeding Piping Plovers. *Wilson Bulletin*. 94: 531-545.
- Cape Cod National Seashore. 1993. Piping plover nest found trampled by pedestrian. News Release. Cape Cod National Seashore, South Wellfleet, Massachusetts. 2 pp.
- Collazo, J.A., J.R. Walters, and J.F. Parnell. 1994. Factors Affecting Reproduction and Migration of Waterbirds on North Carolina Barrier Islands. 1993 Annual Progress Report. North Carolina State University, Raleigh, North Carolina. 57 pp.
- Coutu, S., J. Fraser, J. McConnaughey and J. Loegering. 1990. Piping Plover distribution and reproductive success on Cape Hatteras National Seashore. Unpublished report. Cape Hatteras National Seashore, Manteo, North Carolina. 67 pp.

- Cross, R.R. 1989. Monitoring, management and research of the piping plover at Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge. Unpublished report. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. 80 pp.
- Cross, R.R. 1990. Monitoring, management and research of the piping plover at Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge. Unpublished report. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. 68 pp.
- Cross, R.R. and K. Terwilliger. 1993. Piping plover flushing distances recorded in annual surveys in Virginia 1986-1991. Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries. 5 pp.
- Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. 1990. Delaware Piping Plover Management Plan. Delaware Department of Natural Resources and Environmental Control. 5 pp.
- Eddings, K.S., C.R. Griffin, and S.M. Melvin. 1990. Productivity, activity patterns, limiting factors, and management of piping plovers at Sandy Hook, Gateway National Recreation Area, New Jersey. Unpublished report. Department of Forestry and Wildlife Management, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 79 pp.
- Flemming, S.P., R. D. Chiasson, and P.J. Austin-Smith. 1990. Piping Plover nest-site selection in New Brunswick and Nova Scotia. Unpublished document. Dept. of Biology, Queen's University, Kingston, Canada. 31 pp.
- Gibbs, J.P. 1986. Feeding ecology of nesting piping plovers in Maine. Unpublished report to Maine Chapter, The Nature Conservancy. Topsham, Maine. 21 pp.
- Goldin M., C. Griffin and S. Melvin. 1990. Reproductive and foraging ecology, human disturbance, and management of Piping Plovers at Breezy Point, Gateway National Recreation Area, New York, 1989. Progress report. 58 pp.
- Goldin, M.R. 1990. Reproductive ecology and management of piping plovers (Charadrius melodus) at Breezy Point, Gateway National Recreation Area, New York -- 1990. Unpublished report. Gateway National Recreation Area, Long Island, New York. 16 pp.
- Goldin, M.R. 1993. Effects of human disturbance and off-road vehicles on piping plover reproductive success and behavior at Breezy Point, Gateway National Recreation Area, New York. M.S. Thesis. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts. 128 pp.
- Goldin, M.R. 1994. Breeding history of, and recommended monitoring & management practices for piping plovers (Charadrius melodus) at Goosewing Beach, Little Compton, Rhode Island (with discussion of Briggs Beach). Report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife

- Service, Hadley, Massachusetts. 36 pp.
- Hake, M. 1993. 1993 summary of piping plover management program at Gateway NWRA Breezy Point district. Unpublished report. Gateway National Recreation Area, Long Island, New York. 29 pp.
- Hill, J.O. 1988. Aspects of breeding biology of Piping Plovers *Charadrius melodus* in Bristol County, Massachusetts, in 1988. Unpublished report. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts. 44 pp.
- Hoopes, E.M., C.R. Griffin, and S.M. Melvin. 1992. Relationships between human recreation and Piping Plover foraging ecology and chick survival. Unpublished report. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts. 77 pp.
- Hoopes, E.M. 1993. Relationships between human recreation and piping plover foraging ecology and chick survival. M.S. Thesis. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts. 106 pp.
- Howard, J.M., R.J. Safran, and S.M. Melvin. 1993. Biology and conservation of piping plovers at Breezy Point, New York. Unpublished report. Department of Forestry and Wildlife Management, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 34 pp.
- Loefering, J.P. 1992. Piping Plover breeding biology, foraging ecology and behavior on Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland. M.S. Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. 247 pp.
- MacIvor, L.H. 1990. Population dynamics, breeding ecology, and management of Piping Plovers on Outer Cape Cod, Massachusetts. M.S. Thesis. University of Massachusetts, Amherst, Massachusetts. 100 pp.
- McConnaughey, J.L., J.D. Fraser, S.D. Coutu, and J.P. Loefering. 1990. Piping plover distribution and reproductive success on Cape Lookout National Seashore. Unpublished report. Cape Lookout National Seashore, Morehead City, North Carolina. 83 pp.
- Melvin, S.M., L.H. MacIvor, and C.R. Griffin. 1992. Predator exclosures: a technique to reduce predation of piping plover nests. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. 20: 143-148.
- Melvin, S.M., C.R. Griffin and A. Hecht. 1994. Mortality of piping plover chicks caused by off-road vehicles on Atlantic coast beaches. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*, in press.
- Nicholls, J.L. 1989. Distribution and other ecological aspects of Piping Plovers (*Charadrius melodus*) wintering along the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts. M.S. Thesis. Auburn University, Auburn, Alabama. 150 pp.
- Northeast Nongame Technical Committee. 1993. Legal categories of rare species in the

- northeastern states. Northeast Nongame Technical Committee, Northeast Association of Fish and Wildlife Agencies. 22 pp.
- Patterson, M.E. 1988. Piping plover breeding biology and reproductive success on Assateague Island. M.S. Thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg, Virginia. 131 pp.
- Patterson, M.E., J.D. Fraser, and J.W. Roggenbuck. 1991. Factors affecting piping plover productivity on Assateague Island. *Journal of Wildlife Management*. 55(3): 525-531.
- Rimmer, D.W., and R.D. Deblinger. 1990. Use of predator exclosures to protect piping plover nests. *Journal of Field Ornithology*. 61: 217-223.
- Shaffer, F. and P. Laporte. 1992. Rapport synthese des recherches relatives au pluvier siffleur (*Charadrius melodus*) effectuees aux Iles-de-la-Madeleine de 1987 a 1991. Association quebecoise des groupes d'ornithologues et Service canadien de la faune. 78 pp.
- Strauss, E. 1990. Reproductive success, life history patterns, and behavioral variation in a population of Piping Plovers subjected to human disturbance (1982-1989). Ph.D. dissertation. Tufts University, Medford, Massachusetts.
- Tull, C.E. 1984. A study of nesting piping plovers of Kouchibouguac National Park 1983. Unpublished report. Parks Canada, Kouchibouguac National Park, Kouchibouguac, New Brunswick. 85 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1985. Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants; Determination of Endangered and Threatened Status for the Piping Plover; Final Rule. *Federal Register* 50 (238): 50726-50734.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1993. 1993 Status Update; U.S. Atlantic Coast Piping Plover. Unpublished report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sudbury, Massachusetts. 7 pp.
- Welty, J.C. 1982. *The life of birds*. Saunders College Publishing, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 754 pp.
- Wilcox, L. 1959. A twenty year banding study of the piping plover. *Auk*. 76:129-152.