


Draft Recovery Plan for the Great Lakes Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*)



PIPING PLOVER

Charadrius melodus

Great Lakes Population

AGENCY DRAFT RECOVERY PLAN

July 2002

Region 3
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Fort Snelling, Minnesota

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Current Status: The Great Lakes population of piping plovers was listed as endangered under provisions of the U.S. Endangered Species Act on January 10, 1986. Critical habitat was designated on May 7, 2001. The population had declined from a historic size of several hundred breeding pairs to 17 at the time of listing. From 1986-2000, the population fluctuated between 12 and 32 breeding pairs, with breeding areas remaining largely confined to Michigan. The restricted breeding range of this population creates a gap in the distribution of piping plovers across North America, with the Great Lakes population isolated from the two other breeding populations (Atlantic and Northern Great Plains). The current size of the Great Lakes population makes it extremely vulnerable to chance demographic and environmental events that could extirpate the species from the Great Lakes region.

Habitat Requirements and Limiting Factors: In the Great Lakes region, piping plovers breed and raise young mainly on sparsely vegetated beaches, cobble pans, and sand spits of glacially-formed sand dune ecosystems along the Great Lakes shoreline. Wintering grounds range from North Carolina to Florida and along the Florida Gulf Coast to Texas, Mexico, and the Caribbean Islands. On the wintering grounds, piping plovers forage and roost along barrier and mainland beaches, sand, mud, and algal flats, washover passes, salt marshes, and coastal lagoons. Threats to populations and habitat are similar on the breeding and wintering ranges. Habitat destruction and degradation are pervasive and have reduced physically suitable habitat. Human disturbance and predators further reduce breeding and wintering habitat quality and affect survival. Contaminants, as well as genetic and geographic consequences of small population size, pose additional threats to piping plover survival and reproduction.

Recovery Objective: To restore a viable population (greater than a 95% chance of persisting 100 years) to the Great Lakes region and remove the Great Lakes population from the list of Threatened and Endangered Species by 2020.

Recovery Strategy: To provide mechanisms to increase the population and preserve habitat essential for long-term survival.

Recovery Criteria:

Reclassification from endangered to threatened when:

1. the population has increased to at least 150 pairs with at least 100 breeding pairs in Michigan and 50 breeding pairs distributed among sites in other Great Lakes states,
2. five-year average fecundity has increased to 2.0 fledglings per pair, per year, across the breeding distribution,
3. essential breeding habitat in the Great Lakes and wintering habitat is protected, and
4. genetic diversity within the population is deemed adequate for population persistence and can be maintained over the long-term.

Delisting when the above criteria are met, plus:

5. agreements and funding mechanisms are in place for long-term protection and management activities in essential breeding and wintering habitat.

Actions Needed:

1. Protect the Great Lakes piping plover breeding population and manage breeding habitat to maximize survival and fecundity,
2. Protect wintering piping plovers and manage habitat to promote survival and recruitment,
3. Identify and protect migration habitat,
4. Conduct scientific research to facilitate recovery efforts,
5. Develop and implement public education and outreach,
6. Develop partnerships and additional funding mechanisms,
7. Develop emergency methods to prevent extirpation, and
8. Review progress toward recovery and revise recovery tasks as appropriate.

Estimated cost of recovery for FY 2002-2004 (in \$1000s): Details are found in the Implementation Schedule.

Fiscal Year	Action 1	Action 2	Action 3	Action 4	Action 5	Action 6	Action 7	Action 8	TOTAL
2002	370	142	15	173	27	6	25	3	761
2003	327	142	10	168	1	6	20	3	677
2004	327	142	10	80	22	6	20	3	610
TOTAL	1024	426	35	421	50	18	65	9	2048

Date of Recovery: Contingent on various factors and vigorous implementation of recovery actions, full recovery of this species could occur in 2020.

DISCLAIMER

Recovery plans delineate reasonable actions which are believed to be required to recover and/or protect listed species. Plans published by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) are sometimes prepared with the assistance of recovery teams, contractors, state agencies, and other affected and interested parties. Recovery teams serve as independent advisors to the USFWS. Plans are reviewed by the public and submitted for additional peer review before they are adopted by the USFWS. Draft plan objectives and funds are subject to budgetary and other constraints affecting the parties involved, as well as the need to address other priorities. Recovery plans do not obligate other parties to undertake specific tasks and may not represent the views nor the official positions or approval of any individuals or agencies involved in the plan formulation, other than the USFWS. They represent the official position of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service **only** after they have been signed by the Regional Director as **approved**. Approved recovery plans are subject to modification as dictated by new findings, changes in species status, and the completion of recovery tasks.

By approving this document, the Regional Director certifies that data used in its development represents the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of writing. Copies of all documents reviewed in development of the plan are available in the administrative record, located at the East Lansing Field Office, Michigan.

Literature Citation:

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2002. Piping Plover (*Charadrius melodus*), Great Lakes Population, Agency Draft Recovery Plan. Ft. Snelling, Minnesota. viii + 121 pp.

Additional copies of this draft plan can be obtained from:

Fish and Wildlife Reference Service
5430 Grosvenor Lane, Suite 110
Bethesda, Maryland 20184-2158
(800)582-3421 or (301)492-6403
<http://fa.r9.fws.gov/r9fwrs/>

TTY users may contact the Fish and Wildlife Reference Service through the Federal Relay Service at (800)877-8339

Document costs vary depending on number of pages.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Sincere thanks are owed to the following individuals whose contributions greatly increased the scope of this document and aided the preparation process. Rachel Miller, Mark Hodgkins, Jack Dingleline, and Carrie Tansy, USFWS, East Lansing, Michigan Field Office, provided guidance and leadership during the revision process, prepared the regulatory sections of the plan, and reviewed and edited a number of drafts. Uygur Özesmi helped formulate the habitat-based population model that aided assessment of recovery goals and spent countless hours building models and running simulations. Curt Zonick and Katherine and Kiel Drake provided unpublished manuscripts and insightful comments on sections dealing with wintering issues. Parts of the Natural History Section were provided by Nell McPhillips, USFWS Region 6, Pierre, South Dakota Field Office. Dave Best, USFWS East Lansing, Michigan Field Office, furnished unpublished data and interpretation of contaminants in Great Lakes piping plover tissue and prey. Casey Kruse and Robyn Niver generously provided unpublished information on captive-rearing efforts in the Great Plains. The current group that coordinates piping plover management efforts in the Great Lakes acted as an advisory team and commented on a preliminary draft of the plan. The piping plover cover illustration was provided by Julie Zickefoose. Sally Hopp provided additional edits and word processing. Finally, a large group of agency personnel and private citizens contributed to this effort by reporting sightings of banded piping plovers, answering inquiries about threats and conservation issues, providing field assistance or data, and supporting piping plover conservation and research efforts throughout the range.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page</u>
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	ii
DISCLAIMER	iv
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS	v
TABLE OF CONTENTS	vi
I. INTRODUCTION	1
A. Ecosystem Implications of Piping Plover Protection	1
B. Description and Taxonomy	3
C. Life History and Ecology	5
1. Breeding Chronology and Behavior	5
2. Foraging and Diet	6
3. Breeding Distribution, Population Trends, and Reproductive Success	7
4. Survival, Site Fidelity, and Dispersal	11
5. Nest Site Selection	12
6. Breeding Habitat Availability	13
7. Migration	16
8. Winter Distribution and Ecology	17
9. Population Viability	19
D. Reasons for Listing and Existing Threats	20
1. Habitat Destruction and Modification	21
2. Predation and Disease	21
3. Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms	22
4. Other Natural or Man-made Factors	22
E. Conservation Measures	25
1. Regulatory Protection	25
2. Field-based Conservation Efforts	36
3. Public Education	38
4. Involvement of Zoos in Recovery Efforts	39
5. Research	40
F. Strategy of Recovery	40
II. RECOVERY	41
A. Objective and Criteria	41
B. Stepdown Recovery Action Outline	45
C. Narrative for Recovery Actions	51
1. Protect the Great Lakes piping plover breeding population and manage habitat to maximize survival and fecundity.	51

2.	Protect wintering piping plovers and manage habitat to promote survival and recruitment.	60
3.	Identify and protect migration habitat.	63
4.	Conduct scientific research to facilitate recovery efforts.	64
5.	Develop and implement public education and outreach.	68
6.	Develop partnerships and additional funding mechanisms.	70
7.	Develop emergency methods to prevent extirpation	70
8.	Review progress toward recovery and revise recovery tasks as appropriate.	75
D.	Literature Cited	76
E.	Additional References	87
III.	IMPLEMENTATION	88
A.	Key to Priority Descriptions	88
B.	Key to Agency Designations	88
C.	Implementation Schedule	90
IV.	APPENDICES	101
	Appendix A. Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan . . .	102
	Appendix B. Federal and state laws applicable to the protection of piping plover . . .	111
	Appendix C. An assessment of banding impacts for the Great Lakes population . . .	113
	Appendix D. Guidelines for predator exclosure use to protect piping plover nests . . .	114
	Appendix E. Guidelines for determining egg abandonment and protocol for salvage	116
	Appendix F. Federal and state contacts in the breeding and wintering range	119

LIST OF FIGURES

Figure 1. Piping plover breeding and wintering distribution	2
Figure 2. Piping plover adult and chick	4
Figure 3. Piping plover historical breeding sites in the Great Lakes	8
Figure 4. Piping plover breeding sites in the Great Lakes	9
Figure 5. Breeding pair estimates for the Great Lakes piping plover	10
Figure 6. Reproductive success estimates for the Great Lakes piping plover	10
Figure 7. Wintering sites and previous breeding sites of piping plovers banded in Michigan	18
Figure 8. Piping plover critical habitat units in Michigan	28
Figure 9a-f. Critical habitat units in the Great Lakes, outside of Michigan	30

LIST OF TABLES

Table 1. Survival rates of piping plovers	12
Table 2. Critical habitat designations for the breeding population of the Great Lakes piping plover in Michigan	27
Table 3. Critical habitat designations for the breeding population of the Great Lakes piping plover outside of Michigan	29
Table 4. State listing status and legal protection of the piping plover in states within the breeding and wintering ranges of the Great Lakes population	35
Table 5. Essential breeding habitat in the Great Lakes outside Michigan	43
Table 6. Winter locations of piping plovers known to have nested or hatched in the Great Lakes region	45

I. INTRODUCTION

The piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) was listed on January 10, 1986, under provisions of the U.S. Endangered Species Act (ESA) of 1973, as amended (USFWS 1985). Piping plovers breed only in North America in three geographic regions: beaches of the Atlantic Coast, shorelines of the Great Lakes, and along alkali wetlands and major rivers of the Northern Great Plains (Figure 1). Though declining, the Northern Great Plains breeding population is the largest, numbering 3,284 adults during a 1996 census (Plissner and Haig 2000a). In 1996, the Atlantic Coast population consisted of 2,581 adults, a 31% increase from 1991. The Great Lakes population remains extremely imperiled. Only 48 adults were recorded during the 1996 census, and the range had not expanded to narrow the current gap among the three breeding populations that potentially inhibits inter-regional gene flow (Haig and Oring 1985; Plissner and Haig 2000a). The three breeding populations are recognized and treated separately in the Final Rule (USFWS 1985) listing the piping plover across its range: the American Atlantic and Northern Great Plains populations are classified as threatened and the Great Lakes population as endangered. Piping plovers on migration and in wintering areas are considered threatened under the ESA. On May 7, 2001 critical habitat was designated for the Great Lakes breeding population (USFWS 2001). The Great Lakes piping plover population has been assigned a 5C (high degree of threat and low recovery potential) recovery priority (USFWS 2001).

In 1986, recovery teams were appointed to develop recovery plans for the Atlantic Coast breeding population and the Great Lakes and Northern Great Plains breeding populations. These teams worked together with the two Canadian recovery teams to make progress on recovery tasks outlined in the original plans (USFWS 1988a, 1988b; Canadian Wildlife Service 1993). This revised recovery plan reviews progress toward recovery of the endangered Great Lakes population and outlines a strategy to achieve its full recovery.

A. Ecosystem Implications of Piping Plover Protection

The Great Lakes basin was identified as a refuge for a diversity of globally rare species and ecosystems (TNC 1994). Of the globally significant biodiversity elements that occur entirely or largely within the Great Lakes basin, nearly 30% are associated within coastal shore systems. Unique natural communities of the coastal shore region include dunes, interdunal wetlands, jack pine (*Pinus banksiana*) barrens and sand beaches. Many piping plover breeding beaches harbor rare dune features or provide habitat for other species of special status such as the federally listed Houghton's goldenrod (*Solidago houghtonii*), Pitcher's thistle (*Cirsium pitcheri*), and dwarf lake iris (*Iris lacustris*), as well as the state listed Lake Huron locust (*Trimerotropis huroniana*), among others. Adequately protecting Great Lakes piping plover breeding habitat may safeguard a significant proportion of shoreline biodiversity (Cuthbert et al. 1998).




Figure 1. Piping plover breeding and wintering distribution (from Haig 1992)

Similarly, wintering sites of the piping plover are located in delicate coastal ecosystems and provide habitat for endangered or threatened marine plants and animals, such as seabeach amaranth (*Amaranthus pumilus*) and loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*).

Habitat alterations such as marina construction, erosion control measures, and residential development affect the dynamic nature of the beach ecosystem by altering sediment patterns and hydrology, and inhibiting dune formation. These actions may degrade or destroy habitat for all the above species (USFWS 1996, 1997; Cuthbert et al. 1998). Off-road vehicles (ORVs) and high levels of foot traffic may erode dunes and result in direct mortality by trampling (Bowles et al. 1990; USFWS 1997). Other rare or sensitive species often benefit from piping plover protection efforts, at least for limited time periods while plovers are present. However, some piping plover management activities, such as re-routing of foot traffic around piping plover nest sites (and sometimes over sensitive dunes) or habitat enhancement through vegetation removal, may be detrimental to these species if these activities are not considered adequately during management planning. Given the imperiled nature of beach ecosystems, both within the Great Lakes region and along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts, an ecosystem approach to conservation will benefit both piping plovers and other inhabitants of coastal ecosystems.

B. Description and Taxonomy

The piping plover (Figure 2), named for its melodic call, is a small North American shorebird approximately 17 cm (6.7 in) in length (Palmer 1967) that weighs 40-65 g (1.4-2.3 oz) and has a wing span measuring about 38 cm (15 in) (Haig 1992). Light sand-colored upper plumage and white undersides blend in well with the piping plover's principal beach habitats. During the breeding season, the legs and bill are bright orange and the bill has a black tip. Other distinctive markings include a single black band across the upper breast and a smaller black band across the forehead. In adult females, the breast band is often thin or incomplete, and plumage is frequently duller than in adult males (Wilcox 1959; Haig 1992). During winter, the legs pale, the bill turns black, and darker markings are lost. Chicks have speckled gray, buff, brown, and white down. The coloration of fledged young resembles that of adults in winter. Juveniles acquire adult plumage the spring after they fledge (Prater et al. 1977).

Ornithologists have long debated the designation of two subspecies, *C. m. melodus* (Atlantic Coast) and *C. m. circumcinctus* (inland birds). Moser (1942) argued the distinction based on differences in the extent and brightness of the breast bands on inland and coastal birds, facilitating acceptance of two subspecies by the American Ornithologists' Union (AOU) (1945). Wilcox (1959) reported breast bands of variable extent in piping plovers on Long Island, New York, and did not find significant differences in morphological measurements of birds from different regions. Although




Figure 2. Piping plover adult and chick (drawing by Zickefoose)

electrophoretic analyses did not indicate genetic differences among populations in Saskatchewan, Manitoba, and New Brunswick as well as North Dakota and Minnesota (Haig and Oring 1988a), the AOU (1957, 1983, 1998) has not revised the subspecies designations.

C. Life History and Ecology

In the Great Lakes region, piping plovers breed and raise young on the shores of the Great Lakes. They migrate along an unknown flight pattern to the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of southern North America and Central America.

1. Breeding Chronology and Behavior

Piping plovers are migratory shorebirds that spend approximately 3-4 months a year on breeding grounds. In the Great Lakes region, birds begin arriving on breeding grounds in late April, and most nests are initiated by mid to late May (Pike 1985). Courtship behavior includes aerial displays, digging of several nest scrapes, and a ritualized stone-tossing display (Cairns 1977, 1982; Haig 1992). Finished nest cups are shallow depressions approximately 6 cm (2.3 in) in diameter and 2 cm (0.8 in) deep, usually lined with light-colored pebbles and shell fragments less than 1 cm (0.4 in) in diameter (Pike 1985; Perles 1995). Nest territories are actively defended by both adults. Females lay an egg approximately every other day; clutches are complete at three or four eggs. Both sexes share incubation duties that last 25-31 days (Wilcox 1959; Cairns 1977; Prindiville 1986; Wiens 1986; Haig and Oring 1988b). Adults may re-nest up to four times if nests are destroyed (USFWS 1988b), but in the Great Lakes region, they usually re-nest only once per breeding season (Wemmer 2000).

At Great Lakes nesting sites, eggs hatch from late May to late July (Lambert and Ratcliff 1981; Pike 1985). Precocial chicks usually hatch within one half to one day of each other and are able to feed themselves within a few hours. Brooding responsibilities are shared by both sexes, although females may desert broods as soon as 1-2 weeks after eggs hatch (Haig 1992; Sharyn Howard, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, pers. comm., 1996). Adults and chicks rely on their cryptic coloration to avoid predators. Adults also use distraction displays (feigning injury, false brooding) to lure intruders away from their territories (Cairns 1977; Pike 1985). In Michigan, chicks fledge approximately 21-30 days after hatching (Wemmer 2000). Although piping plovers typically rear one brood per year, they have produced two broods at some Atlantic Coast sites (Bottitta 1997). Breeding adults depart nesting grounds in the Great Lakes as early as mid-July, but the majority depart by mid-August (Wemmer 2000). Juveniles usually depart a few weeks later than adults, and most disperse by late August.

2. Foraging and Diet

Piping plovers feed primarily on exposed beach substrates by pecking for invertebrates one centimeter (0.4 in) or less below the surface (Cairns 1977; Whyte 1985). Diet generally consists of invertebrates, including insects, marine worms, crustaceans, and mollusks (Haig 1992). The endangered and threatened status of piping plover populations precludes collection of birds for gizzard/stomach content analyses. Opportunistic salvage of dead piping plovers and fecal analysis have provided information on diet preferences. Bent (1929) reported the eggs and larvae of flies (Diptera) and beetles (Coleoptera), as well as crustaceans (Crustacea), mollusks (Mollusca), and other small marine animals in the stomachs of four piping plovers from Alabama. Fecal analysis revealed that piping plovers in a marine environment prey predominantly on rove beetles (Staphylinidae), snout beetles (Curculionidae), and flies (Shaffer and Laporte 1994). Cuthbert et al. (1999) identified freshwater prey in gizzards of four dead piping plovers salvaged from a breeding area in Grand Marais, Michigan. These chicks consumed insects from 16 different families and 6 orders; the most common orders were wasps and bees (Hymenoptera), beetles, and flies.

Most foraging is diurnal, but piping plovers in New Jersey have been observed feeding at night with reduced intensity during the breeding season (Staine and Burger 1994). The time adults devote to foraging may increase during the incubation period and after chicks fledge; adults incubating or caring for chicks may spend less time foraging than birds that have lost their broods (Burger 1991). Time spent foraging by piping plovers wintering in Alabama dominated diurnal activities during all months from September through April and was highest in December (Johnson and Baldassarre 1988).

Piping plovers utilize numerous areas within breeding and wintering habitats for foraging, including wet sand in the wash zone, intertidal ocean beach, wrack lines, washover passes, mud, sand and algal flats, and shorelines of streams, ephemeral ponds, lagoons, and salt marshes (Powell 1991; Hoopes et al. 1992; Loegering 1992; Zonick et al. 1998). Areas used by piping plovers for foraging depend on availability of habitat types, prey abundance, stage of breeding cycle, and human disturbance (Cross 1990; Burger 1991; Loegering and Fraser 1995; Zonick et al. 1998). Several studies on the Atlantic Coast indicate that foraging habitat and food resources ultimately affect piping plover survival. In Maryland, chick survival was related to brood access to quality foraging habitats (Loegering and Fraser 1995). Goldin and Regosin (1998) found that chicks foraging in Rhode Island mudflats were more likely to survive than chicks foraging in other habitats. In New York, chicks preferred ephemeral pools, where arthropod abundance was greater than in other foraging habitats. Chick survival was also higher in areas containing ephemeral pools (Elias et al. 2000).

3. Breeding Distribution, Population Trends, and Reproductive Success

Piping plovers once nested on Great Lakes beaches in Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, Wisconsin, and Ontario, Canada (Figure 3). Russell (1983) reviewed historic records and estimated pre-settlement populations based on these accounts and his knowledge of historically suitable habitat. Russell's estimates may be high for some Great Lakes states (S. Matteson, biologist, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison, pers. comm., 1988), but no other historic estimates are available for the Great Lakes population. Russell estimated a total population of 492-682 breeding pairs in the Great Lakes region in the late 1800s. Michigan may have had 215 pairs or more; Ontario and Illinois likely supported the next largest populations (152-162 and 125-130, respectively). Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin were estimated to have 100 or fewer breeding pairs each, and Minnesota, New York, and Pennsylvania fewer than 30.

Piping plovers were extirpated from Great Lakes beaches in Illinois, Indiana, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Ontario by the late 1970s (Russell 1983), coincident with major industrial development and urbanization of the southern lakeshores. Few piping plovers nested in Wisconsin after the 1970s, and no nests were found in the state between 1983 and 1997 (S. Matteson, pers. comm., 1998). Similarly, the small number of pairs that nested in Duluth Harbor, Minnesota had abandoned the area by 1986 (B. Eliason, biologist, Minnesota Department of Natural Resources, pers. comm., 1999). In 1977, the Great Lakes population was estimated at 31 nesting pairs (Lambert and Ratcliff 1979) but declined to approximately 17 pairs by 1985 (USFWS 1985). When the piping plover was listed as endangered in 1986, the Great Lakes population nested exclusively at a few sites on the northeastern shore of Lake Michigan and southeastern shore of Lake Superior in Michigan, the state with the most habitat remaining.

Between 1986 and 2000, nests were recorded at 32 breeding sites in 10 counties in Michigan and one county in Wisconsin (Figure 4). A breeding site represents a contiguous area of shoreline habitat supporting a nesting location or collection of locations or "nest sites." During different stages of the breeding season, piping plovers use different zones of breeding areas for foraging, nesting, brood rearing, and pre-migratory flocking. In the Great Lakes region, breeding sites are located on bay beaches, sand spits or islands; sites are either discrete areas bounded by geomorphological or artificial features or areas located within continuous habitat.

The Great Lakes piping plover population has ranged from 12 to 32 breeding pairs, but has not increased significantly since listing as endangered (Figure 5). Reproductive success has also fluctuated among years (Figure 6) and may be negatively correlated with increases in lake levels (Wemmer 2000). In recent years, the Great Lakes population has gradually increased and expanded to the south and west; one quarter and one third of all breeding pairs nested in the Sleeping Bear Dunes area (Leelanau and Benzie Cos., Michigan) in 1997 and 1998, respectively (Wemmer et al. 1997; Stucker et al. 1998).




Figure 3. Piping plover historical breeding sites in the Great Lakes. Solid circles indicate nest records; open circles indicate sighting record. Locations for Michigan sites based on Cottrille (1957) and Lambert and Ratcliff (1979); sites in other states based on information in Russell (1983). Locations of some sites are not exact.



Figure 4. Piping plover breeding sites in the Great Lakes, 1986-2000




Figure 5. Breeding pair estimates for the Great Lakes piping plover, 1984-2000




Figure 6. Reproductive success estimates for the Great Lakes piping plover, 1984-2000

Additionally, pairs nested at Chequamegon Point-Long Island, Ashland County, Wisconsin in 1998 and 1999 (Matteson and Manthey 1998; Stucker and Cuthbert 1999).

4. Survival, Site Fidelity, and Dispersal

Prior to the 1990s, information on survival, fidelity to breeding areas, and dispersal was extremely limited for the Great Lakes population (Pike 1985). Recent data from piping plovers banded in Michigan suggest approximately a 70% adult survival rate, a similar level to that reported for other populations (Wemmer and Cuthbert 1999; Wemmer 2000). Survival of fledglings to first breeding (30%) falls between rates reported for populations in the Great Plains and Atlantic Coast (Table 1). Accurately measuring survivorship is hindered by small sample sizes, color band loss, dispersal outside monitored areas, and delay of breeding by some young adults for one or more years. Nevertheless, survival estimates are important for accuracy of population viability models. These models are useful for setting recovery goals and examining the impact of alternative management strategies on population persistence.

Adult fidelity to breeding areas in other piping plover populations range from 24% to 69% (Haig and Oring 1988b). However, study areas and number of birds banded varied widely among studies summarized by Haig and Oring (1988b; 1988c). In Michigan, adults returned to beaches where they nested previously approximately 65% of the time. In Manitoba and Minnesota, site fidelity was apparently not related to sex or reproductive success (Haig and Oring 1988b; Wiens and Cuthbert 1988); however, in Michigan, site fidelity was correlated with previous reproductive success with males more faithful to breeding areas than females (Wemmer 2000). Distances between successive nests in Michigan have ranged from 0.2 - 180 km (0.1 - 111.8 mi) (Wemmer 2000). The longest distance between successive nests recorded for individuals from this population was 595 km (370 mi): an adult that nested on Long Point, Ontario (Lake Erie) was recaptured the following year breeding on Waugoshance Point, Michigan (Pike 1985). Most young return to nest at sites distant from natal areas. The longest distance recorded between a natal site and first breeding site for this population is 360 km (224 mi), the approximate flight-line distance from Grand Marais, Michigan to Long Island Chequamegon Point, Wisconsin (Wemmer 2000). Because adults use numerous beaches throughout their lifetimes and many young breeders nest distant from natal areas, preservation of historic and less frequently used areas in addition to traditional breeding sites remains important for population persistence.

Exchange of individuals among the three breeding populations has not been observed, but banding efforts are probably too limited to detect very low rates of exchange (Haig and Oring 1988c). Gene flow was probably more feasible historically when gaps between currently recognized populations were much smaller. Development of genetic markers for piping plover populations may increase the ability to detect inter-population dispersal.

Table 1. Survival rates of piping plovers

Adults*	Fledging to adult	Location	Source
0.47-0.97 (n=47)	0.11-0.35 (n=91)	Lake of the Woods, MN	Wiens 1986
0.56-0.93 (n=214)	0.138 (n=138)	North Dakota	Root et al. 1992
0.67-0.72 (n=53)	0.41 (n=29)	Assateague Island, MD	Loegering 1992
0.74 (n=103)	0.48 (n=61)	Massachusetts	MacIvor (in USFWS 1996)
0.75-0.83	0.44	Virginia	Cross (in USFWS 1996)

*Population sizes in parenthesis when available from source

5. Nest Site Selection

Piping plovers select open, sparsely vegetated sandy habitats for nesting, foraging, and rearing young throughout their breeding range. On Lake Michigan, piping plover nest sites occur on sand spits or sand beaches associated with wide, unforested systems of dunes and swales or in the flat pans located behind the primary dune (Pike 1985; Powell and Cuthbert 1992). These sand dune systems are dynamic communities formed by glacial activity 4,500 – 2,500 years ago (TNC 1994). Dominant plant species include marram grass (*Ammophila breviligulata*), bearberry (*Arctostaphylos uva-ursi*), sand cherry (*Prunus pumila*), willow (*Salix* spp.), and creeping (*Juniperus horizontalis*) and common juniper (*J. communis*). Michigan breeding areas on Lake Superior are generally simpler morphologically, consisting of a single, large dune dominated by marram grass associated with a beach more than 30 m (100 ft) wide. Nesting on both Great Lakes often occurs adjacent to rivers or ephemeral ponds (Pike 1985; Olivero 1994) that function as alternate feeding sites for chicks (Lambert and Ratcliff 1981; Wemmer, pers. obs.).

Beach width, the distance between the water's edge and dune or contrasting habitat edge when a dune is absent, has been shown to influence nest site selection on the Atlantic Coast and on inland lakes in North Dakota (Burger 1987; Prindiville Gaines and Ryan 1988). Similarly, piping plovers in Michigan construct nests in wide areas of beach (Wemmer 2000). Studies of several nest sites in Michigan report mean beach widths greater than 30 m (100 ft) (Lambert and Ratcliff 1981; Powell and Cuthbert 1992; Allan 1993), but piping plover nest sites vary widely in their physical characteristics. Wemmer (2000) and Olivero (1994) measured characteristics of the majority of nests in Michigan from 1994–1997; beach width at the nest ranged from 7–89 m (23–620 ft; n=81). Sparse, low-lying vegetation and cobble (light colored stones more than 1 cm or 0.4 in diameter) are also important to nest site selection by piping plovers because they provide cover from predators (Cairns 1977; Whyte 1985). The coloration of adult piping plovers and their eggs and chicks resembles the light coloration of sand and cobble and provides camouflage against predators. In North Dakota, Prindiville (1986) found that piping

plover territories had significantly more cobble that was more uniformly distributed than unoccupied sites. Vegetation on the beach may function as additional escape cover from predators for piping plovers and may help conceal the location of nests. Prindiville Gaines and Ryan (1988) found that vegetation was more clumped within piping plover territories than in unoccupied areas. Furthermore, territories of plovers that successfully produced young had either less vegetation or more clumped vegetation than territories of plovers with unsuccessful nests. Faanes (1983) suggested that visibility around the nest influenced nest site selection on rivers in Nebraska.

In Michigan, nests were located 35 m (115 ft) or more from a forest edge. Vegetative cover around nests ranged from 0–50%, while gravel (stones with a diameter less than 0.5 cm or 0.2 in) or cobble around the nests ranged from 0–97%. Nests of piping plovers that successfully produced young were surrounded by significantly greater amounts of cobble and were located on beaches that had a greater overall percentage of vegetation than nests of unsuccessful plovers (Wemmer 2000). Nests have also been found in the following atypical situations: 1) under a willow shrub on the primary dune, 2) 5 m (16 ft) up the steep side of a dune blowout, 3) in narrow interdunal cobble pans more than 100 m (330 ft) from the lakeshore, and 4) in an active gravel pit 0.5 km (0.3 mi) from shoreline (Wemmer et al. 1993, 1994, 1996, 1997; F. Cuthbert, pers. obs.). Despite the variability in nest location and characteristics found in Michigan, piping plovers likely select optimal nesting sites that have unsaturated habitat at the current small population size and low nesting density. During population expansion, piping plovers will likely use areas now regarded as sub-optimal or marginal habitat.

While physical characteristics of nest microhabitats are well documented for the Great Lakes population, information on size and characteristics of nesting and brood rearing territories remains scarce. Brood home range is highly variable (Shutt 1996; Fadoski 1998) as observed elsewhere; broods on the Atlantic Coast have been observed utilizing habitat greater than 1000 m (3300 ft) from nest sites (USFWS 1996). Home range size may be influenced by a number of factors including age of chicks, physical dimensions and features of the habitat, foraging opportunities, presence of other territorial piping plovers, and human disturbance (Jones 1997).

6. Breeding Habitat Availability

“Physical habitat”¹ is shoreline that meets the minimum physical characteristics of known piping plover nest sites in the Great Lakes, regardless of factors such as human

¹ Physical habitat in the Great Lakes can be characterized as beaches having 0-50% average vegetation cover and 0-45% average cobble cover with areas where cobble cover is as high as 97%. Nesting has occurred in areas with a minimum beach width of 7 m (23 ft)(Wemmer 2000), a minimum shoreline length of 0.4 km (0.25 mi) and a minimum area, including open dunes, of 1.97 ha (4.87 ac)(Olivero 1994; Wemmer 2000).

disturbance or predator levels. The total amount of physical habitat probably does not limit the Great Lakes population to its current size, but whether enough remains to support a viable population remains uncertain. The relationship between the spatial arrangement of habitat and the needs of breeding piping plovers also is unknown.

Habitat destruction and development have greatly reduced the amount of nesting habitat in all states in the Great Lakes region from which piping plovers are extirpated. Human disturbance and high predator densities compromise the quality of habitat that otherwise currently possesses physical characteristics suitable for piping plover foraging and breeding. Additionally, many physically suitable sites that are no longer occupied are distant from the current breeding area, potentially limiting opportunities for recolonization. Finally, lake level fluctuations and winter storms periodically alter the quantity and quality of habitat at individual sites throughout the region.

Small tracts of Lake Michigan shoreline in Indiana (Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, Porter Co.) and Illinois (Illinois Beach State Park, Lake Co.) have physical characteristics suitable for piping plover breeding. While the Nature Preserve at Illinois Beach State Park is closed to human use, the present high levels of recreational use at Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore may discourage re-establishment by breeding piping plovers. Transient individuals have frequented both Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore and areas near Illinois State Beach Park. Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore personnel annually close some areas of beach during the migration and early nesting period to protect migrating plovers and encourage nesting.

In New York, dune habitat that once supported piping plovers still exists along eastern Lake Ontario in New York from Salmon River to Stony Point (Oswego and Jefferson Cos.). The Nature Conservancy has curtailed ORV use along 12 km (7.5 mi) of shoreline through conservation easement or ownership (S. Bonnano, biologist, The Nature Conservancy, Pulaski, New York, pers. comm., 1999). Along Lake Erie in Pennsylvania, a historic piping plover breeding site is preserved as a Natural Area at Presque Isle State Park (Erie Co.), Pennsylvania. In addition to recreation, a gull (*Larus* spp.) colony and vegetation encroachment from beach nourishment presently threaten the quality of this site as piping plover nesting habitat (C. Copeyon, biologist, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, State College, Pennsylvania, pers. comm., 1999). Two Lake Erie beaches in Ohio, Sheldon Marsh Nature Preserve (Erie Co.) and Headlands Dunes State Nature Preserve (Lake Co.), presently have physical habitat for piping plover nesting. Predation, recreation, and beach erosion may limit the suitability of these sites. Ohio Department of Natural Resources is currently attempting to reduce these threats at Sheldon Marsh (G. Obermiller, preserve manager, Sheldon Marsh, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, and J. Windus, biologist, Ohio Department of Natural Resources, pers. comm., 1998). Transient piping plovers were recorded there in 1999.

Depending on lake levels, an additional 5-25 km (3-15 mi)(), of Lake Erie shoreline on Long Point, Ontario is physically suitable nesting habitat for a potential 15-20 breeding pairs, but efforts are needed to control very high predator activity if piping plovers attempt to nest at this site (J. McCracken, Program Manager, Bird Studies Canada, Long Point Observatory, Port Rowan, Ontario, pers. comm., 1999). However, Canada has not specified a recovery goal for the Canadian Great Lakes. A transient plover was observed on Long Point in 2000 and 2001.

Matteson and Strand (1988) provided an overview of availability of habitat in Wisconsin for nesting piping plovers. They indicated historic nesting habitat on Lake Michigan south of Kenosha (Kenosha Co.) and at Lilly Bay (Door Co.) has been compromised by urban development, high water levels, and/or recreational pressure. Point Beach State Forest (Manitowoc Co.) and Whitefish Dunes State Park (Door Co.) have suitable habitat; some areas of the beaches are wide (greater than 20 m or 66 ft) but high levels of human disturbance may discourage nesting by piping plovers unless properly managed. Harrington Beach State Park (Ozaukee Co.), Kohler-Andrea State Park (Sheboygan Co.) and Seagull Bar (Marinette Co.) are probably no longer regularly occupied by piping plovers because of narrow beaches and/or human disturbance. On Lake Superior, Long Island/Chequamegon Point (Ashland Co.), the only area in Wisconsin supporting regularly occurring nesting piping plovers since the 1970s, is currently the least disturbed habitat in the state. In 1998, approximately 4 km (2.5 mi) of wide, sand and cobble beach existed. This beach may be capable of supporting 10-20 nesting pairs (Matteson 1996), but periodic high lake levels may substantially lower the amount of available nesting substrate at this site (J. van Stappen, biologist, Apostle Islands National Lakeshore, Bayfield, Wisconsin, pers. comm., 1998). Re-establishment of breeding plovers at Wisconsin Point and Interstate Island (Douglas Co.) will likely require the control of gulls and vegetation to increase the amount of suitable nesting substrate. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources (WDNR) already manages vegetation and gulls in some areas to maintain desirable conditions for nesting terns (F. Strand, natural resource manager, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Brule, pers. comm., 1999). Adjacent areas in Duluth Harbor (St. Louis Co.), Minnesota were recently used by breeding piping plovers in the 1980s; some habitat still exists but is highly disturbed by human activity (F. Cuthbert, pers. comm., 1996).

Michigan has the largest amount of existing habitat for nesting piping plovers, though many former breeding sites are lost to or degraded by development (see Figures 2 and 3). Cottrille (1957) summarized sightings and collections made of piping plovers in Michigan through 1956. Piping plovers were documented as occurring in 24 counties. Nesting was recorded in 13 counties including Alcona, Alger, Benzie, Cheboygan, Charlevoix, Delta, Emmet, Huron, Leelanau, Macomb, Monroe, Muskegon, Schoolcraft, and Tuscola.

Multiple reports of numerous individuals or nests suggest that Muskegon State Park, Manistique Beach, Port Inland, Waugoshance Point, North Manitou Island, and Sand Point were among the major breeding areas in the state, with up to 10 individuals recorded at each site during a single visit (Cottrille 1957). By the time Lambert and Ratcliff surveyed more than 800 km (500 mi) of Michigan shoreline in 1979, former piping plover breeding sites in Alcona, Benzie, Delta, Macomb, Monroe, Muskegon, and Tuscola counties were either destroyed or abandoned. Lambert and Ratcliff (1979) documented or inferred nesting at 14 beaches in 8 counties, including 10 breeding areas not mentioned by Cottrille.

More recent surveys of Michigan shoreline (Nordstrom 1990; Powell and Cuthbert 1990, 1991, 1992; Germain and Struthers 1995) provide mostly qualitative information on suitability of beaches to breeding piping plovers; studies that quantified characteristics of breeding and/or potential habitat are scarce (Olivero 1994, Wemmer 2000). Furthermore, the quality of habitat physically suitable for nesting may be substantially reduced by factors such as human disturbance and predator activity. Wemmer (2000) used aerial videography and photography, and Geographic Information Systems (GIS) to map breeding habitat in Michigan. Total area and proportion of area suitable for nesting were quantified from GIS maps. Site suitability was also ranked based on additional data on human disturbance, accessibility, predator levels, adjacent land use, vulnerability to rising lake levels, and patterns of habitat use and reproduction by piping plovers. This research along with previous surveys has identified some of the breeding habitat essential to the survival and future recovery of the Great Lakes piping plover (see appendix A).

7. Migration

Piping plovers depart Great Lakes breeding areas from mid-July to early September (Pike 1985; Wemmer 2000). Adult females typically depart first, followed in order by unpaired males, males with fledglings, and unaccompanied young (Haig 1992). In Texas, piping plovers arrive on beaches in two pulses: mid-July to early August, and October to early November (Haig 1992). Observations of color-marked birds in Alabama indicated wintering piping plovers were least mobile from late November through late January (Johnson and Baldassarre 1988). Piping plovers begin departing the wintering grounds in mid-February, although peak migration departure occurs in March (Haig 1992). Males and females may migrate separately, although they arrive simultaneously at major breeding sites. Males may then disperse to satellite breeding areas alone or accompanied by a female (Haig 1992).

Very little is known about migration routes of piping plovers, and Haig and Plissner (1993) suggested paucity of piping plover sightings at inland shorebird stopover sites may indicate nonstop migration between the Great Lakes and the wintering grounds. However, many historic breeding sites within the Great Lakes presently function as foraging areas for migrating piping plovers. Transient individuals have been reported at a number of sites in Michigan as well as in other states. Cuthbert (unpubl. data) surveyed

Michigan Audubon reports through 1996 and found spring or fall sightings of piping plovers at 24 beaches in 20 Michigan counties. Piping plovers were recorded at beaches in Ashland, Bayfield, Brown, Dane, Dodge, Douglas, Manitowoc, Marinette, Milwaukee, Ozaukee, Racine, Vernon and Waukesha counties in Wisconsin during a check-list study conducted from 1982–1986 (Temple and Cary 1987). Brock (1986) summarized migration reports since 1959 from Indiana’s Lake Michigan Dunes, and a limited survey of birding literature for Illinois revealed migratory sightings at an inland site (Rend Lake) as late as 1992 (Robinson 1996). Further compilation of such information may reveal important resting and foraging habitat for piping plovers migrating along the Great Lakes and perhaps along inland migration routes as well.

8. Winter Distribution and Ecology

The wintering ranges of the three breeding populations of the piping plover overlap and extend from southern North Carolina to Florida on the Atlantic Coast and from the Florida Gulf Coast west to Texas and into Mexico, the West Indies and the Bahamas (Haig 1992). The amount of population mixing that occurs on the wintering grounds is not known. Piping plovers banded in Michigan have been sighted in both Atlantic and Gulf coast states, suggesting a strong eastward component to migration and dispersal throughout the wintering range by this population (Figure 7). Re-sightings of piping plovers banded in Alabama, Florida, Michigan, and Texas indicate some piping plovers exhibit inter- as well as intra-annual fidelity to wintering sites (Johnson and Baldassarre 1988; Zonick and Ryan 1994; T. Below, biologist, National Audubon Society, Naples, Florida, pers. comm., 1998; K. and K. Drake, graduate students, Department of Wildlife, Texas A & M, College Station, pers. comm., 1999; Wemmer 2000). Related or paired individuals may not necessarily winter in the same areas (Wemmer 2000).

Piping plovers likely spend more than eight months per year on the wintering grounds. At the time initial recovery plans were approved for this species little was known about wintering distribution or ecology. Since then, several studies attempted to predict winter habitat use on a broad scale. Nicholls and Baldassare (1990) recorded habitat types used by wintering piping plovers and surmised that habitat heterogeneity is a more important predictor of habitat use than specific habitat features. Building on this idea, Climo (1997) compared sites in the Gulf Coast of Florida with and without piping plovers and used significant differences in cover types from satellite imagery to generate predictive GIS models. The models, based on the Gulf Coast of Florida, were not useful for predicting suitable habitat in Texas. However, the ability to generate a GIS model to predict suitability of wintering habitat could aid conservation efforts. Only 63% of the 1991 breeding population has been accounted for on the wintering grounds, suggesting unidentified wintering habitat exists in or outside the U.S. (Haig and Plissner 1993).




Figure 7. Wintering sites and previous breeding sites of piping plovers banded in Michigan, 1993-2000

Knowledge of winter ecology of piping plovers has also greatly increased since the initial recovery plan was approved in 1988. Johnson and Baldassare (1988) found that tidal stage, weather, time of day, and season influence foraging rates of plovers wintering in coastal Alabama. They suggested that plovers used protected sand flats and mudflats predominantly for foraging and Gulf shore sand beaches primarily for roosting and preening.

Zonick (2000) investigated the winter ecology of piping plovers at 18 sites along the Texas Gulf Coast from Galveston Bay south to the Rio Grande from 1991-1994. He determined which factors (bay and beach tidal amplitudes, climatic conditions, season, time of day, habitat and ecosystem type, food resources, and human disturbance) most influenced piping plover abundance and densities. Piping plovers wintering in Texas foraged preferentially on bayshore mudflats and algal flats and used Gulf Coast beaches as secondary habitat when bayshore habitats were inundated (Zonick and Ryan 1995). Patterns of habitat use by plovers varied geographically along the Texas Gulf Coast with differences in habitat. The northern Gulf Coast of Texas progresses from an estuarine bay

system (Galveston Bay) with geographically limited areas of bayshore flats through an ecotone (Mustang Island), where bay and mainland flats are completely submerged at high tide, to a hypersaline lagoon system (Laguna Madre) where some bayshore flats are almost continually available to plovers. Zonick's (2000) research suggested plovers are exposed to greater levels of human disturbance and expend greater levels of energy at beach habitat relative to bayshore tidal flats. A multiple regression model identified beach length and beach vehicular density as the factors most strongly influencing the number of piping plovers at nine winter sites along the Texas Coast (Zonick and Ryan 1995; Zonick 2000).

During 1997 and 1998, winter movements of 49 piping plovers were monitored on South Padre Island, Texas. Radio-transmitters and band relocations were used to estimate home range size, determine the relationship of movements to environmental factors, and identify important foraging and roosting habitat types (Zonick et al. 1998; K. R. Drake 1999; K. L. Drake 1999). Plovers predominantly used algal mats and exposed sand flats of South Padre Island for foraging and roosting, although they also utilized washover passes and Gulf Coast sand beach, primarily when bayshore tidal flats were inundated. Thus, both habitats are essential for plovers wintering on the Texas Gulf Coast. Habitat use varied seasonally with greater use of algal flats in fall and spring and use of lower sand flats predominantly in winter. Birds roosted in close proximity to foraging areas (primarily on algal mats) with intra-annual fidelity to roost sites documented in some birds (K. L. Drake 1999). Mean home range size was 12.6 km² (4.9 mi²) and most plover movements were less than 5 km (3.1 mi) (Drake et al. in press). Plovers avoided dredge spoil placement areas and rarely used habitat adjacent to development (Drake et al. in press; Zonick et al. 1998).

9. Population Viability²

Plissner and Haig (2000b) examined viability of all three piping plover breeding populations using VORTEX metapopulation³ viability analysis software (Lacy et al. 1995). They treated the Great Lakes population as a sub-population of a larger metapopulation consisting of both Great Lakes and Northern Great Plains breeding populations. A baseline model of the Great Lakes/Great Plains metapopulation indicated that 36% greater mean reproductive success (an increase from 1.25 fledglings per pair to 1.70 fledglings per pair) would result in a 95% probability of piping plovers persisting 100 years. In these simulations, fecundity of 2.0 fledglings per pair was needed to maintain a stable trend in this metapopulation, and even at this reproductive rate, the Great Lakes subpopulation was unlikely to persist. Plissner and Haig (2000b) assumed adult mortality of 34.0%, and juvenile mortality of 56.8%; rates based on studies of sub-populations of

²Population viability is the degree to which a population is indefinitely self-sustaining.

³Metapopulations are networks of semi-isolated populations with some level of intermittent gene flow among them, in which individual populations may be extirpated but then be re-colonized from other populations (Meffe and Carroll 1997).

the Great Plains and Atlantic breeding populations (MacIvor 1990; Ryan et al. 1993; Melvin and Gibbs 1994). Plissner and Haig (2000b), assuming that limited dispersal occurs among breeding populations, estimated a dispersal rate of 0.01 birds per year between adjacent populations. Their model was highly sensitive to variation in both survivorship and dispersal, parameters that are poorly understood empirically.

Wemmer et al. (2001) created a habitat-based population model to examine the effect of habitat availability on persistence of the Great Lakes population. Model inputs were based on data for the Great Lakes population obtained by monitoring breeding pairs and reproductive success from 1984–1997 and banding efforts conducted since 1993. This model assumed a closed population with no immigration or emigration. Results of model simulations suggest the population will likely not persist for more than 25 years given current reproductive success, nest site use patterns, and nesting densities (total available territories at observed densities = 57). In simulations, raising mean reproductive success to 2.0 fledglings per pair for breeding areas where reproduction is currently lower, predicted 0.80 probability of survival for the next 100 years, but did not increase the population significantly from 25 breeding pairs. The model suggests piping plovers must also nest at densities more than double the maximum recorded at each of 29 breeding areas occupied since 1984 and/or colonize new or long-unoccupied breeding areas for the population to reach a size where it is likely to persist.

Historic observations and increasing nest densities on the Atlantic Coast suggest that higher nesting densities are possible in the Great Lakes region, but carrying capacity of breeding habitat remains very difficult to estimate without concrete historical information. Even if high densities can be reached, full recovery may take decades without additional human intervention. Together, these modeling efforts suggest that aggressive measures to increase reproductive success and protection or creation of additional breeding habitat are required for the population to recover.

D. Reasons for Listing and Existing Threats

Hunting during the late 19th and early 20th centuries likely led to initial declines of the Atlantic piping plover population. The role hunting played in the decline of piping plovers in the Great Lakes region remains uncertain. Increasing habitat loss, recreational pressure, predation, and contaminants are likely responsible for continued population declines since the 1940s (USFWS 1985). Scientific collecting may also have contributed to reduction of breeding pairs in the early 1940s (Cuthbert, unpubl. data). These factors, with the exception of scientific collecting, are among those that presently threaten the Great Lakes population throughout its range.

1. Habitat Destruction and Modification

Shoreline development in the Great Lakes region and the wintering grounds poses a threat to the Great Lakes population of piping plovers. The effects of habitat loss and degradation on Atlantic Coast populations are well documented (USFWS 1996). The extirpation of piping plovers from formerly occupied Great Lakes states has been associated with development that permanently converted shoreline to another type of land use or recreational uses that altered the physical nature of beaches (Russell 1983; Matteson and Strand 1988; Matteson 1996). Although residential development has not deterred nesting at some Michigan beaches, piping plovers utilizing residential areas generally exhibit lowered reproductive success. Even with predator exclosures and psychological fencing, these piping plovers may experience increased disturbance by humans and their pets (Wemmer 2000).

Inlet dredging and artificial structures, such as breakwalls and groins, can eliminate breeding areas and alter sedimentation patterns leading to the loss of nearby breeding habitat. Marina construction can also disrupt natural dynamic processes that maintain shoreline habitats. Deposition of dredge spoil, a practice often considered beneficial to piping plovers and used to mitigate effects of habitat destruction, may actually be detrimental, depending on placement. For example, in Texas, piping plovers avoid islands of dredged material in favor of natural habitats (Zonick et al. 1998). In the Laguna Madre, these artificial islands impede water flow between tidal flats and the lagoon, resulting in vegetation encroachment that lowers the quality of important foraging habitat for piping plovers (Zonick et al. 1998).

2. Predation and Disease

Predation was identified as the cause of nest failure of approximately 14.5% of clutches in Michigan from 1981 to 1999 (Wemmer 2000), and predators are suspected in the majority of disappearances of unfledged chicks. Determining that predation has occurred and identifying the species of predator responsible is difficult. In Michigan, identification of tracks in breeding areas, monitoring nests with video cameras, experimentation with artificial nests, and anecdotal data on predation have been used to identify potential predators of piping plover eggs, chicks and adults. Additionally, a team of investigators participated in a 24 hour per day monitoring project at one nest for an entire breeding season to determine predator risks (Germain and Struthers 1994). These efforts identified a diversity of actual and potential predators including herring gull (*L. argentatus*), ring-billed gull (*L. delawarensis*), merlin (*Falco columbarius*), peregrine falcon (*Falco peregrinus*), great horned owl (*Bubo virginianus*), snowy owl (*Nyctea scandiaca*), American crow (*Corvus brachyrhynchos*), common raven (*Corvus corvax*), red fox (*Vulpes vulpes*), coyote (*Canis latrans*), raccoon (*Procyon lotor*), thirteen-lined ground squirrel (*Spermophilus tridecemlineatus*), striped skunk (*Mephitis mephitis*), domestic cat (*Felis catus*), and dog (*Canis familiaris*). Human developments near beaches attract increased numbers of predators such as skunks and raccoons (USFWS 1985).

Predator impacts and threats vary among seasons, years, and sites. Very little information exists on cues predators use to locate nests or chicks, the time predation occurs, or the relative importance of specific animals as predators (Cuthbert and Wemmer 1999). Disease is not currently a problem known to occur in this species.

3. Inadequacy of Existing Regulatory Mechanisms

Prior to listing under the ESA, several states listed the piping plover as threatened or endangered, and human intrusion at a few nesting sites was prohibited by local conservation efforts. Although the Migratory Bird Treaty Act (16 USC 703) protects the species from taking and bans trade in piping plovers and their parts, it was determined that because the Act does not protect habitat, the Act alone would not provide adequate protection to prevent further loss of the species' habitat. Listing under the ESA offers additional protection, primarily through the recovery and consultation processes.

Although the species is listed under the ESA, there still remains inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms. Some Federal actions under the Coastal Zone Management Act administered by the National Oceanic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA) and the Michigan Department of Environmental Quality (MDEQ) have not yet been reviewed under section 7 of the ESA. These Federal actions have impacted the species by funding or issuing permits for construction within essential habitat or in areas that may affect essential habitat. Similarly, some wetland permitting actions by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (USACE) and MDEQ continue to result in diminished habitat quality for the piping plover. The U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) and state agencies establish water quality guidelines and standards as well as clean-up levels for hazardous waste sites, but thus far these regulatory mechanisms have not been sufficient to eliminate or prevent elevated contaminant concentrations measured in addled eggs and carcasses. The USFWS consulted with EPA on water quality guidance for the Great Lakes, but full compliance with the guidance has not yet been achieved. Section 9 of the ESA prohibits unlawful take of endangered species, but incidents of take are difficult to prevent without constant law enforcement presence and are difficult to prove when they occur. Local ordinances and state laws that protect piping plovers are also infrequently enforced because law enforcement agents rarely patrol the areas where plovers nest.

4. Other Natural or Man-made Factors

Disturbance by Humans and Pets

Use of motorized vehicles on beaches threatens both wintering and breeding piping plovers. Although driving is unlawful on publicly-owned Great Lakes shoreline, periodic vehicle use occurs at a number of sites (Pike 1985; S. Howard, pers. comm., 1996; R. Utych, Whitefish Point Bird Observatory, Paradise, Michigan, pers. comm., 1997). Vehicles have crushed eggs and killed adults and chicks (Pike 1985; Melvin et al. 1994). Additionally, driving on beaches early in the breeding season degrades the quality of

substrate and may deter piping plovers from nesting or cause them to desert nests (Hoopes et al. 1992; Hoopes 1994). Vehicle use is legal in many areas of the wintering grounds and displaces piping plovers from preferred areas causing greater energy expenditure that may affect their survival (Zonick and Ryan 1995). Other motorized activities, such as boating, jet-skiing, or flying aircraft may also be a disturbance if they occur too close to beaches that support piping plovers (M. Holden, resource specialist, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Empire, Michigan, pers. comm., 1997; Wemmer, pers. obs.).

Beach-walking, bike riding, kite flying, fireworks (Howard et al. 1993), bonfires, horseback riding, kayaking, windsurfing, camping, and close-up photography are among the many non-motorized activities that disturb piping plovers and disrupt normal behavior patterns. High pedestrian use may deter piping plovers from using nesting habitat (Burger 1991, 1994). Pedestrians accompanied by pets present an even greater disturbance to breeding piping plovers (Pike 1985), as dogs frequently chase and attempt to capture adults and chicks (Lambert and Ratcliff 1979). Repeated flushing of birds from their nests by pedestrians exposes eggs to potentially lethal extremes in temperature (Welty 1982; Bergstrom 1991). Chicks may become separated from adults by pedestrians or displaced from preferred foraging habitats, which may make them more susceptible to the elements and predators and may ultimately affect their survival (Flemming et al. 1988). In wintering sites in Texas, human disturbance continues to decrease the amount of undisturbed habitat and appears to limit local piping plover abundance (Zonick and Ryan 1995). The presence of pets increases disturbance to wintering piping plovers; pedestrians have been observed walking their dogs through congregations of feeding shorebirds and encouraging their dogs to chase the birds (P. Blair, volunteer, Florida State Department of Fish and Game, Seminole, pers. comm., 1999). Disturbance also reduces the time migrating shorebirds spend foraging (Burger 1991) and has been implicated as a factor in the long-term decline of migrating shorebirds at staging areas (Pfister et al. 1992).

Small Population Size

Endangered populations, by virtue of their small size and geographic isolation, are inherently at greater risk of extinction than larger populations (Caughley and Gunn 1996). Small, isolated populations are more likely to be destroyed by random environmental events than larger widespread populations. Similarly, very small isolated populations are more strongly affected by demographic stochasticity, random changes in sex ratios or ability to find mates (“Allele effect”), which all influence population persistence. In the Great Lakes population, up to 29% of adults may remain unmated throughout the breeding season suggesting that Allele effect may occur (Wemmer 2000). Inbreeding depression, a reduction in fitness resulting from decreased genetic variability due to a high incidence of matings between close relatives, may also affect this population. Between 1993 and 1999, 6 of 14 matings of banded plovers, whose parents were known, were between close relatives (parents and offspring, full siblings or half siblings) (Wemmer 2000). These observations, along with small population size, indicate that inbreeding depression and loss of genetic diversity through a population bottleneck are potential concerns. Further

analyses of band data and genetic material will provide greater insight into the extent of inbreeding and genetic variability present in this population.

Contaminants

Contaminants have sub-lethal as well as lethal effects on birds. Sub-lethal effects include behavioral impairment, deformities, and impaired reproduction (Rand and Petrocelli 1985; Gilbertson et al. 1991; Hoffman et al. 1996). Piping plovers may accumulate contaminants from point sources and non-point sources at breeding, migratory stop-over, and wintering sites. Oil spills represent an important concern for Great Lakes piping plovers wintering on both the Atlantic and Gulf Coasts; oiled piping plovers have been reported at a number of sites in these regions (USFWS 1996). Oiling also poses a potential threat to piping plovers migrating and breeding along Great Lakes waterways. The magnitude of threat that pollution plays to piping plover habitats and associated shorebirds is yet unknown. The carcass of one piping plover banded in Michigan was among 81 dead western sandpipers (*Calidris mauri*) discovered near Marco Island, Florida (T. Below, pers. comm., 1998); pesticide application for mosquito control may be implicated.

The endangered status of this species warrants an assessment of the sub-lethal impacts of contaminants. Addled eggs from all three breeding populations have been collected and analyzed for inorganic and organic residues (Day et al. 1991; Ruelle 1993; Welsh and Mayer 1993); the Great Lakes population offers the most complete sampling (n=81 eggs) in which contaminant levels have been monitored since 1988. Several composites of piping plover eggs from Michigan had levels of total PCBs (polychlorinated biphenols) rivaling those in eggs of colonial piscivorous (fish eating) cormorants and terns (> 13 µg/g), species that occupy a higher trophic level than piping plovers and potentially bioaccumulate contaminants more rapidly (USFWS, unpubl. data). Contaminant levels in eggs from Great Lakes piping plovers generally exceeded those detected in eggs from the Atlantic and Great Plains populations. PCB concentrations in the range detected in the piping plover eggs from Michigan have the potential to cause reproductive impairment (D. Best, biologist, USFWS, East Lansing, Michigan, pers. comm., 1999). Analysis of prey available to piping plovers at representative Michigan breeding sites indicated that breeding areas along the upper Great Lakes are not likely the major source of contaminants to this population based on rates of biomagnification for other Great Lakes species (D. Best, pers. comm., 1999). The relative contribution of wintering and migratory stopover sites to contaminant levels in piping plovers is unknown.

E. Conservation Measures

Conservation measures underway to protect the piping plover include recognition, research, protective management, requirements for Federal protection, and prohibitions against certain practices. Recognition through listing encourages and results in increased conservation actions by Federal, state and private agencies, groups, and individuals. The ESA provides for possible voluntary land acquisition and cooperation with the states and requires that recovery plans be developed for all listed species. The protection required of Federal and state agencies and the prohibition against certain activities involving listed animals are discussed, in part, below. See appendix B for a list of principle Federal and state laws applicable to the protection of the piping plover and its habitat.

1. Regulatory Protection

Federal Protections: The ESA contains several sections that provide regulatory protections for the piping plover. Designation of critical habitat, consultations between the FWS and other Federal agencies, and prohibitions against take are some of the important protections provided for in ESA regulations.

Critical Habitat

The ESA defines critical habitat as (1) the specific areas within the geographical area occupied by those species, at the time it is listed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of this law, on which are found those physical or biological features essential to the conservation of the species and which may require special management considerations for protection; and (2) specific areas outside the geographical area occupied by the species at the time it is listed in accordance with the provisions of section 4 of the ESA, upon a determination by the Secretary of the Interior (Secretary) that such areas are essential for the conservation and recovery of the species.

Except in those circumstances determined by the Secretary, critical habitat shall not include the entire geographical area which can be occupied by the threatened or endangered species. The provisions under section 4 state: “The Secretary shall designate critical habitat, and make revisions thereto, under subsection (a)(3) on the basis of the best scientific data available and after taking into consideration the economic impact, and any other relevant impact, of specifying any area as critical habitat. The Secretary may exclude any area from critical habitat if he/she determines that the benefits of such exclusion outweigh the benefits of specifying such area as part of the critical habitat, unless he/she determines, based on the best scientific and commercial data available, that the failure to designate such area as critical habitat will result in the extinction of the species concerned.”

Section 4 of the ESA also requires the Secretary to designate critical habitat, to the maximum extent prudent and determinable, concurrently with the listing of a species as

threatened or endangered (16 USC 1533(a)(3)). If critical habitat is not determinable at that time, the Secretary may extend the period for designating such habitat “by no more than one additional year” (16 USC 1533 (b)(6)C(ii)). The final rule listing the piping plover as endangered (USFWS 1985) indicated that designation of critical habitat was not determinable. Thus, in 1986 designation was deferred for one year.

In December 1996, Defenders of Wildlife (Defenders) filed a suit against the Department of the Interior and the USFWS over its failure to designate critical habitat for the Great Lakes population of the piping plover. Defenders filed a similar suit for the Northern Great Plains piping plover population in 1997. On February 7, 2000, the United States District Court for the District of Columbia issued an order directing the USFWS to publish a proposed critical habitat designation for nesting and wintering areas of the Great Lakes population of the piping plover by June 30, 2000, and for nesting and wintering areas of the Northern Great Plains piping plover by May 31, 2001. A subsequent order by the Court directed the USFWS to finalize the two critical habitat designations by April 30, 2001, and March 15, 2002, respectively. The USFWS chose to propose critical habitat for the wintering grounds for all piping plovers in a separate rule to be published by June 30, 2000 and finalized by September 30, 2000. The final rule designating critical habitat for the wintering grounds was published on July 7, 2001 (66 FR 36038).

On July 6, 2000, the USFWS proposed to designate 37 units along the Great Lakes shoreline of Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York as critical habitat for the Great Lakes breeding population of the piping plover. Following a series of public meetings and comment periods, the USFWS published a final rule designating critical habitat for the Great Lakes breeding population of the piping plover on May 7, 2001 (66 FR 22938). A total of 35 units (extending 500 m (1640 ft) inland) were designated along the Great Lakes shorelines of eight states. Approximately 325 km (201 mi) of shoreline were included in 26 counties in Minnesota, Michigan, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, Ohio, Pennsylvania and New York. The greatest number of critical habitat units (23) occur in Michigan with a total shoreline length of 224 km (139 mi)(Table 2, Figure 8). The remaining units cover approximately 101 km (62 mi) of shoreline in seven states (Table 3, Figure 9a-f).

Areas included in the critical habitat designation for the Great Lakes breeding population of piping plover were considered essential to the conservation of the species and were based on the best scientific and commercial data available at the time of the designation. Critical habitat areas were derived from research, historic records, surveys of habitat, information from local experts, and data on plover nest locations since 1984.

Within the geographic areas designated, only those areas that contain the primary constituent elements, as defined by 50 CFR 424.12(b), are considered as critical habitat. The primary constituent elements for the Great Lakes breeding population of the piping plover are defined as island and mainland shorelines that support open, sparsely vegetated, sandy habitats, such sand spits or sand beaches, that are associated with wide,

unforested systems of dunes and inter-dune wetlands. Per the rule, suitable sites must have at least 0.2 km (0.12 mi) length of gently sloping, sparsely vegetated (<50% herbaceous and woody cover) sand beach with a total beach area of at least 2 ha (5 ac). Within these size sites, the habitat must be at least 50 m (164 ft) in length where beach width is greater than 7 m (23 ft); there is protective cover for chicks; and the distance to the treeline from the normal high water line is more than 50 m (164 ft). The beach width may be narrower than 7 m (23 ft) if areas of sand and cobble of at least 7 m (23 ft) exist between the dune and treeline. Sites must also have a low level of disturbance from human activities and from domestic animals.

Table 2. Critical habitat designations for the breeding population of the Great Lakes piping plover in Michigan

County	Location	Ownership	Unit Number	Unit Length km (mi)
Chippewa/Luce/ Alger	Whitefish Point to Grand Marais	Federal/state/private	MI-1	14.3 (8.9)
Mackinac	Point Aux Chenes	Federal/private	MI-2	2.0 (1.2)
Mackinac/ Schoolcraft	Port Inland	state/private	MI-3	3.0 (1.9)
Emmet	Sturgeon Bay to Cross Village	state/private/municipal	MI-4	15.1 (9.4)
Emmet	Thornswift Nature Preserve	private	MI-5	0.9 (0.5)
Emmet	Petosky State Park	state/private	MI-6	2.0 (1.2)
Charlevoix	North Point	municipal	MI-7	1.1 (0.7)
Charlevoix	Fisherman's Island State Park	state	MI-8	1.3 (0.6)
Charlevoix	Donegal Bay	private	MI-9	2.6 (1.6)
Charlevoix	McCauley's Point	state	MI-10	0.8 (0.5)
Charlevoix	Greenes Bay	state/private	MI-11	1.8 (1.1)
Leelanau	Cathead Bay	state/private	MI-12	5.1 (3.2)
Leelanau	South Fox Island	state/private	MI-13	6.0 (3.7)
Leelanau	North Manitou Island	Federal	MI-14	3.3 (2.0)
Leelanau	Empire Beach	Federal/municipal	MI-15	18.6 (11.6)
Benzie	Platte River Point	Federal	MI-16	28.6 (17.8)
Mason	Nordhouse Dunes	Federal/state	MI-17	13.4 (8.3)
Muskegon	Muskegon State Park	state	MI-18	2.5 (1.6)
Chippewa	Lake Superior State Forest	state	MI-19	3.0 (1.9)
Cheboygan	Grass Bay	state/private	MI-20	3.0 (1.9)
Presque Isle	Hoefl State Park	state	MI-21	3.7 (2.3)
Presque Isle	Thompson's Harbor	state/private	MI-22	2.8 (1.7)
Iosco	Tawas Point State Park	state	MI-23	2.0 (1.2)




Figure 8. Piping plover critical habitat units in Michigan (see table 2 for descriptions)

Table 3. Critical habitat designations for the breeding population of the Great Lakes piping plover outside of Michigan

State/County	Location	Ownership	Unit Number	Unit Length km (mi)
Illinois				
Lake	Illinois Beach State Park	state	IL-1	10.2 (6.4)
Indiana				
Porter	Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	Federal/state	IN-1	7.9 (4.9)
Minnesota				
St. Louis	Duluth Harbor	state/private	MN-1	0.6 (0.4)
New York				
Oswego & Jefferson	Salmon River to Stony Point	state/private	NY-1	27.4 (17.0)
Ohio				
Erie	Sheldon Marsh Nature Preserve	state/private	OH-1	3.2 (2.0)
Lake	Headlands Dunes State Nature Preserve	state	OH-2	0.8 (0.5)
Pennsylvania				
Erie	Presque Isle State Park	state	PA-1	6.0 (3.7)
Wisconsin				
Douglas	Wisconsin Point/Interstate Island	Federal/municipal	WI-1	4.0 (2.5)
Ashland	Long Island/Chequamegon Pt	Federal/tribal/private	WI-2	25.3 (15.7)
Ashland	Western Michigan Island	Federal	WI-3	6.5 (4.0)
Marinette	Seagull Bar	state/municipal	WI-4	1.5 (0.9)
Manitowoc	Point Beach State Forest	state	WI-5	8.0 (5.0)

Designation of critical habitat does not imply, however, that all areas which may be essential for the species are covered by the designation. The rule acknowledges that other areas may become essential over time or may be considered essential upon availability of better information. Critical habitat also does not establish refuges or wildlife management areas. Activities which may occur within areas designated as critical habitat are subject to the consultation requirements under section 7 of the ESA, but only if there is Federal involvement in the action. Recovery plans, however, address all areas important for the species and identify management and conservation actions needed to recover the species. As such, the recovery actions described in this plan are not limited to the areas designated as critical habitat but apply throughout the range where the species




Figure 9a. Critical habitat units in Ohio.




Figure 9b. Critical habitat units in Pennsylvania.

Figure 9a-f. Piping plover critical habitat units in the Great Lakes, outside of Michigan (see table 3 for unit descriptions)




Figure 9c. Critical habitat units in New York.




Figure 9d. Critical habitat units in Illinois and Indiana.

Figure 9a-f (cont.) Piping plover critical habitat units in the Great Lakes, outside of Michigan (see table 3 for unit descriptions)




Figure 9e. Critical habitat units in Wisconsin.




Figure 9f. Critical habitat units in Minnesota and Wisconsin.

Figure 9a-f(cont.) Piping plover critical habitat units in the Great Lakes, outside of Michigan (see table 3 for unit descriptions)

may be found. When addressing habitat concerns, “essential” habitat is often referred to. This differs from critical habitat in several ways. Critical habitat is defined by regulation; thus it is a legal definition of the areas of suitable piping plover habitat that are considered essential to the conservation and recovery of the species. However, because it is not all-inclusive of all areas of habitat that are or may become biologically essential to the species, essential habitat is the focus of the recovery plan. Essential habitat, collectively, is all of the area that is essential to piping plovers on their breeding and wintering grounds, and during migration. Federal designation of critical habitat is one mechanism of protecting essential habitat.

Section 7–Interagency Consultations with Federal Agencies

Regulations implementing interagency cooperation provisions of the ESA are codified at 50 CFR Part 402. Section 7(a)(2) of the ESA requires Federal agencies to consult with the USFWS when federally permitted, authorized, or funded actions may affect listed species, including the piping plover. This consultation process promotes interagency cooperation in finding ways to avoid or minimize adverse effects to listed species. If a Federal action is likely to adversely affect any listed species, the Federal agency must enter into formal consultation with the USFWS. The USACE is one of many agencies that have undergone formal consultation with the USFWS because of actions that may affect piping plovers. Section 7(a)(2) also requires these agencies use their authorities to further the conservation of federally listed species.

Section 9–Prohibitions against Take

Section 9 of the ESA prohibits any person subject to the jurisdiction of the United States to take listed wildlife species. The term “take” is defined to include harassing, harming, pursuing, hunting, shooting, wounding, killing, trapping, capturing, or collecting. It is also unlawful to attempt such acts, solicit another to commit such acts, or cause such acts to be committed. Regulations implementing the ESA (50 CFR 17.21) define “harm” to mean an act which actually kills or injures wildlife. Such an act may include significant habitat modification or degradation where it actually kills or injures 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. These restrictions apply to all listed species not covered by a special rule. No special rule has been published for the piping plover.

Sections 6 and 10–Permits and Funding for Scientific Research and Conservation Actions

Section 10 of the ESA provides for permits to authorize activities otherwise prohibited under section 9 for scientific purposes or to enhance the propagation or

survival of a listed species. Section 10 permits have been issued for research, management (predator exclusions), captive rearing, salvage of eggs and carcasses, and banding of piping plovers from the Great Lakes population. Also under section 10, it is 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. Further, state conservation agencies and their designated agents have certain “take” authority for species listed as endangered or threatened if the species are covered by a Section 6 Cooperative Agreement with the USFWS (see discussion of section 6, below). Activities that may proceed are limited by regulation, but may include many recovery research projects that are identified in this plan. The limits on this authority are detailed in 50 CFR 17.21 (c)(5).

Section 10 permits can also provide for take that is incidental to an otherwise lawful activity, provided certain conditions have been met. In order to obtain an incidental take permit, an applicant must prepare a habitat conservation plan (HCP). The HCP is designed to offset any harmful effects that the proposed activity may have on the species by minimizing and mitigating the effects of the authorized incidental take. In March, 2001, an HCP was submitted to the USFWS by the Magic Carpet Woods Association in association with residential development in Leelanau County, Michigan. The HCP provides for a number of protections and conservation measures for the piping plover, including establishment of a Great Lakes piping plover conservation fund.

Section 6 of the ESA allows the USFWS to grant money to states for the conservation of species. The USFWS has funded the Michigan Natural Features Inventory through grants to the Michigan Department of Natural Resources to conduct a Landowner Contact Program to notify landowners of the presence of piping plovers and other threatened or endangered plants and animals, and to suggest methods for protecting the species on their lands. Section 6 grants have also supported statewide surveys, monitoring, and research.

State Protections: Several states within the breeding and wintering ranges of the Great Lakes piping plover have listed the species as threatened or endangered as a result of its Federal listing, including Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, New York, Texas, North Carolina, Georgia, Florida, and Louisiana (Table 4).

In Michigan, the piping plover was listed as a threatened species by the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (MDNR) in 1976. It was listed pursuant to Michigan's Endangered Species Act (Public Act 203 of 1974), now Part 365 of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act of 1994 (Public Act 451). The piping plover was elevated to endangered status in Michigan in 1983. Other laws pursuant to Michigan's Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act that provide protections to the piping plover and its habitat include Michigan Environmental Protection Act (part 17), Conservation and Historic Preservation Easement (subpart 11 of part 21: General Real Estate Powers), Sand Dunes Protection and Management (part 353), and Sand Dune

Mining (part 637). Other states have similar acts or statutes that provide protection for the species and its habitat (Table 4, Appendix B).

Interagency Measures: In September 1994, 14 Federal agencies, including the USFWS, National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Coast Guard, USACE, and the Department of Defense signed a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) affirming their commitments to carry out programs for the conservation of species listed under the ESA and the ecosystems upon which they depend, including implementing appropriate recovery actions that are identified in recovery plans.

Table 4. State listing status and legal protection of the piping plover in states within the breeding and wintering ranges of the Great Lakes population

State	State Legal Protections
Endangered	
Illinois	Illinois Endangered Species Protection Act-520 ILCS (Illinois Compiled Statutes) 10/
Indiana	IC (Indiana Code) 14-22-34
Michigan	Part 365 of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act of 1994 (Public Act 451)
Minnesota	Minnesota Endangered Species Statute, Section 84.0895; Minnesota Rules, Chapter 6134; Minnesota Rules 6212.1800-6212.2300
New York	6 NYCRR (New York Code of Rules and Regulations), Part 182; New York State Environmental Conservation Law, 11-0535[1]-[2], 11-0536[2],[4]
Ohio	Ohio Revised Code, Section 1531.25
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Statutes, Section 29.604; Wisconsin Administrative Codes, Chapter NR (Natural Resources) 27
Threatened	
Florida	Florida Endangered and Threatened Species Act, Sections 372.072, 372.0725 of Title 28
Georgia	Endangered Wildlife Act (1973)
North Carolina	North Carolina General Statutes, Chapter 113, Article 25
Texas	Texas Parks and Wildlife Code, Chapters 67 & 68; Texas Administrative Code, Sections 65.171-65.184 of Title 31
Threatened/Endangered	
Louisiana	RS (Revised Statutes) 56:1901, RS 56:1903, RS 56:1904
State Protected	
Alabama	Alabama Code 9-2-2 (1), the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources has the responsibility to protect, conserve, and increase the wildlife of the state.
Not Listed	
Mississippi	
Pennsylvania	
South Carolina	

2. Field-based Conservation Efforts

Field-based conservation measures for the piping plover have occurred primarily in Michigan as the Great Lakes population has been largely limited to Michigan since it was listed as endangered. Habitat surveys, beach restoration, and prey studies have occurred in Wisconsin (Matteson and Strand 1988) and several states have protected habitat under a variety of mechanisms.

Surveys and Monitoring

Breeding sites in Michigan are surveyed annually for piping plovers, and all located nests are monitored throughout the breeding season. Additionally, the International Piping Plover Census surveys historic breeding areas at least once every five years. MDNR funded the first statewide survey of Michigan breeding sites in 1979 and has coordinated annual statewide surveys and monitoring since 1983. In 1985, a Michigan state recovery team was founded. In 1987, Michigan recovery team members developed a state recovery plan independently from the first Federal recovery plan. Since 1994, the East Lansing, Michigan Field Office of the USFWS has sponsored coordination meetings attended by agency employees involved in piping plover management, seasonal field workers, researchers, Michigan recovery team members and invited guests to organize seasonal field efforts. In 1994, the USFWS initiated a program to organize volunteers to patrol piping plover nesting areas over holiday weekends. This program has been continued and expanded in subsequent years.

Protection of Eggs and Chicks

Since 1988, fencing has been consistently used to protect all known piping plover nests from predation. Two designs of predator exclosures have been used. The most common design is a 15 m (50 ft) roll of welded wire supported by fence posts around the nest and topped with monofilament line (Rimmer and Deblinger 1990). Smaller, 1 m (3.0 ft) by 1 m (3.0 ft) welded wire boxes have also been used to protect nests. Widespread use of the smaller box exclosures was abandoned after a clutch of eggs protected by the box-type exclosure was depredated by a red fox in 1993. Box exclosures are still used periodically on private land with narrow beaches and/or when landowners object to the larger exclosure. They are also used on occasion to protect extremely vulnerable clutches during the laying phase prior to erection of a larger exclosure. Psychological fencing is currently used in concert with predator exclosures at most nest sites to limit human activity in the vicinity of piping plover nests. This fencing consists of bailing twine held in place with fence posts. Michigan DNR “Unlawful to Enter” signs and/or USFWS “Closed Area” signs are hung from the fencing. The area fenced varies, depending on the site, and ranges from a small circular area approximately 100 m (330 ft) in radius to larger areas of approximately 800 m (2600 ft) on either side of the territory.

Consistent use of exclosures and psychological fencing increased hatching success from 37% to 72% between 1984 and 1999 (Cuthbert and Wemmer 1999; Wemmer 2000). Reasons for hatching failure despite this management include depredation prior to erection of exclosures, abandonment, inviable eggs, and egg loss to small unidentified predators. Documented negative effects of exclosures on piping plovers include nest abandonment, entanglement of an adult piping plover in the monofilament line used to top an exclosure, increased disturbance to incubating birds by curious people, and destruction of eggs by vandals who likely located the nest by the predator exclosure. Because of the site specific nature of predator activities, additional management (e.g., removal of foxes denning near a breeding pair and communication with landowners to control domestic dog activity) has been used to reduce predation risks. However, loss of chicks remains a major source of mortality and is extremely difficult to predict or control (Cuthbert and Wemmer 1999).

Habitat Enhancement and Protection

Federal, state, and local actions have enhanced and increased protection of piping plover habitat. Guardrails or boulders placed at vehicle access points have prevented people from driving on piping plover habitat at some Michigan breeding sites. The U.S. Forest Service (USFS) enhanced nesting habitat at Pointe Aux Chenes, Mackinac County, Michigan by adding cobble to the beach. Piping plover nesting habitat was protected from marina development at Cross Village, Emmet County, Michigan in a section 7 consultation between the USFWS and the USACE in 1994 (USFWS 1994). The USFWS has worked with local planning and zoning boards to incorporate shoreline protection and piping plover habitat needs into land use plans and existing permitting processes. The USFWS has begun administration of a 3-year Great Lakes Protection Fund grant of \$281,000 that began in 1999. The grant supports several private conservation groups that work with private landowners, citizen's groups, townships officials, county planning commissions, and Soil Conservation District offices to demonstrate the economic and environmental benefits of coastline protection. The grant also supports piping plover research, management, and protection undertaken by university researchers.

Banding and Population Studies

A long-term banding program has begun to yield important insights into population dynamics of Great Lakes piping plovers and has helped shape protective management measures. Sightings of piping plovers banded in the Great Lakes as well as other regions (e.g., Saskatchewan, Maritime Provinces and the Great Plains) have greatly enhanced the knowledge of winter distribution. Prior to banding, knowledge of survival, mortality, and adult and juvenile dispersal within the Great Lakes region was very limited (Pike 1985). Marking individuals has increased accuracy of population size estimates by allowing identification of re-nesting attempts. Banding has allowed monitoring of movements by individuals and provides information on post-fledging dispersal. Life history information about individuals has generated public interest in conserving these

birds. However, trapping and banding piping plovers pose potential risks, including stress, injury, and mortality to adults, chicks, and eggs. Therefore, banding should continue only as long as necessary to obtain information that contributes to recovery of this population (see appendix C for details on banding methods and impacts).

Captive-rearing Abandoned Eggs

From 1988-1992, in spite of the use of protective fencing, piping plovers continued to abandon nests and fecundity remained low. Beginning in 1992, the USFWS permitted Dr. Francie Cuthbert and her investigators to collect orphaned piping plover chicks and abandoned eggs and to raise them in captivity using previously developed techniques (Powell 1991). These efforts have shown that captive-rearing can successfully produce fledglings from eggs that would otherwise not hatch in the wild and that fledglings reared in captivity exhibit behavior similar to wild counterparts (Powell et al. 1997). In 1998, three of four birds reared in captivity and released in 1997 (total released 1992-1998 =18) were sighted at beaches in Michigan (Wemmer 2000). Two of the three appeared to have paired with wild mates and one of these pairs was observed copulating. While no nests of these pairs were found, observations suggest that at least one adult laid eggs that were destroyed before a nest was located (Stucker et al. 1998). In 1999, one of these captive-reared plovers was documented to reproduce successfully (Stucker and Cuthbert 1999). Similarly, breeding by six captive-reared individuals in the Great Plains was documented between 1997-2000 (C. Kruse, biologist, USACE, Yankton, South Dakota, and Robyn Niver, graduate student, University of Wisconsin-Madison, pers. comm., 2000). Although only 25 of 360 captive-reared piping plovers in the Great Plains were sighted in the years following release, logistical difficulties in monitoring plovers over vast areas likely led to an underestimation of returns (C. Kruse, biologist, USACE, Yankton, South Dakota, pers. comm., 1999).

Conservation on the Wintering Grounds

Conservation efforts directed at this population on the wintering grounds have not occurred because winter distribution of the Great Lakes population was not known until very recently. Consultations by the USFWS on specific shoreline development projects have been undertaken for wintering piping plovers (USFWS 1996). Broad management efforts that have likely benefitted wintering Great Lakes piping plover populations include protecting “Shorebird Resting Areas” in some Florida State parks, designating shorebird wintering sites “Important Bird Areas” of the American Bird Conservancy and/or protected sites under the Western Hemisphere Shorebird Reserve Program, and conducting regular shorebird surveys in select states.

3. Public Education

Public education efforts have been diverse. Several press releases are prepared annually by the USFWS to alert the public to the presence and protection needs of piping

plovers. The USFWS Region 3 Office, Fort Snelling, Minnesota, prepared an informative brochure about piping plover (104,000 copies printed) and distributed it widely throughout the Great Lakes states. The USFWS East Lansing, Michigan, Field Office, and the MDNR created a lesson plan about piping plovers with a slide show and distributed it to Michigan elementary school teachers in 1994. Also in 1994, the Michigan Chapter of The Nature Conservancy conducted a landowner contact program to inform private owners of Great Lakes coastline about endangered plants and animals on their property. In 1995, 12 large interpretative displays featuring the piping plover were funded by the USFWS and erected at breeding areas receiving high human use. Finally, numerous public presentations have been made to citizen groups in the Great Lakes region on the endangered status of piping plovers and recovery efforts.

4. Involvement of Zoos in Recovery Efforts

The involvement of American Zoo and Aquarium (AZA) institutions in piping plover recovery started in 1995 when the USFWS and USACE requested assistance with an egg rescue operation for the Great Plains population on the Missouri River. The Milwaukee County Zoo and the Lincoln Park Zoo each salvaged 15 eggs and a total of 19 eggs hatched in the zoos. Through a MOU and the section 10 permitting process, the USFWS has officially allowed the zoo community to house the small rescued population for research and educational purposes. The current zoo population consists of 14 birds; 11 are from the original 19 that were hatched and three are offspring of birds held in captivity.

A Piping Plover Specialist Group was formulated in 1995 under the AZA Charadriiformes Taxonomic Advisory Group (TAG). The purpose of the Piping Plover Specialist Group is to create a network of zoos and organizations willing to assist with the recovery of the piping plover in all three geographic regions. Six AZA institutions currently participate in the program: Milwaukee County Zoo, Lincoln Park Zoo, Detroit Zoo, New England Aquarium, Houston Zoo and the San Antonio Zoo. Five of these institutions currently house captive piping plovers. Since 1995, participating zoos have been developing appropriate husbandry methods for piping plovers and researching nutrition and development, captive breeding requirements, and appropriate exhibit design. In January 2000, representatives from the participant institutions, USFWS, and USACE met at the Milwaukee County Zoo to formulate goals and objectives for the Piping Plover Specialist Group. Major program objectives are to create an official husbandry manual and studbook for captive piping plovers, increase awareness of the plight of the species, and identify and develop new funding sources for piping plover conservation. Participant zoos have also assisted field research. In 1999, biologists at the Milwaukee County Zoo tested several radio transmitter harness designs on captive piping plovers in an effort to develop a safe design for use in the wild.

5. Research

A number of research projects directed specifically at the Great Lakes population are described in detail in previous sections of this document. Research projects have focused primarily on population dynamics, breeding ecology, habitat assessment, predator identification, and contaminant evaluation. Additional studies have evaluated the efficacy of using certain techniques as conservation tools to speed recovery by augmenting the Great Lakes population. Powell and Cuthbert (1993) compared the effectiveness of cross-fostering and captive-rearing piping plovers using killdeer (*Charadrius vociferus*) as models. This study developed a protocol for rearing piping plovers in captivity and found captive-rearing more effective than cross-fostering in producing fledged young.

Doolittle (1998) used a stochastic population model to investigate the effects of using different captive-rearing strategies (single-egg removal and double-clutching⁴) to augment the Great Lakes population. She compared model results over a 20 year period including the first 5 years of implementation. She examined five different levels of intervention on the population and compared costs and benefits of each strategy in terms of magnitude of population trends and probabilities of extinction. Doolittle simulated the following five year strategies: no egg removal for captive rearing purposes (control), removal of entire clutches from 10% and 25% of nests, and removal of single eggs from 50% and 100% of nests. Model results showed captive-rearing strategies raised the population to significantly higher levels than did the control, even when the survival of captive-reared fledglings was halved. Model results also showed an increasing population trend that continued after captive-rearing ended. If assumptions about survival and behavior are accurate, Doolittle's modeling effort suggests that short-term captive-rearing efforts may boost piping plover populations over the long-term.

F. Strategy of Recovery

The recovery objective for the Great Lakes population as stated in the Great Lakes and Northern Great Plains Recovery Plan (1988) was "to prevent extirpation of piping plovers on the Great Lakes." Attaining this objective would have required increasing the population to 150 breeding pairs, maintaining this population for 15 years, protecting breeding and wintering habitat, and restoring breeding pairs to the former range in Canada as described in the Canadian Recovery Objective of the Canadian Piping Plover Recovery Plan (Canadian Wildlife Service 1993). The recovery objectives and criteria of the 1988 recovery plan were developed at the time of listing using current knowledge of distribution and abundance, survey data, historical population data, loss of viable habitat,

⁴ Double-clutching is the process of removing eggs from a clutch during egg laying inducing the female to produce additional eggs.

and an assessment of the potential to increase breeding pairs at occupied sites and establish pairs at unoccupied sites.

For this recovery plan, separate plans were drafted for the Great Lakes and Northern Great Plains populations because threats and conservation issues relating to the two populations were too diverse. In addition, progress on recovery tasks, new information on the Great Lakes population, and population modeling allowed substantial redefinition and refinement of recovery objectives, criteria, and tasks particular to the Great Lakes population. The recovery objective of this plan for the endangered Great Lakes population is to restore a viable population of piping plovers to the region. Attainment of this objective entails meeting criteria that will allow the population to persist with a 95% or better probability for at least 100 years and provide mechanisms to preserve both the population and habitat essential to its long-term survival.

II. RECOVERY

A. Objective and Criteria

The objective of the recovery plan is to restore and maintain a viable population of piping plovers in the Great Lakes region. Population viability is difficult to define in quantitative terms. Shaffer (1981) suggested that each population has a minimum threshold size below which the population is at imminent risk of extinction due to demographic and environmental effects. An effective population of 50-500 individuals is often quoted as the size necessary to avoid extinction due to random loss of genetic variation alone (Franklin 1980; Soulé 1980); populations must be much larger to persist in the face of environmental change. Although determining minimum viable population size (MVP) for a single species is nearly impossible, general MVP guidelines have been sought (Frankel and Soulé 1981; Mace and Lande 1991). However, no single number can be wisely applied to all populations (Soulé 1987). It follows that population viability analysis (PVA) is employed more appropriately to examine the effect of variation in demographic and environmental factors on theoretical population trends than to derive quantitative population goals (Caughley 1994; Beissinger and Westphal 1998). However, because the majority of PVA's specify a 95% or better probability of persisting 100 years as a criterion by which to judge model results, this level of risk in avoiding extinction appears to be socially and scientifically acceptable.

Five recovery criteria were developed based on population theory as well as estimates of the current capability of habitat in the Great Lakes region to support breeding pairs. These criteria are subject to modification as habitat availability is further investigated, critical habitat designation is refined, and viability of the Great Lakes piping plover population is better understood.

Reclassification to threatened status may be considered when Criteria 1-4 are met; removal from the Endangered and Threatened Species list may be considered when all five Criteria are met. Monitoring shall continue for at least 5 years after delisting to ensure maintenance of these criteria.

CRITERIA FOR RECLASSIFICATION TO THREATENED

The Great Lakes population of piping plovers will be considered for reclassification from endangered to threatened status when all of the following criteria are achieved:

Criterion 1. The population has increased to at least 150 pairs with at least 100 breeding pairs in Michigan and 50 breeding pairs distributed among sites in other Great Lakes states.

The recovery objective of the 1988 Great Lakes/Northern Great Plains Piping Plover Recovery Plan specified a population target of 150 breeding pairs for the Great Lakes population, with 100 pairs in Michigan, 35 pairs in Wisconsin and 15 pairs in other Great Lakes states (USFWS 1988b). Because the Great Lakes shoreline is dynamic, breeding sites may be available to plovers in some years but not in others. Use of breeding sites by plovers also varies from year to year. Therefore, maintaining breeding pair goals for states other than Michigan may be unrealistic. Michigan habitat can potentially support 100 or more breeding pairs (see appendix A). We expect that an additional 50 pairs would be supported by essential habitat in states other than Michigan (Table 5).

Criterion 2. Five-year average fecundity has increased to 2.0 fledglings per pair per year across the breeding distribution.

Population modeling efforts suggest that current survival and reproduction rates will not likely sustain a population of 150 pairs. Therefore, a substantial increase in reproductive success must occur to achieve and maintain the target population at a size that preserves sufficient genetic diversity and avoids extinction due to random events.

Criterion 3. Essential breeding habitat in the Great Lakes and wintering habitat is protected.

Currently, habitat degradation and loss represent the greatest threat to successful recovery of the piping plover. Adequate essential breeding and wintering habitat must be protected to recover the Great Lakes population and support it into the future. Initial efforts to protect essential habitat have been undertaken through designation of critical habitat in the Great Lakes.

Table 5. Essential breeding habitat in the Great Lakes outside Michigan

State/County	Location	Ownership	Plover Use	Potential Pairs ^a
Illinois				
Lake	Illinois Beach State Park	state	historic ^b	15
Indiana				
Porter	Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore	Federal/state	recent ^c (transient)	3
Minnesota				
St. Louis	Duluth Harbor	private/state	recent	1-2
New York				
Oswego & Jefferson	Salmon River to Stony Point	private/state	historic	3
Ohio				
Lake	Headlands Dunes State Nature Preserve	state	potential ^d	1
Erie	Sheldon Marsh Nature Preserve	state	recent (transient)	2
Pennsylvania				
Erie	Presque Isle State Park	state	recent (transient)	3
Wisconsin				
Ashland	Long Island/Chequamegon Pt	Federal	recent	10-20
Douglas	Wisconsin Point/Interstate Island	state	recent	2-3
Manitowoc	Point Beach State Forest	state	historic	1-2
Marinette	Seagull Bar	municipal	historic	1-2
Canada				
Ontario	Long Point	National/ provincial/ private	historic	15-20 ^e

^a Potential capacity of breeding pairs are preliminary estimates and were based roughly on the size and physical quality of the habitat, if known, or on personal communications with local experts. Because thorough surveys to quantify existing physical habitat throughout the Great Lakes have not been done, it is likely that all potential habitat has not been identified. Therefore, these preliminary breeding pair estimates should not be construed as definitive population limits or as management targets for individual states or breeding sites.

^b Historic = used for breeding prior to the 1980s.

^c Recent Transient = recently used but not for breeding.

^d Potential = no record of nesting but habitat is suitable.

^e Potential pairs for Canadian Great Lakes are not counted toward U.S. recovery goal.

Essential breeding habitat is currently defined as any Great Lakes shoreline that meets the physical characteristics of piping plover breeding habitat. Appendix A and table 5 list locations with essential breeding habitat in the Great Lakes. Specifically, essential habitat includes:

- a. areas recently (since 1980) used by piping plovers for breeding,
- b. areas occupied historically (before 1980) that still contain habitat physically suitable for breeding, or
- c. potential breeding habitat, which is currently defined as areas with:
 - C beach width > 7 m (23 ft)
 - C shoreline length > 0.4 km (0.25 mi)
 - C dune area > 1.95 ha (4.82 ac)
 - C patches of > 0% cobble or debris
 - C areas of beach with up to 50% vegetation cover

Essential wintering habitat is all areas where Great Lakes banded piping plovers are reported in the winter (Table 6). Additional areas are likely as most individuals are not accounted for in the winter.

Migration habitat has not yet been determined but may be added to the definition of essential habitat if identified through investigations of migratory patterns and ecology.

Criterion 4. Genetic diversity within the population is deemed adequate for population persistence and can be maintained over the long-term.

Small population size and potentially limited natural opportunities for genetic exchange with the other larger breeding populations justify investigation of the genetic diversity present in the Great Lakes population and its genetic similarities with the other breeding populations. If genetic research strongly indicates the lack of genetic diversity threatens the population, methods to supplement gene flow to ensure species recovery will be considered.

CRITERIA FOR DELISTING

The Great Lakes population of piping plovers will be considered for delisting when all of the above criteria (1-4) are achieved, plus:

Criterion 5. Agreements and funding mechanisms are in place for long-term protection and management activities in essential breeding and wintering habitat.

Long-term agreements and mechanisms to fund protection efforts are necessary to prevent reversal of population increases after removal from the Endangered and Threatened Species list. Agreements should also provide for monitoring to evaluate whether population targets are maintained successfully.

Table 6. Winter locations of piping plovers known to have nested or hatched in the Great Lakes region, 1993-2000

State/County	Location	Ownership	# Individuals
GULF OF MEXICO COAST			
Florida			
Collier	Marco Island	state	6
Pinellas	Honeymoon Island State Park	state	2
Pinellas/Pasco	Anclote Key	state	3
Louisiana			
St. Bernard Parish	Chandeleur Islands	Federal	1
Texas			
Cameron	South Padre Island	Federal/state	3
ATLANTIC COAST			
Florida			
Duval	Little Talbot/Little Bird Island	state	2
Georgia			
Chatham	Little Tybee Island	municipal	1
	Ossabaw Island	state	1
Liberty	St. Catherine's Island	private	1
Glynn	Jekyll Island		1
	Little St. Simon's Island	private	19
McIntosh/Glynn	Altamaha/Egg Island Bar/Wolf Island	Federal/state	12
North Carolina			
Dare	Pea Island National Wildlife Refuge	Federal	1
South Carolina			
Georgetown	Litchfield By the Sea	private	1

B. Stepdown Recovery Action Outline

The stepdown outline lists actions required to meet recovery objectives. Recovery objectives can be accomplished by: 1) protecting piping plover breeding populations, and manage habitat, 2) protecting wintering piping plovers and managing wintering habitat, 3) identifying and protecting migration habitat, 4) conducting scientific research to facilitate recovery efforts, 5) developing and implementing public education and outreach, 6) developing funding mechanisms and partnerships, 7) developing methods to prevent extirpation, and 8) reviewing and revising recovery actions.

The stepdown outline and narrative are presented in order of task category; priority level of each sub-task is indicated at the end of the task description in parentheses. Implementation of all actions with Priority **(1)** is essential to prevent the

endangered Great Lakes population of piping plovers from becoming extinct in the foreseeable future. Implementation of all actions with Priority level **(2)** is necessary to prevent a decline in population numbers or habitat quality and quantity. Actions assigned Priority **(3)** are necessary to create an increasing trend toward recovery of the endangered Great Lakes population of piping plovers.

Tasks are listed in order of priority and their costs outlined in the Implementation Schedule.

1. Protect the Great Lakes piping plover breeding population and manage breeding habitat to maximize survival and fecundity.
 - 1.1 Coordinate survey, monitoring, and management efforts in breeding range.
 - 1.11 Coordinate seasonal field activities at biannual meetings of Breeding Range Coordination Group. (1)
 - 1.12 Coordinate survey in Michigan to ensure consistent coverage and effort among years. (1)
 - 1.13 Identify survey coordinators and survey sites for other Great Lakes states and Ontario. (1)
 - 1.14 Develop standard, range wide monitoring and reporting protocol. (1)
 - 1.15 Develop guidelines and conduct annual training workshops for seasonal piping plover monitors. (1)
 - 1.16 Continue to support a coordinator to oversee data collection, maintain databases, analyze field data, and disseminate results. (1)
 - 1.17 Develop agreements with private landowners and townships to allow monitoring and management efforts on private and municipal lands. (1)
 - 1.18 Develop and implement protection guidelines for unoccupied or historic breeding habitat on state and Federal lands via MOU/MOA. (1)
 - 1.19 Organize and train volunteers to patrol nesting areas. (2)
 - 1.2 Monitor and manage breeding pairs and reproductive success.

- 1.21 Survey known, historic, and potential breeding sites to locate breeding piping plovers. (1)
- 1.22 Reduce predation and disturbance of breeding piping plovers.
 - 1.221 Protect nests with predator exclosures and limit human activity in nesting areas with fencing and signs. (1)
 - 1.222 Clarify policies and protocol for predator control/removal and implement when and where warranted. (1)
 - 1.223 Report dog leash law infractions in nesting areas and work with state and Federal conservation officers to increase enforcement. (1)
 - 1.224 Evaluate and enhance current use of vehicle blockades and discourage vehicle use on public and privately owned land with piping plovers. (1)
- 1.3 Protect natural processes that maintain dune ecosystems and essential breeding habitat.
 - 1.31 Identify and update essential habitat in Great Lakes region. (1)
 - 1.32 Work to minimize development and encourage activities that prevent degradation or destruction of essential habitat on public lands in the breeding range. (1)
 - 1.33 Protect breeding population from oil spills in Great Lakes waterways. (1)
 - 1.34 Work to minimize development and encourage activities that prevent degradation or destruction of essential habitat on private lands in the breeding range.
 - 1.341 Incorporate protection of breeding areas into land use plans and existing permitting processes. (2)
 - 1.342 Develop guidelines for landowner Habitat Conservation Plans. (2)
 - 1.35 Assess and foster compatibility of management with efforts that benefit other threatened and endangered Great Lakes species. (3)

- 1.36 Restore and acquire habitat.
 - 1.361 Control vegetation and conduct cobble nourishment at marginal breeding sites when and where appropriate. (3)
 - 1.362 Purchase habitat and increase protection through conservation easements, deed restrictions, etc. (2)
- 2. Protect wintering piping plovers and manage habitat to promote survival and recruitment.
 - 2.1 Organize protection efforts for wintering piping plover populations.
 - 2.11 Create a Wintering Grounds Coordination Group to organize protection efforts on piping plover's wintering range. (1)
 - 2.12 Organize winter surveys to locate banded birds and identify key wintering areas for the Great Lakes population. (1)
 - 2.13 Annually monitor wintering populations at sites with sightings of birds banded in the Great Lakes. (1)
 - 2.14 Reduce disturbance to piping plovers at wintering sites by humans and pets. (1)
 - 2.15 Protect wintering populations from oil spills. (1)
 - 2.16 Identify and reduce additional threats to winter populations. (1)
 - 2.2 Protect natural processes that maintain coastal ecosystems and quality wintering habitat.
 - 2.21 Identify and update essential wintering habitat. (1)
 - 2.22 Work to minimize development and encourage activities that will prevent degradation or destruction of essential wintering habitat. (1)
 - 2.23 Assess and foster compatibility of winter management with efforts that benefit other threatened and endangered species. (3)
 - 2.24 Work with states to protect wintering habitat on private lands through conservation easements, deed restrictions, land purchases, or other appropriate mechanisms. (2)

3. Identify and protect migration habitat.
 - 3.1 Compile information from ornithological literature to identify probable migration sightings in each of the Great Lakes states and Ontario and along migratory pathways. (2)
 - 3.2 Target bird watching groups in each state and Ontario and request assistance in locating migrating piping plovers. (2)
 - 3.3 Identify and reduce threats to habitat and migrating piping plovers at key migration sites. (3)
4. Conduct scientific research to facilitate recovery efforts.
 - 4.1 Continue to study survival, recruitment, dispersal, and ecology by color-banding Great Lakes population. (2)
 - 4.2 Study breeding ecology.
 - 4.21 Investigate factors influencing nest densities at breeding sites.
 - 4.211 Study food resources at occupied and unoccupied breeding habitat. (3)
 - 4.212 Quantify other factors (disturbance, predation) limiting piping plovers at current and historic breeding sites. (2)
 - 4.22 Investigate relationship of brood home range size to biotic and abiotic factors. (3)
 - 4.3 Study migration ecology if important migration sites can be identified. (3)
 - 4.4 Study wintering ecology and distribution.
 - 4.41 Continue to investigate winter distribution. (2)
 - 4.42 Characterize physical characteristics of wintering habitat. (2)
 - 4.43 Determine spatial and temporal use of wintering habitat by piping plovers with focus on sites known to be used by Great Lakes population. (3)
 - 4.5 Evaluate effect of contaminants on piping plovers.

- 4.51 Analyze contaminant residues in salvaged eggs and carcasses. (2)
- 4.52 Analyze contaminant levels in prey at known wintering sites for Great Lakes population. (3)
- 4.53 Determine if registered pesticide use poses threat to breeding or wintering piping plovers or food base. (1)
- 4.6 Investigate genetic variation within the Great Lakes population and among the three breeding populations. (2)
- 4.7 Refine population viability models as new data become available. (3)
- 5. Develop and implement public education and outreach.
 - 5.1 Develop and promote seasonal natural history programs for state parks and National Lakeshore users in the Great Lakes region. (3)
 - 5.2 Conduct landowner contact and education programs to promote awareness of status and threats to piping plovers. (2)
 - 5.3 Make educational presentations to citizen groups in communities in or near piping plover habitat. (3)
 - 5.4 Prepare several press releases annually to apprise the public of the piping plover's special status, biology, and management. (2)
 - 5.5 Evaluate and improve current educational materials and methods of distributing them. (3)
 - 5.6 Design a piping plover sign appropriate for use on privately-owned land. (2)
 - 5.7 Evaluate and improve educational opportunities and materials in zoos. (3)
- 6. Develop partnerships and additional funding mechanisms.
 - 6.1 Identify similar or overlapping conservation efforts by other agencies to reduce redundancy and increase complementarity. (3)
 - 6.2 Create regional interagency task forces to develop funding initiatives for recovery efforts on wintering and breeding grounds. (3)
- 7. Develop emergency methods to prevent extirpation.

- 7.1 Evaluate criteria for use of population augmentation strategies on the Great Lakes population. (1)
- 7.2 Develop a protocol for population augmentation.
 - 7.21 Captive-rear abandoned clutches while the population is below 50 pairs and reevaluate 50 pairs as a threshold for this task. (1)
 - 7.22 Evaluate potential for a pro-active captive-rearing program and outline methods for use. (1)
 - 7.23 Evaluate translocation as an augmentation tool for piping plovers; assess benefits compared to captive-rearing and captive-breeding. (3)
 - 7.24 Re-evaluate role of zoos in piping plover conservation efforts and coordinate with American Zoo and Aquarium Association (AZA) and appropriate zoos to develop desired elements of captive breeding program and reintroduction techniques.
 - 7.241 Re-evaluate the role of zoos in piping plover conservation efforts through annual review of zoo section 10 permits. (2)
 - 7.242 Coordinate with AZA and appropriate zoos to develop desired elements of captive breeding program and reintroduction techniques. (3)
 - 7.25 Establish networks necessary to determine and implement population augmentation protocol. (3)
- 8. Review progress toward recovery and revise recovery tasks annually, as appropriate. (3)

C. Narrative for Recovery Actions

1. **Protect the Great Lakes piping plover breeding population and manage habitat to maximize survival and fecundity.** Efforts to protect nests and manage recreation at Atlantic breeding sites have demonstrated that intensive management can achieve substantial increases in piping plover reproductive success and population numbers (USFWS 1996). Conservation biology theory and population modeling suggest the Great Lakes population will not persist for more than a few decades without a substantial increase in reproductive success and protection of existing habitat. Immediate expansion of intensive protection efforts to include all essential habitat is necessary to prevent extirpation from the

Great Lakes. Appendix A provides a preliminary list of current and needed management actions for Michigan breeding sites within essential breeding habitat for the Great Lakes population. Updates to Appendix A will occur as new information becomes available regarding the current understanding of what constitutes essential piping plover habitat.

1.1 Coordinate survey, monitoring, and management efforts in breeding range. Since 1994, an informal coordination group involving the USFWS, representatives of state and Federal agencies and other land management organizations, seasonal field technicians, and Michigan working group members have met annually to plan management efforts for the year. These meetings function as the backbone of recovery efforts and have resulted in increased coordination, efficiency of piping plover protection and management efforts, and information sharing.

1.11 Coordinate seasonal field activities at biannual meetings of Breeding Range Coordination Group. (1) The Breeding Range Coordination Group should include census coordinators and key land managers from other Great Lakes states and Ontario. Several meetings held at the end of the breeding season identified management issues on breeding areas needing attention. Holding an additional meeting at the end of the breeding season allows adequate time to address issues the following year. These meetings should continue to be held twice annually (pre- and post-breeding season).

1.12 Coordinate surveys in Michigan to ensure consistent coverage and effort among years. (1) Annual surveys of breeding areas in Michigan are conducted to locate nests for monitoring reproductive success, assessing population trends, and success of protective management efforts. Extensive surveys have covered known breeding areas in many counties and some historic breeding areas. Because survey effort tends to vary among years, some sites are visited only once every five years during the International Piping Plover Census. Observations of unbanded fledglings indicate that not all nests were found and that surveys need to be expanded. The USFWS should develop and maintain a complete list of sites that need checking for piping plover activity and identify parties responsible for checking sites each year.

1.13 Identify survey coordinators and survey sites for other Great Lakes states and Ontario. (1) As the number of breeding pairs in Michigan has gradually increased in recent years, breeding pairs have apparently expanded into more distant breeding areas. In

addition, birds breeding for the first time tend to nest far from their natal sites. In 1998, a pair of piping plovers banded as chicks in Michigan was fortuitously discovered nesting at Chequamegon Point, Long Island, Ashland Co., Wisconsin. As the Great Lakes population recovers, the incidence of piping plovers recolonizing historic habitat outside Michigan will likely increase. The USFWS should establish a network of census coordinators in other Great Lakes states and Ontario and generate lists of sites for annual surveys for each state. Survey coordinators should report sightings of banded birds to the USFWS, East Lansing, Michigan Field Office and the bander.

1.14 Develop standard, range wide monitoring and reporting protocol. (1) Quantity and quality of data provided by piping plover monitors varies. Developing a standard, range wide monitoring and reporting protocol will allow consistency in data collection and accurate measurement of population trends and progress toward recovery goals. At a minimum, data reported should include:

- date monitoring began and ended,
- monitoring interval,
- nesting chronology including dates and numbers (pairs located, nests initiated, exclosures erected, eggs hatched, chicks fledged or disappeared, re-nests initiated, birds dispersed),
- locations of nests and brood foraging territories within sites,
- known and suspected reasons for chick loss,
- sightings of banded birds,
- locations of commonly used foraging areas throughout the season,
- problems encountered with exclosures, trespassers, dogs, vehicles, etc., and
- recommendations or improvements for future management.

1.15 Develop guidelines and conduct annual training workshops for seasonal piping plover monitors. (1) Piping plover monitors are responsible for management which directly affects birds. Improper management may have detrimental consequences. Field skills and knowledge of piping plover biology and behavior vary among seasonal personnel who are supervised by several different agencies. A handbook describing appropriate methods for locating nests, erecting predator exclosures, and identifying abandoned nests (among other activities) will help ensure effective and non-

disruptive monitoring and management. A handbook would also facilitate consistent methods to protect piping plovers throughout the Great Lakes region. The USFWS should use the best available information to develop the handbook which should include maps and contact lists in addition to protocol and information on the piping plover. Handbooks will need to be updated annually as new information is obtained. Field personnel would receive updated handbooks annually. A required workshop for field personnel led by experienced piping plover biologists early in the season would provide hands-on experience in locating birds and nests, setting up predator exclosures, and other duties.

1.16 Continue to support a coordinator to oversee data collection, maintain databases, analyze field data, and disseminate results.

(1) The extensive information generated on nest locations, number of nesting pairs, habitat use and movements, reproduction, and banded individuals requires someone to coordinate data collection and manage and analyze resulting databases. Information generated from the data would be used to evaluate progress toward recovery and direct protective management each year. Ideally the data manager will have field and analytical experience with the ability to coordinate training for field personnel and oversee data collection.

1.17 Develop agreements with private landowners and townships to allow monitoring and management efforts on private and municipal lands.

(1) One such agreement is currently in place in Burt Township, Alger County, Michigan. Developing similar agreements with landowners is important because approximately one-third of piping plover nests occur on private or municipal lands; therefore survival of this population depends on the protection of piping plovers from take on private lands. To reduce risk of illegal take, local conservancies should secure protection on private lands by negotiating long-term agreements that will allow standard monitoring and management efforts.

1.18 Develop and implement protection guidelines for unoccupied or historic breeding habitat on state and Federal lands via MOU/MOA.

(1) Approximately two-thirds of piping plover nests and most historic breeding habitat occur on publicly-owned state and Federal land. Frequently piping plovers are observed at parks early in the breeding season but are driven off or discouraged from nesting because immediate protection from disturbance is not currently provided. Development and implementation of standard,

region-wide guidelines for protecting potential nesting piping plovers when they are discovered on previously unoccupied state or Federal lands will expedite protection and increase the likelihood piping plovers will reproduce in these areas. The USFWS should develop guidelines and create a Memorandum of Understanding/Agreement with state and Federal land management agencies. There are no MOU or MOAs in place at this time.

1.19 Organize and train volunteers to patrol nesting areas. (2) For several years, volunteers have patrolled active breeding areas in some state and National Parks and educated the public about threats to piping plovers during busy holiday weekends. Regular patrol of nest sites in high recreation areas should also occur. State and Federal agencies are responsible for organizing volunteers and training them in compatible techniques. The USFWS should continue to organize and train volunteers, and evaluate the use of volunteers on an annual basis to determine if patrols are cost-effective in reducing risks to nesting piping plovers.

1.2 Monitor and manage breeding pairs and reproductive success. A network of public agency staff and seasonal field workers monitor activities and reproductive success of all piping plover pairs and use management techniques to protect piping plovers and educate the public. Monitoring breeding pairs and reproductive success is necessary to determine population trends and evaluate effectiveness of management and progress toward recovery goals.

1.21 Survey known, historic, and potential breeding sites to locate breeding piping plovers. (1) Effective expansion of protection efforts on the breeding grounds depends on the ability to identify areas currently used by piping plovers. In Michigan, piping plovers readily nest at suitable breeding sites that were unoccupied for a number of years and also will nest in new areas. Therefore, it is important that piping plover researchers annually census all known current and historic breeding areas as well as potential habitat to determine management needs and further identify essential/critical habitat. Initially, censuses should occur early in the breeding season (first or second week of May) to locate nesting piping plovers; several visits should be made later in the breeding season (mid-June and mid-July) to identify late nesting and re-nesting attempts.

1.22 Reduce predation and disturbance of breeding piping plovers. Throughout the breeding range, research has shown that reducing

depredation of eggs, chicks and adults, and minimizing disturbance of adults and chicks by humans and pets, can effectively increase piping plover reproductive success.

1.221 Protect nests with predator exclosures and limit human activity in nesting areas with fencing and signs. (1)

Consistent use of predator exclosures has significantly increased hatching success of piping plover nests but does not provide protection to mobile chicks after hatching. Limiting human activity in breeding areas by strategic placement of psychological fencing provides additional protection to piping plovers during courtship, nest-building, incubation, and brood-rearing. Public agency staff and trained volunteers should erect predator exclosures and fencing around all nesting areas to reduce risk of take during the breeding season on public land and private lands (where landowners have granted access). See appendix D for guidelines on use of predator exclosures.

1.222 Clarify policies and protocol for predator control/removal and implement when and where warranted. (1)

Predation is an important limiting factor for piping plover populations throughout the breeding range. Establishment of predator control/removal protocols for all sites and identification of responsible parties for implementation of a suite of predator control actions is needed. The NPS, for example, may need to reevaluate and clarify policies on predator management when predators jeopardize piping plovers, especially breeding adults. The need to control or remove specific predators that pose a threat to nesting adults should be assessed annually by field personnel and land managers. Removal of predators by lethal or non-lethal means should be pursued as necessary with sensitivity to public relations.

1.223 Report dog leash law infractions in nesting areas and work with state and Federal conservation officers and local animal control officers to increase enforcement. (1)

Domestic dogs have killed piping plovers, and experts frequently suspect dogs as the cause of disappearing chicks. Repeated disturbance by dogs may compromise piping plover reproduction and survival. Michigan State Parks prohibit dogs on swimming beaches and require a 2m (6ft) leash at all times. Dog leash laws are currently not well

enforced on state land and increased enforcement will reduce risk of take. Land managers and field personnel should contact local conservation officers early in the breeding season and apprise them of the potential threat dogs present to piping plovers at individual breeding sites. Field personnel should report leash law infractions to local conservation officers and to the Report All Poaching Hotlines (Michigan: 1-800-292-7800). If landowners' dogs jeopardize piping plovers in breeding areas on private land, education and subsequent law enforcement action may be necessary.

1.224 Evaluate and enhance current use of vehicle blockades and discourage vehicle use on public and privately-owned land with piping plovers. (1) Vehicle use occurs at a number of piping plover breeding areas and endangers both adults and chicks. Placement of boulders or guardrails at vehicle access points has helped keep vehicles off public beaches. The Piping Plover Coordination Group should assess current placement of vehicle blockades and possible needed enhancements, and make recommendations to appropriate land managers as necessary. Field personnel should report incidents of unlawful vehicle use on Michigan beaches to the Report All Poachers Hotline. Landowners need to be informed of the risk of taking endangered species by driving through nesting areas on their land.

1.3 Protect natural processes that maintain dune ecosystems and essential breeding habitat. Ecosystems the piping plover inhabits throughout the year are dynamic and dependent on natural processes of sediment deposition, erosion, and scouring for maintenance. Shoreline dredging, construction of break-walls, jetties, marinas, and rip rap disrupt these processes by altering sedimentation patterns or hydrology. Beach stabilization and “nourishment” projects also degrade the quality of beach habitat for piping plovers and other coastal species. To ensure adequate habitat for survival, reproduction and recovery, natural processes within the ecosystems piping plovers utilize must be protected.

1.31 Identify and update essential habitat in Great Lakes region. (1) A preliminary definition of essential habitat for breeding appears in the Objective and Criteria section. This information is based on current and historic breeding site use by piping plovers, characteristics of past nest sites, and potential of habitat for

reproduction based on physical characteristics and threats. This information should be reviewed for updating at least once every three years.

- 1.32 Work to minimize development and encourage activities that prevent degradation or destruction of essential habitat on public lands in the breeding range. (1)** Public land managers should limit activities that reduce the likelihood of piping plover use, preventing alteration of physical and biological components of essential habitat. In addition, they should maintain and improve features of historic habitat to increase the likelihood that piping plovers will re-colonize historic breeding areas. Construction practices, pollution control, pesticide application, and recreation management should maintain or improve conditions for foraging, nesting, and brood-rearing.
- 1.33 Protect breeding population from oil spills in Great Lakes waterways. (1)** Atlantic Coast oil spills have resulted in oiled piping plovers. Oils spills are also a risk to piping plovers breeding on the Great Lakes. The USFWS Region 3 should contact appropriate individuals in Region 5 to gather information on how to rehabilitate oiled piping plovers. Region 3 should also coordinate with other USFWS regions to develop standard oil spill emergency response protocols (see task 2.15).
- 1.34 Work to minimize development and encourage activities that prevent degradation or destruction of essential habitat on private lands in the breeding range.** The USFWS and other public agencies should discourage activities on private lands that degrade or destroy piping plover habitat.
- 1.341 Incorporate protection of breeding areas into land use plans and existing permitting processes. (2)** Recovery also requires protection and maintenance of essential habitat on private land; therefore, the USFWS should continue to work with local planning and zoning boards to incorporate piping plover protection into existing land use plans and permitting and zoning processes.
- 1.342 Develop guidelines for landowner Habitat Conservation Plans. (2)** Habitat Conservation Plans (HCPs) are plans that seek to mitigate effects of legally permitted actions that may result in incidental take. Development of standard guidelines to assist landowners with preparation of HCPs

will also facilitate protection of breeding and wintering areas that occur within or encompass privately-owned land.

1.35 Assess and foster compatibility of management with efforts that benefit other threatened and endangered Great Lakes species. (3) The plight of the piping plover demonstrates the imperiled nature of the ecosystems it inhabits. Breeding sites of the Great Lakes piping plover provide habitat for a number of species of special conservation concern such as the federally threatened Pitcher's thistle and Houghton's goldenrod, the locally rare Lake Huron tansy (*Tanacetum huronense*) and Lake Huron locust, among other rare species. Additionally, freshwater dunes are features important to the natural heritage of the Great Lakes region. Encouraging compatibility among management efforts for multiple species co-occurring in beach ecosystems may result in more streamlined management processes for all vulnerable species and landscape features. Additionally, consideration of these species as a group for management purposes may lead to more efficient use of limited funding resources.

1.36 Restore and acquire habitat. Full recovery of the Great Lakes population requires preservation of sites that piping plovers currently do not occupy but meet the physical characteristics of breeding habitat. Enhancement of some of these sites by improving the physical characteristics of the habitat or by decreasing levels of human disturbance would increase the likelihood piping plovers will recolonize or utilize them on a regular basis.

1.361 Control vegetation and conduct cobble nourishment at marginal breeding sites when and where appropriate. (3) Observations at breeding sites over the past six or more years suggest that succession may eventually deter piping plovers from nesting at some sites (appendix A). Removal of vegetation to improve suitability of nesting areas on the Atlantic Coast seems to encourage immediate use of treated areas by piping plovers and other shorebirds (USFWS 1996). The physical suitability of other Great Lakes sites, such as Pointe Aux Chenes, Michigan, for piping plover nesting was improved by the addition of cobble. Biologists observed piping plovers utilizing the cobble patches for nesting when they were available (S. Sjogren, District Biologist, USFS, St. Ignace, Michigan, pers. comm., 1996). Researchers should consider sites where piping plover use

has declined due to succession or sand deposition as primary candidates for restoration activities such as vegetation removal (woody vegetation and non-native species) and/or cobble augmentation. Researchers should monitor treated sites to determine the effectiveness of habitat modification in attracting and retaining piping plovers.

1.362 Purchase habitat and increase protection through conservation easements, deed restrictions, etc. (2) The USFWS should work with The Nature Conservancy, local land trusts, and state organizations to assist in the purchase or acquisition of deed restrictions, dedications, and conservation easements. These groups should also identify other mechanisms for protection of private land that meets physical characteristics of piping plover breeding habitat but lacks sufficient protection from human disturbance or development under current ownership.

2. Protect wintering piping plovers and manage habitat to promote survival and recruitment. Piping plovers spend eight or more months annually on the wintering grounds, so threats there can significantly affect individual survival and ultimately, population recovery. Protection and habitat management for piping plovers on the wintering grounds falls short of the protection on the breeding grounds, primarily due to lack of knowledge about winter distribution. Sightings of banded piping plovers during the winter are beginning to identify essential wintering sites for the Great Lakes population. This information allows more focused and stringent protection of these areas.

2.1 Organize protection efforts for wintering piping plover populations. The formation of a Winter Grounds Coordination Group (WCGC) that parallels the Breeding Grounds Group will allow more effective protection efforts for wintering piping plovers. Members of this group should collaborate to establish surveys, as well as monitoring and protection programs for winter populations. This effort will increase knowledge of wintering distribution and threats, allowing more effective protection of wintering areas.

2.11 Create a WCGC to organize protection efforts on piping plover's wintering range. (1) USFWS Regions 4 and 2 should coordinate with USFWS Regions 3, 5, and 6 to initiate formation of a group of USFWS employees, biologists and state land managers in the piping plover's wintering range. This group should convene annually to develop recovery efforts for wintering

sites, assure consistency in monitoring and protection efforts, share information on threats and management efforts across the wintering range, and address conservation issues.

- 2.12 Organize winter surveys to locate banded birds and identify key wintering areas for the Great Lakes population. (1)** Most winter sightings of piping plovers banded in the Great Lakes have been the fortuitous result of informal surveys or research by local amateur ornithologists and agency biologists. There has been no organized effort, other than the International Census, to locate banded piping plovers on the wintering grounds. The USFWS and the WGCG should create a parallel network of individuals and birding groups to survey wintering habitat annually. Such an effort would increase knowledge of winter distribution of Great Lakes breeders.
- 2.13 Annually monitor wintering populations at sites with sightings of birds banded in the Great Lakes. (1)** Piping plovers appear to exhibit fidelity to wintering sites, and several wintering sites that host a number of birds from the Great Lakes population have been identified. Land management agencies should monitor these sites annually to determine trends in piping plover populations and identify potential threats and necessary protection efforts. The WGCG should agree upon consistent monitoring and data reporting methods. Agencies would report banded birds to the WGCG and the Breeding Coordination Group and the Great Lakes piping plover data manager.
- 2.14 Reduce disturbance to piping plovers at wintering sites by humans and pets. (1)** As on the breeding grounds, public land managers should use recreation management techniques such as vehicle and pet restrictions and psychological fencing, to reduce disturbance and risk of take of piping plovers during winter.
- 2.15 Protect wintering populations from oil spills. (1)** The Winter Coordination Group and International Piping Plover Working Group should work with experts to devise emergency response protocol and networks for cleaning up oil/chemical spills, rehabilitating oiled piping plovers, and filing for damages for restoration efforts. The group should make protocol and networks known to piping plover biologists throughout the wintering range so that oiled birds and habitat can be dealt with in the most expeditious manner.

2.16 Identify and reduce additional threats to winter populations.
(1) As winter distribution is further refined and piping plover populations and habitat on the wintering ground are monitored more closely, additional threats to winter populations and essential habitat will likely be discovered.

2.2 Protect natural processes that maintain coastal ecosystems and quality wintering habitat.

2.21 Identify and update essential wintering habitat locations. (1)
Table 6 summarizes initial information on essential wintering habitat from sightings of piping plovers banded in the Great Lakes. Surveys and monitoring of wintering populations and banded piping plovers would allow further definition and refinement of essential wintering habitat. Locations of essential wintering habitat should be reviewed for updating at least every 3 years.

2.22 Work to minimize development and encourage activities that will prevent degradation or destruction of essential wintering habitat. (1) The USACE and the Federal Emergency Management Agency have major programs affecting barrier beach dynamics. USACE issues permits to state and local governments and private parties for shoreline alteration. For example, current placement of dredge spoil in the Laguna Madre negatively affects wintering piping plovers. These agencies must enter into consultation with the USFWS as required by section 7 of the ESA if their activities may affect piping plover populations or their habitat. Accomplishment of this task would result in protection of habitat used by many other species of shorebirds.

2.23 Assess and foster compatibility of winter management with efforts that benefit other threatened and endangered species. (3) As in the Great Lakes region, wintering areas used by Great Lakes piping plovers provide habitat for other species of special concern. On the wintering grounds, piping plovers co-occur with the federally threatened sea beach amaranth and loggerhead sea turtle. Again, encouraging coordination among beach ecosystems management efforts would likely result in more streamlined management for all species considered and benefit the entire ecosystem.

2.24 Work with states to protect wintering habitat on private lands through conservation easements, deed restrictions or other appropriate mechanisms. (2) State and Federal ownership protects much wintering habitat, but wintering piping plovers may benefit from acquisition or protective legal agreements on privately owned land. More information on winter distribution and threats to piping plovers at wintering sites would determine which private sites are candidates for purchase or other protection. The USFWS and the Winter Grounds Coordination Group should contact state and local land trusts to identify mechanisms for private land protection in each state and work with willing landowners to apply protection.

3. Identify and protect migration habitat. While little is known about sites used by migrating piping plovers, availability of quality migration sites is likely important to piping plover survival. This task is currently of lower priority than others, but may be elevated to Priority 1 if information suggests migration sites are limiting or highly threatened.

3.1 Compile information from ornithological literature to identify probable migration sightings in each of the Great Lakes states and Ontario and along migratory pathways. (2) Preliminary efforts suggest that compilation of migrating piping plover sightings from ornithological literature (e.g., state bird journals and Audubon reports) would greatly aid identification of probable migration sites and routes. This information would allow targeting of areas to survey for migrating piping plovers and assess potential threats. Initially, the effort should compile literature from all Great Lakes states (Illinois, Indiana, Michigan, Minnesota, New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania and Wisconsin) and Ontario. The literature search may expand to inland states along potential migration routes if initial investigations suggest inland stopover sites exist.

3.2 Target bird watching groups in each state and Ontario and request assistance in locating migrating piping plovers. (2) Bird watchers are a largely untapped resource that can help locate migrating piping plovers and key migration areas. The USFWS should contact bird watching groups in each state and Ontario by telephone and follow-up with mailings identifying potential migration sites and request assistance in checking these areas for piping plovers between April 15 and May 15. A web-page linked to popular bird websites could track sightings and may increase bird watchers' interest in this effort.

- 3.3 Identify and reduce threats to habitat and migrating piping plovers at key migration sites. (3)** Once probable migration sites are identified, information on threats to habitat and migrating piping plovers should be gathered for each site from local agencies/sources or from new surveys if no local information source can be identified.
- 4. Conduct scientific research to facilitate recovery efforts.** Research has provided key information to management agencies involved with recovery efforts for this population. Additional research will refine current management efforts in both breeding and wintering habitat.
- 4.1 Continue to study survival, recruitment, dispersal, and ecology by color-banding Great Lakes population. (2)** Color-banding the breeding population has contributed greatly to knowledge of adult and juvenile survival, recruitment of juveniles into the breeding population, dispersal and distribution in the breeding range and wintering grounds, and has aided ecological studies. Identification and monitoring of key wintering sites for this population depends on continued color-banding on the breeding grounds. Color-banding of the Great Lakes population should continue at least until 2003 (in concert with intensive efforts to locate banded birds on the wintering grounds) after which the need for additional color-banding should be assessed. Color-banding of captive-reared individuals, however, should continue for the duration of captive-rearing efforts to gather information on survival and reproduction by these individuals.
- 4.2 Study breeding ecology.** The breeding ecology of piping plovers has been generally well studied, but additional investigations are needed to help determine essential habitat and management efforts for both unoccupied essential habitat and active breeding areas, especially during the brood-rearing phase.
- 4.21 Investigate factors influencing nest densities at breeding sites.** The amount of habitat needed to support a recovered population in the Great Lakes region depends on the densities at which breeding piping plovers occupy sites. Nesting densities likely depend on habitat quality, physical habitat features, available food resources, and other factors, such as disturbance and predator populations. These factors have not been measured or are poorly known for most breeding areas.
- 4.211 Study food resources at occupied and unoccupied breeding habitat. (3)** Nordstrom and Ryan (1996) published the only food resources study for piping plovers in the Great Lakes region. They sampled invertebrates from

occupied habitat in North Dakota and unoccupied habitat in Michigan and found greater biomass of insects in the North Dakota breeding areas. They surmised that food limitation may occur in the Great Lakes region. Thorough sampling of a variety of shoreline microhabitats in Michigan over the breeding is needed before this conclusion can be accepted. Sampling food resources at both occupied and historic breeding areas in the Great Lakes region would help determine if prey limitation influences piping plovers' utilization of sites and may help prioritize historic sites for preservation.

4.212 Quantify other factors (disturbance, predation) limiting piping plovers at current and historic breeding sites. (2)

Disturbance and predation likely limit piping plover densities, diminish breeding success, or deter piping plovers from using certain breeding areas. Quantification of levels of disturbance and predator activity at current and historic breeding areas would help determine where human use or predator management should occur. With little additional effort, these data could be gathered during annual habitat surveys and monitoring of breeding pairs.

4.22 Investigate relationship of brood home range size to biotic and abiotic factors. (3) Observations (Shutt 1996; Fadroski 1998) have shown that the extent of shoreline used by piping plover broods is highly variable. The minimum area needed for brood survival is unknown and may be specific to breeding area and dependent on factors such as food resources, physical features of the beach, disturbance levels, predation risks, and presence of other piping plover families. Investigations of these factors in relation to brood home range size would aid management directed at protecting broods and increasing fledging success at breeding sites.

4.3 Study migration ecology if important migration sites can be identified.

(3) If important migration sites are identified, ecological studies would help identify threats to migrating piping plovers and determine management needed to protect birds during this stage. Studies should focus on identifying the timing and duration of use of migration sites by piping plovers, the area and area types of habitat used, as well as how it is used. Additionally, studies should include identification of the major threats to migrating piping plovers at these sites, and how to alleviate them.

- 4.4 Study wintering ecology and distribution.** The winter distribution of piping plovers is very widespread, but a large proportion (53%) of birds winter along the Gulf Coast of Texas (Plissner and Haig 2000a), with about 15% of all piping plovers wintering on South Padre Island (K. & K. Drake, pers. comm., 1999). This region deserves greater attention with regard to conservation; however, winter sightings of Great Lakes piping plovers suggest that a focus on preservation of the Texas Gulf Coast alone may not ensure the survival of the Great Lakes population. Most reports of birds from this population are from the southern Atlantic Coast and Gulf Coast of Florida. Greater effort at pinpointing the winter distribution of the Great Lakes population would help identify wintering habitat in need of preservation and management for this population's continued survival.

Very little is known about wintering ecology of piping plovers, particularly in areas that currently appear to be key wintering sites for the Great Lakes population (e.g., Altamaha Estuary, Georgia, and Marco Island, Florida). Studies focusing on wintering sites where piping plovers that were banded in the Great Lakes region have been sighted will help determine threats and shape protective management. This management also would benefit piping plovers breeding on the Northern Great Plains and Atlantic Coast that winter in the same areas.

- 4.41 Continue to investigate winter distribution. (2)** The International Piping Plover Census has conducted surveys of winter populations once every 5 years since 1991. This census should continue to provide population trend information and identify additional key wintering sites. Previous censuses identified areas requiring greater survey effort (e.g., Louisiana, Texas, Mexican Gulf Coast and Caribbean islands)
- 4.42 Characterize physical characteristics of wintering habitat. (2)** Information characterizing piping plover foraging and roosting habitat is lacking for sites on the Atlantic and Gulf coasts of Florida. Characterization at multiple scales (from microhabitats to landscapes) in a number of different regions is needed to determine appropriate protection actions for wintering habitat.
- 4.43 Determine spatial and temporal use of wintering habitat by piping plovers with focus on sites known to be used by Great Lakes population. (3)** Research along the Texas Gulf Coast indicates that piping plovers use different habitats for foraging and resting and that temporal and spatial factors influence these patterns of habitat use. Development of protective management

for wintering Great Lakes piping plovers requires habitat use data along the Atlantic and Gulf coasts.

- 4.5 Evaluate effect of contaminants on piping plovers.** Elevated contaminant levels in eggs of some Great Lakes piping plovers suggest that exposure to contaminants may jeopardize this population. Further study would determine if contaminant loads are detrimental, pinpoint the sources of contaminants, and ascertain if pesticide use in breeding and/or wintering areas warrants stricter regulation.
- 4.51 Analyze contaminant residues in salvaged eggs and carcasses. (2)** The USFWS should continue to analyze contaminant levels in addled eggs and carcasses salvaged from the Great Lakes population and attempt to track residue levels in eggs of banded females to identify potential sources of exposure (breeding vs. wintering areas). Contaminant analysis of tissue from live piping plovers (e.g. blood, feathers) should be pursued if signs of threat from contamination are indicated by observation of: 1) decreased hatching, fledging, or juvenile return rates not attributed to predation, 2) deformed chicks, 3) altered adult breeding behavior following a reduction in human disturbance on breeding grounds, and 4) analysis of available specimens continues to indicate high contaminant levels in tissues.
- 4.52 Analyze contaminant levels in prey at known wintering sites for Great Lakes population. (3)** Analysis of prey at major breeding sites suggests that breeding areas are not likely the primary source of contaminants to the Great Lakes population. A parallel study of known wintering sites of Great Lakes piping plover will aid understanding of contaminant levels present in prey throughout the range.
- 4.53 Determine if registered pesticide use poses threat to breeding or wintering piping plovers or food base. (1)** Pesticide use in breeding and wintering areas may threaten piping plovers directly and/or impact the food base. The magnitude, timing, and proximity of pesticide applications to breeding and wintering areas of Great Lakes birds should be assessed from local sources. Results would be used to identify areas where further study of pesticide impacts on shorebirds may be warranted or where pesticide use needs stricter regulation.
- 4.6 Investigate genetic variation within the Great Lakes population and among the three breeding populations. (2)** Populations that remain small for many years may lose the genetic variability required for long-

term survival in the face of environmental change. An assessment of the genetic variability of the Great Lakes population and its distinctness from the other two breeding populations would indicate whether genetic concerns exist for this population. Development of genetic markers for the three breeding populations is currently underway and should help clarify this question (S. Haig, USGS-BRD, Oregon State University, pers. comm., 1998). The USFWS should continue to provide tissue for Haig's study. Techniques (such as translocation of individuals from other populations) are available to increase genetic variability if low variability threatens population persistence. Increasing genetic variation in the Great Lakes population may become a recovery task if evidence suggests low genetic variation negatively affects fitness (for example, reduced hatching success, impaired reproductive behavior, or reduced fertility).

- 4.7 Refine population viability models as new data become available. (3)** Population viability models are useful for evaluating quantitative recovery goals and the impact of different management strategies on population trends. Initial models require refinement as better data on survival, dispersal, habitat, and genetics become available.

- 5. Develop and implement public education and outreach.** Effective management to protect the piping plover depends on the public abiding by protective regulations. Intense human activity on piping plover breeding and wintering areas each year create a great need and opportunity for public education. Public education efforts within Michigan are diverse; current programs should continue and be expanded to reach other Great Lakes audiences.

- 5.1 Develop and promote seasonal natural history programs for state park and National Lakeshore users in the Great Lakes region. (3)** The state park and National Park Service systems protect a large amount of piping plover breeding habitat. A natural history program on the piping plover and the dune ecosystem it inhabits, presented in state and National Parks, and Natural Areas having Great Lakes shoreline, would reach a large audience of residents and visitors. This program should educate users of public lands about the importance of piping plover dune ecosystem protection.

- 5.2 Conduct landowner contact and education program to promote awareness of status and threats to piping plover. (2)** The cooperation of private landowners in piping plover protection and research has been vital to the success of recovery efforts in the Great Lakes. Appropriate organizations (e.g., TNC, MNFI, local land trusts) in cooperation with the USFWS should conduct a contact program to promote awareness of piping plover status for private owners of occupied, historic, or potential habitat occurring in both the breeding and wintering ranges.

- 5.3 Make educational presentations to citizen groups in communities in or near piping plover habitat. (3)** The USFWS in cooperation with conservation groups or land conservancies should target citizen groups (landowner associations and township boards) for educational presentations in communities affected by piping plover recovery efforts. These presentations will enhance communication among natural resource agencies and communities and cultivate positive attitudes in people affected by recovery efforts.
- 5.4 Prepare several press releases annually to apprise the public of the piping plover's special status, biology, and management. (2)** The USFWS should continue to use press releases in Michigan to promote public understanding of the piping plover's endangered status, biology, and management. Also, in cooperation with state natural resource agencies, the USFWS should develop appropriate press releases for other states in the Great Lakes region and in the wintering range.
- 5.5 Evaluate and improve current educational materials and methods of distributing them. (3)** The USFWS piping plover brochure and elementary school slide program need periodic revision to include current information and improved designs. The USFWS should continue to revise existing educational videos on piping plovers in the Great Lakes. The USFWS also should periodically evaluate the use and educational effectiveness of these materials through consultation with professional educators and primary users such as state and National Park Service staff and elementary school teachers. Additionally, the USFWS should continue to broaden its audience by providing brochures, videos, and slide programs to state and Federal agencies, nature centers, zoos and others involved in public education and piping plover recovery. Finally the USFWS should develop an ongoing distribution program for these materials.
- 5.6 Design a piping plover sign appropriate for use on privately-owned land. (2)** Current signs available for use with psychological fencing of nesting areas are geared toward beach closures on publicly-owned land. The USFWS should coordinate with local communities to gather input to create an appropriate sign for use on private land.
- 5.7 Evaluate and improve educational opportunities and materials in zoos. (3)** Several zoos in the Great Lakes region currently have piping plovers rescued from the Great Plains population on exhibit. The locations of the zoos present opportunities to educate the public in the Great Lakes region about the piping plover. The USFWS should collaborate with zoos having piping plover educational materials and

programs to evaluate their effectiveness and to find ways to expand education opportunities. Materials should emphasize methods to reduce threats to the Great Lakes population in the broader context of the North American distribution of this species. Piping plover educational programs should be evaluated annually to assess effectiveness.

6. **Develop partnerships and additional funding mechanisms.** The piping plover cannot survive without continual management of breeding and wintering areas due to its beach-dwelling habits and sensitivity to disturbance. Development of a self-sustaining network of partnerships with cooperating agencies, conservation organizations, and landowners is needed to ensure future management that will promote piping plover survival. This network, along with long-term mechanisms for the funding of management activities, would ensure long-term protection and management of breeding and wintering areas.

- 6.1 **Identify similar or overlapping conservation efforts by other agencies to reduce redundancy and increase complementarity. (3)** A number of conservation organizations have programs directed at protecting the piping plover as an element of biological diversity. The USFWS should identify overlapping efforts by other agencies/organizations and collaborate with these groups to reduce duplication and increase complementarity of efforts. Collaboration and coordination among organizations should increase the efficiency with which funds are used to manage and protect piping plovers.

- 6.2 **Create regional interagency task forces to develop funding initiatives for recovery efforts on wintering and breeding grounds. (3)** The USFWS should foster creation of regional interagency task forces for both breeding and wintering grounds. Groups composed of a few key personnel (upper level managers and fund-raisers) from state, Federal and Provincial agencies and non-governmental organizations would comprise the task forces. The task forces should meet at least once annually (prior to the Management Coordination Groups) to collaborate on obtaining funding for recovery efforts and to identify or develop long-term funding mechanisms for protection of piping plovers and their habitat.

7. **Develop emergency methods to prevent extirpation.** Emergency methods to rescue the population from extirpation (e.g., captive-rearing, translocation of eggs/juveniles from other populations, captive breeding) are potentially important strategies for recovery. Prior to implementation, methods need to be developed and criteria established that would trigger action on these tasks. Delays in planning for emergency population rescue results in limited choices. Planning delays directly affect the ability to prevent extinction of rapidly declining wild populations and reestablishment of populations in the wild from captive stock.

- 7.1 Evaluate criteria for use of population augmentation strategies for use on the Great Lakes population. (1)** Population augmentation should commence only if the population fails to increase significantly after tasks to improve reproductive success and protect habitat have been fully implemented throughout the breeding range. Population augmentation should commence only after tasks to increase reproductive success are fully implemented (should occur by 2005) and the population fails to increase to a rate where it will reach 50 pairs by 2020, or if the population falls below 10 pairs and the total adult population is below 22 individuals. These criteria require reevaluation as population dynamics, risk factors and costs of implementing population augmentation become better understood.
- 7.2 Develop a protocol for population augmentation.** Development of appropriate methods to augment the Great Lakes population requires thorough knowledge of species biology and adequate prior testing. In addition to captive-rearing abandoned eggs, methods recommended to boost the endangered Great Lakes population from perilously low levels include proactive captive-rearing (using eggs produced locally by double-clutching ,Michigan DNR 1987), translocation of eggs or individuals from other populations, and captive breeding in zoos. Each method poses risks that, while not fully understood, may affect the ultimate success of augmentation measures. For example, translocating individuals from other populations may significantly alter the genetic makeup of the Great Lakes population, potentially resulting in outbreeding depression⁵ and increased risk of disease transmission. In the case of double-clutching, the effects of egg or clutch removal on piping plovers' immediate or subsequent behavior (i.e., site fidelity) and reproductive success remains unknown. Adult survival, return rates, and reproductive success of piping plovers reared in captivity remain poorly known. Like translocation, introducing captive-reared birds into the wild gene pool may alter genetic diversity depending on the egg collection strategy and increase the possibility of disease transmission to wild stock. In addition to biological risks to the species, population augmentation efforts involve considerable costs, logistics, and political implications. Finally, successful implementation of augmentation measures requires removal of the causes of population declines, unsaturated and sufficiently protected habitat, and appropriately developed technology for augmentation (Kleiman and Beck 1994).

⁵Outbreeding depression is negative evolutionary fitness that results from mixing two very genetically dissimilar populations.

- 7.21 Captive-rear abandoned clutches while the population remains below 50 pairs and reevaluate 50 pairs as a threshold for this task. (1)** At a population size of < 50 breeding pairs, failure of one or more clutches to hatch represents a significant or even dangerous reduction in reproduction, especially in years of low fledging rates. Captive-rearing of abandoned piping plover eggs in Michigan has supplemented natural fledging rates 10% to 17%. Several captive-reared individuals have returned to breeding areas, exhibited normal breeding behavior and produced young. Others have returned and appear to exhibit natural behavior but have not nested. Captive-rearing appears to have important potential for population enhancement. However, captive-rearing methods remain costly and pose risks (e.g., incorrect determinations of abandonment - see appendix E for guidelines for determining abandonment for captive-rearing purposes). Hence, continued use of this emergency measure requires clearly defined criteria. A significant increase in population would allow lowering the priority of this task to three. Continued captive-rearing for a specified number of nests in a portion of the range may be considered to expedite population increases.
- 7.22 Evaluate potential for a proactive captive-rearing program and outline methods for use. (1)** Proactive captive-rearing involves a systematic and deliberate effort to take piping plover eggs from the wild for the purpose of rearing and reintroduction the same breeding season. Research should be undertaken to fully understand the potential risks and benefits of a formal captive-rearing program. Researchers from universities, wildlife agencies, and zoos should individually, or in collaboration, evaluate the feasibility of an active program to captive-rear piping plover eggs from the wild. This research should fully investigate the potential biological, genetic, and political implications for such a program, as well as describe the methods and materials required to undertake such a program. To the degree possible, research should utilize existing population viability models to evaluate potential captive-rearing scenarios. Other programs to captive-breed and/or captive-rear piping plovers or other endangered species for reintroduction, should be examined for applicability to the Great Lakes piping plover population.
- 7.23 Evaluate translocation as an augmentation tool for piping plovers; assess benefits compared to captive-rearing and captive breeding. (3)** Translocation from other populations may be preferable to double-clutching within the Great Lakes

population because translocation decreases the risk of negatively affecting the Great Lakes population through egg manipulation and removal. Potential impediments to translocation include lack of available wild stock from one of the other breeding populations, high cost, greater genetic and disease risks, and logistic problems similar to captive-rearing. An evaluation of the relative benefits of each method requires clarification of population increase desired and level of risk tolerable to attain the increase.

7.24 Re-evaluate the role of zoos in piping plover conservation efforts and coordinate with the American Zoo and Aquarium Association (AZA) and appropriate zoos to develop desired elements of captive breeding program and reintroduction techniques. USFWS permitted zoos to keep piping plovers that were rescued from the Missouri River in 1995. The objective of the zoo programs are to 1) provide the public an opportunity to see and learn about piping plovers and 2) maintain a captive population to supply zoos and provide stock for reintroduction⁶ in the unlikely event that the wild population crashes and wild birds from other populations are not available. Current permits do not allow a formal captive breeding effort and provide few guidelines for zoos. The USFWS in concert with the AZA Piping Plover Specialist Group should reevaluate the role of zoos in Great Lakes piping plover conservation efforts and establish agreements to develop captive breeding criteria if captive breeding is deemed an important strategy for recovery.

7.241 Reevaluate the role of zoos in piping plover conservation efforts through annual review of zoo section 10 permits. (2) The USFWS should annually reevaluate ESA section 10 permits issued to zoos that keep piping plovers. The USFWS should also require an annual report that describes the status of piping plovers in captivity, progress towards improved husbandry techniques, and any zoo activities including education that relate to the piping plover. Any zoo that houses a piping plover should sign an agreement with the USFWS to participate in the recovery program.

⁶Reintroduction is the release of captive-bred animals into a species historical range to reestablish or augment wild populations.

7.242 Coordinate with AZA and appropriate zoos to develop desired elements of a captive breeding program and reintroduction techniques. (3) Reintroduction of zoo-raised piping plovers into the wild is not currently considered a task needed for recovery of the Great Lakes population. However, zoos should seek to maintain captive populations that have characteristics desirable for reintroduction in the event it becomes necessary in the Great Lakes. Zoos should carefully manage breeding to maintain genetic diversity and provide environmental enrichment for captive piping plovers by simulating natural environments to promote skills necessary for survival in the wild. For example, zoos should house piping plovers in coastal exhibits with access to pools (preferably with realistic wave action), suitable cover in the form of native species of vegetation, driftwood and cobble, and live food to maintain natural foraging skills. Additionally, zoos should house piping plovers in groups to allow natural social behavior and in exhibits large enough to allow flight. The USFWS should establish relationships with zoos and the AZA to develop guidelines for piping plover husbandry in the event captive breeding of piping plovers is identified as a task necessary for recovery. Any captive breeding program should be developed in close coordination with recovery plan goals.

7.25 Establish networks necessary to determine and implement population augmentation protocol. (3) The USFWS should establish relationships with groups and individuals needed for population augmentation efforts (e.g. natural resource agencies, wildlife veterinarians, field biologists, population geneticists, zoos) to develop protocols and lay the groundwork for possible future implementation. Once a particular augmentation method is chosen, protocol development should consider:

- source of supplemental stock,
- collection procedures,
- transportation procedures,
- husbandry techniques,
- genetic and medical screening methods,
- pre-release training (e.g. predator avoidance training for plovers),
- appropriate release sites and time periods,
- post-release training for plovers,
- monitoring procedures,
- community education about effort,
- criteria to evaluate the success of the effort,

- responsible parties for carrying out each action, and,
- implementation costs.

8. Review progress toward recovery and revise recovery tasks as appropriate. (3) Progress on recovery of the Great Lakes population involves many parties in many different states and requires a high degree of coordination and communication. Annual review of progress is needed to ensure changes or recommendations are conveyed to field personnel in time for incorporation into seasonal field efforts. The USFWS should host an annual workshop for the interagency task force and the Piping Plover Management Coordination Group to bring wintering and breeding grounds personnel into contact for smooth and effective flow of information. These groups should also review recovery efforts and apply adaptive management strategies as additional information becomes available and progress towards recovery is made. Tasks should be updated as needed.

D. Literature Cited

- Allan, T. 1993. Ecology and management of the piping plover in the Upper Peninsula of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, Lansing. 8 pp.
- American Ornithologists' Union. 1945. Twentieth supplement to the checklist of North American birds. *Auk* 62:426-449.
- American Ornithologists' Union. 1957. Checklist of North American birds. 5th edition. Baltimore, Maryland. 691 pp.
- American Ornithologists' Union. 1983. Checklist of North American birds. 6th edition. Lawrence, Kansas. 877 pp.
- American Ornithologists' Union. 1998. Checklist of North American birds. 7th edition. Lawrence, Kansas. 829 pp.
- Beissinger, S. R. and M. I. Westphal. 1998. On the use of demographic models of population viability in endangered species management. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 62:821-841.
- Bent, A. C. 1929. Life histories of North American shorebirds. U.S. Natural Museum Bulletin 146:236-246.
- Bergstrom, P. W. 1991. Incubation temperatures of Wilson's plovers and killdeers. *Condor* 91:634-641.
- Bottitta, G. E. 1997. Piping plovers produce two broods. *Wilson Bulletin* 109:337-339.
- Bowles, M. L., M. M. DeMauro, N. Pavlovic, and R. D. Hiebert. 1990. Effects of anthropogenic disturbances on endangered and threatened plants at the Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore. *Natural Areas Journal* 10:187-200.
- Brock, K. 1986. *Birds of the Indiana Dunes*. Indiana University Press, Bloomington. 178 pp.
- Burger, J. 1987. Physical and social determinants of nest site selection in piping plover in New Jersey. *Condor* 98:811-818.
- Burger, J. 1991. Foraging behavior and the effect of human disturbance on the piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*). *Journal of Coastal Research* 7:39-52.

- Burger, J. 1994. The effect of human disturbance on foraging behavior and habitat use in the piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*). *Estuaries* 3:695-701.
- Cairns, W. E. 1977. Breeding biology and behavior of the piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) in southern Nova Scotia. MS thesis, Dalhousie University. 115 pp.
- Cairns, W. E. 1982. Biology and behavior of breeding piping plovers. *Wilson Bulletin* 94:531-545.
- Canadian Wildlife Service. 1993. Canadian piping plover recovery plan. Ontario, Canada. 18 pp.
- Caughley, G. 1994. Directions in conservation biology. *Journal of Animal Ecology* 63:215-244.
- Caughley, G. and A. Gunn. 1996. Conservation biology in theory and practice. Blackwell Scientific, Cambridge, Massachusetts. 459 pp.
- Climo, L. 1997. A landscape-level analysis of piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) winter habitat. MS thesis. University of Minnesota, St. Paul. 52 pp.
- Cottrille, B. D. 1957. Summer distribution of the piping plover in Michigan. *Jack-Pine Warbler* 35:26-33.
- Cross, R. 1990. Monitoring, management and research of the piping plover at Chincoteague National Wildlife Refuge. Unpublished report. Located at: Virginia Department of Game and Inland Fisheries, Richmond, Virginia. 80 pp.
- Cuthbert, F. J., B. Scholtens, L. C. Wemmer, and R. McLain. 1999. Gizzard contents of piping plover chicks in northern Michigan. *Wilson Bulletin* 111:121-123.
- Cuthbert, F. J., J. L. D. Smith, C. L. Jolls, B. Scholtens, and L. Wemmer. 1998. Conservation of biodiversity in coastal systems of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: the U.S. Forest Service Experiment Station, St. Paul, Minnesota. 28 pp.
- Cuthbert, F. J. and L. C. Wemmer. 1999. The Great Lakes Recovery Program for the piping plover: a progress report. Pages 8-17 in: K. F. Higgins, M. R. Brashier and C.D. Kruse, editors. Proceedings, piping plovers and least terns of the Great Plains and nearby. South Dakota State University, Brookings.
- Day, C. G., M. T. Chezick, and T. Augspurger. 1991. Environmental contaminants in New Jersey coast piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) eggs. Unpublished report. Located at: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, New Jersey Field Office, Pleasantville. 12 pp.

- Doolittle, A. W. 1998. The use of captive rearing in the recovery of the Great Lakes piping plover: a modeling approach. Paper presentation, North American Ornithological Conference, 6-12 April, St. Louis, Missouri.
- Drake, K. L. 1999. Time allocation and roosting habitat of sympatrically wintering piping plovers (*Charadrius melodus*) and snowy plovers (*C. alexandrinus*). MS thesis. Texas A&M University-Kingsville. 59 pp.
- Drake, K. R. 1999. Movements, habitat use, and survival of wintering piping plovers. MS thesis. Texas A&M University-Kingsville. 82 pp.
- Elias, S. P., J. D. Fraser, and P. A. Buckley. 2000. Piping plover brood foraging ecology on New York barrier islands. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 64:346-354.
- Faanes, C. 1983. Aspects of the nesting ecology of least tern and piping plovers in central Nebraska. *Prairie Naturalist* 15:145-154.
- Fadroski, K. A. 1998. Home range size in piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) juveniles from hatching until natal site dispersal. Unpublished report. Research Experience for Undergraduates Program. Located at: University of Michigan Biological Field Station, Pellston, Michigan. 22 pp.
- Flemming, S. P., R. D. Chiasson, P. C. Smith, P. J. Austin-Smith, and R. P. Bancroft. 1988. Piping plover status in Nova Scotia related to its reproductive and behavioral responses to human disturbance. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 59:321-330.
- Frankel, O. H. and M. E. Soulé. 1981. Conservation and evolution. Cambridge University Press. England. 327 pp.
- Franklin, I. R. 1980. Evolutionary change in small populations. Pages 135-139 in: M. E. Soulé and B. A. Wilcox, editors, Conservation biology: An evolutionary-ecological perspective. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- Germain, K. and K. Struthers. 1994. Piping plover chick mortality study at Wilderness State Park, Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, East Lansing, Michigan Field Office. Sept. 29, 1994. 32 pp.
- Germain, K. and K. Struthers. 1995. A survey of piping plover historical nesting sites in Michigan's northern lower peninsula. Unpublished report. Located at: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, East Lansing, Michigan Field Office. 42 pp.

- Gilbertson, M., T. Kubiak, J. Ludwig, and G. Fox. 1991. Great Lakes embryo mortality, edema, and deformities syndrome (GLEMEDS) in colonial fish-eating birds: similarity to chick-edema disease. *Journal of Toxicology and Environmental Health* 33:455-520.
- Goldin, M. R. and J. V. Regosin. 1998. Chick behavior, habitat use, and reproductive success of piping plovers at Goosewing Beach, Rhode Island. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 69:228-234.
- Haig, S. M. 1992. Piping plover. Pages 1-18 *in*: The birds of North America, No. 2 A. Poole, P. Stettenheim, F. Gill, editors. American Ornithologists' Union, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania.
- Haig, S. M. and L. W. Oring. 1985. The distribution and status of the piping plover throughout the annual cycle. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 56:334-345.
- Haig, S. M. and L. W. Oring. 1988a. Genetic differentiation of piping plovers across North America. *Auk* 105:260-267.
- Haig, S.M. and L. W. Oring. 1988b. Mate, site, and territory fidelity in piping plovers. *Auk* 105:268-273.
- Haig, S. M. and L. W. Oring. 1988c. Distribution and dispersal in the piping plover. *Auk* 105:630-638.
- Haig, S. M. and J. H. Plissner. 1993. Distribution and abundance of piping plovers: results and implications of the 1991 International Census. *Condor* 95:145-156.
- Hoffman, D. J., C. P. Rice, and T. J. Kubiak. 1996. PCBs and Dioxins in Birds. Chapter 7. Pages 165-207 *in*: W. N. Beyer, G. H. Heinz and A.W. Redmon-Norwood, editors. Environmental contaminants in wildlife: interpreting tissue concentrations. CRC Press, Inc., New York, New York.
- Hoopes, E. M. 1994. Breeding ecology of piping plovers nesting in at Cape Cod National Seashore. National Park Service, South Wellfleet, Massachusetts. 34 pp.
- Hoopes, E. M., C. R. Griffen, and S. M. Melvin. 1992. Relationships between human recreation and piping plover foraging ecology and chick survival. Unpublished report. Located at: the University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 77 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. Located at: the Department of Forestry and Wildlife Management, University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 34 pp.

- Johnson, C. M. and G. A. Baldassarre. 1988. Aspects of the wintering ecology of piping plovers in coastal Alabama. *Wilson Bulletin* 100:214-223.
- Jones, L. K. 1997. Piping plover habitat selection, home range, and reproductive success at Cape Cod National Seashore, Massachusetts. M.S. Thesis. University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 96 pp.
- Kleiman, D. G. and B. B. Beck. 1994. Criteria for reintroductions. Chapter 14. Pp. 287-303 *in*: P. J. S. Olney, G. M. Mace and A. T. C. Feistner, editors. *Creative Conservation: interactive management of wild and captive animals*. Chapman and Hall, New York, New York.
- Lacy, R. C., K. A. Hughes, and P. S. Miller. 1995. VORTEX: a stochastic simulation of the extinction process. Version 7. IUCN/SSC Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, Apple Valley, Minnesota.
- Lambert, A. and B. Ratcliff. 1979. A survey of piping plovers in Michigan. Report located at the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing. 36 pp.
- Lambert, A. and B. Ratcliff. 1981. Present status of the piping plover in Michigan. *Jack Pine Warbler* 59:44-52.
- Lingle, G. R. and J. G. Sidle. 1993. Observations of leg injuries in the piping plover. Pp. 195-196 *in*: K. F. Higgins and M. R. Brashier, editors. *Proceedings, the Missouri River and its tributaries: piping plover and least tern symposium*. South Dakota State University, Brookings.
- Lingle, G. R., J. G. Sidle, A. Hecht, and E. M. Kirsch. 1999. Observations of banding-related leg injuries in the piping plover. Pp. 118-124 *in*: K. F. Higgins, M. R. Brashier and C.D. Kruse, editors. *Proceedings, piping plovers and least terns of the Great Plains and nearby*. South Dakota State University, Brookings.
- Loegering, J. P. 1992. Piping plover breeding biology, foraging ecology, and behavior on Assateague Island National Seashore, Maryland. MS thesis. Virginia Polytechnic Institute and State University, Blacksburg. 247 pp.
- Loegering, J. P. and J. D. Fraser. 1995. Factors affecting piping plover chick survival in different brood-rearing habitats. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 59:646-655.
- Mace, G. M. and R. Lande. 1991. Assessing extinction threats: toward reevaluation of IUCN threatened species categories. *Conservation Biology* 5:148-157.

- MacIvor, L. H. 1990. Population dynamics, breeding ecology, and management of piping plovers on outer Cape Cod, Massachusetts. MS thesis. University of Massachusetts, Amherst. 100 pp.
- Matteson, S. W. 1996. Birds of Wisconsin's lake beaches and dunes. *The Passenger Pigeon* 58:335-413.
- Matteson, S. W. and F. C. Strand. 1988. Management and reintroduction of the piping plover in Wisconsin – 1987. Bureau of Endangered Resources, Wisconsin Endangered Resources Report 44. Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison. 10 pp.
- Matteson, S. W. and P. Manthey. 1998. Conservation of endangered, threatened and nongame birds. Performance report, 1 July 1997 to 30 June 1998. Bureau of Endangered Resources, Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources, Madison. 13 pp.
- Meffe, G. K. and C. R. Carroll. 1997. *Principles of Conservation Biology*. 2nd edition. Sunderland, Massachusetts Sinauer Associates, Inc. 729 pp.
- Melvin, S. M. and J. P. Gibbs. 1994. Viability analysis for the Atlantic Coast population of piping plovers. Unpublished report located at: the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Sudbury, Massachusetts. 16 pp.
- Melvin, S. M., A. Hecht, and C. R. Griffin. 1994. Piping plover mortalities caused by off-road vehicles on Atlantic Coast beaches. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 22:409-414.
- Michigan Department of Natural Resources. 1987. Michigan piping plover recovery plan. Wildlife Division, Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing. 41 pp.
- Moser, R. A. 1942. Should the belted plover be recognized as a valid race? *Nebraska Bird Review* 10:31-37.
- Nicholls, J. L. and G. A. Baldassarre. 1990. Habitat selection and interspecific associations of piping plovers wintering in the United States. *Wilson Bulletin* 102:581-590.
- Nordstrom, L. H. 1990. Assessment of habitat suitability for reestablishment of piping plovers in the Great Lakes National Lakeshores. M.S thesis. University of Missouri, Columbia. 120 pp.

- Nordstrom, L. H. and M. R. Ryan. 1996. Invertebrate abundance at occupied and potential piping plover nesting beaches: Great Plains alkali wetlands vs. the Great Lakes. *Wetlands* 16:429-435.
- Olivero, A. P. 1994. Great Lakes piping plover habitat characteristics, reproductive success, and habitat availability. Research Experiences for Undergraduates Program. Located at: University of Michigan Biological Station, Pellston, Michigan. 48 pp.
- Palmer, R. S. 1967. Piping plover. Page 2 *in*: G. D. Stout, editor. *The shorebirds of North America*. Viking Press, New York, New York.
- Perles, S. 1995. Characteristics and functions of the lining of piping plover nests in the Great Lakes region. Unpublished report. Research Experiences for Undergraduates Program. Located at: University of Michigan Biological Station, Pellston, Michigan. 18 pp.
- Pfister, C., B. A. Harrington and M. Lavine. 1992. The impact of human disturbance on shorebirds at a migration staging area. *Biological Conservation* 60:115-126.
- Pike, E. 1985. The piping plover at Waugoshance Point. *Jack-Pine Warbler* 63:36-41.
- Plissner J. H. and S. M. Haig. 2000a. 1996 International piping plover census. Report located at: U.S. Geological Survey-Biological Resources Division, Forest and Rangeland Ecosystem Science Center, Corvallis, Oregon. 231 pp.
- Plissner, J. H. and S. M. Haig. 2000b. Metapopulation models for piping plovers (*Charadrius melodus*). *Biological Conservation* 92:163-173.
- Powell, A. N. 1991. Great Lakes piping plover: recovery or extirpation? *Endangered Species Update* 8:1-4.
- Powell, A. N. and F. J. Cuthbert. 1990. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing. 15 pp.
- Powell, A. N. and F. J. Cuthbert. 1991. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the Lower Peninsula of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Lansing. 15 pp.
- Powell, A. N. and F. J. Cuthbert. 1992. Habitat and reproductive success of piping plovers nesting on Great Lakes islands. *Wilson Bulletin* 104:155-161.

- Powell, A. N. and F. J. Cuthbert. 1993. Augmenting small populations of plovers: an assessment of cross-fostering and captive-rearing. *Conservation Biology* 7:160-168.
- Powell, A. N., F. J. Cuthbert, L. C. Wemmer, A.W. Doolittle, and S. T. Feirer. 1997. Captive-rearing piping plovers: developing techniques to augment wild populations. *Zoo Biology* 16:461-477.
- Prater, A. J., J. H. Marchant, and J. Vuorinen. 1977. Guide to the identification and ageing of holarctic waders. British Trust for Ornithology Guide #17. Maund and Irvine Ltd., Tring, Herts, England. 168 pp.
- Prindiville, E. M. 1986. Habitat selection and productivity of piping plovers in central North Dakota. M.S. Thesis, University of Missouri, Columbia. 34 pp.
- Prindiville Gaines, E. and M. R. Ryan. 1988. Piping plover habitat use and reproductive success in North Dakota. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 52:266-273.
- Rand, G. M. and S. R. Petrocelli. 1985. Fundamentals of aquatic toxicology. Hemisphere Publishing Corporation, Washington, D.C. 1125 pp.
- Rimmer, D. W. and R. D. Deblinger. 1990. Use of predator exclosures to protect piping plover nests. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 61:217-223.
- Robinson, W. D. 1996. Southern Illinois Birds: An annotated list and site guide. Southern University Illinois Press, Carbondale. 432 pp.
- Root, B. G., M. R. Ryan, and P. M. Mayer. 1992. Piping plover survival rate in the Great Plains. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 63:10-15.
- Ruelle, R. 1993. Contaminant evaluation of interior least tern and piping plover eggs from the Missouri River in South Dakota. Pp. 159-172 *in*: K. F. Higgins and M. R. Brashier, editors. Proceedings, the Missouri River and its tributaries: piping plover and least tern symposium. South Dakota State University, Brookings.
- Russell, R. 1983. The piping plover in the Great Lakes region. *American Birds* 37:951-955.
- Ryan, M. R., B. G. Root, P. M. Mayer. 1993. Status of piping plovers in the Great Plains of North America: a demographic simulation model. *Conservation Biology* 7:581-585.
- Shaffer, F. and P. Laporte. 1994. Diet of piping plovers on the Magdalen Islands, Quebec. *Wilson Bulletin* 106(3):531-536.

- Shaffer, M. L. 1981. Minimum population sizes for species conservation. *BioScience* 31:131-134.
- Shutt, N. 1996. Home range size in Great Lakes piping plovers: implications for conservation and management. Unpublished report. Research Experience for Undergraduates. Located at: University of Michigan Biological Station, Pellston, Michigan. 17 pp.
- Soulé, M. E. 1980. Thresholds for survival: maintaining fitness and evolutionary potential. Pages 151-169 *in*: M.E. Soulé and B.A. Wilcox, editors. *Conservation biology: an evolutionary-ecological perspective*. Sinauer Associates, Sunderland, Massachusetts.
- Soulé, M. E. 1987. Where do we go from here? Pp. 175-183 *in*: M. E. Soulé, editor. *Viable populations for conservation*. Cambridge University Press, New York, New York.
- Staine, K. J. and J. Burger. 1994. Nocturnal foraging behavior of breeding piping plovers (*Charadrius melodus*) in New Jersey. *Auk* 111:579-587.
- Stucker, J. H., and F. J. Cuthbert. 1999. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the state of Michigan, 1999. Unpublished report. Located at: Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, Lansing. 27 pp.
- Stucker, J. H., L. C. Wemmer, and F. J. Cuthbert. 1998. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the State of Michigan, 1993. Unpublished report. Located at: the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, Lansing. 22 pp.
- Temple, S. and R. Cary. 1987. *Wisconsin birds: a seasonal and geographical guide*. University of Wisconsin Press, Madison. 364 pp.
- The Nature Conservancy. 1994. *The conservation of biological diversity in the Great Lakes ecosystem: issues and opportunities*. The Nature Conservancy Great Lakes Program, Chicago, Illinois. 118 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1985. Determination of endangered and threatened status for the piping plover. *Federal Register* 50(238):50720-34.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1988a. *Atlantic Coast piping plover recovery plan*. Newton Corner, Massachusetts. iii+77 pp.

- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1988b. Great Lakes and Northern Great Plains piping plover recovery plan. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Twin Cities, Minnesota. v+160 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1994. Biological opinion on the Harbor of Refuge at Cross Village, Michigan. East Lansing, Michigan Field Office. 28 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1996. Piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*), Atlantic Coast population, revised recovery plan. Hadley, Massachusetts. xi+245 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1997. Recovery plan for Houghton's goldenrod (*Solidago houghtonii* A. Gray). Ft. Snelling, Minnesota. vii+58 pp.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2001. Final determination of critical habitat for the Great Lakes breeding population of the piping plover. Federal Register 66 (88):22938-69.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2001. Recovery data call-East Lansing Ecological Services Field Office. Threatened and Endangered Species System (TESS).
- Welsh, D. and P. M. Mayer. 1993. Concentrations of elements in eggs of least terns and piping plovers from the Missouri River, North Dakota. Pp. 172-181 in: K.F. Higgins and M.R. Brashier, editors. Proceedings, the Missouri River and its tributaries: piping plover and least tern symposium. South Dakota State University, Brookings.
- Welty, J. C. 1982. The life of birds. Saunders College Publishing, Philadelphia, Pennsylvania. 754 pp.
- Wemmer, L.C., U. Özesmi, and F. J. Cuthbert. 2001. A habitat-based population model for the Great Lakes population of the piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*). Biological Conservation 99:169-181.
- Wemmer, L. C. 2000. Conservation of the piping plover (*Charadrius melodus*) in the Great Lakes region: a landscape-ecosystem approach. PhD thesis, University of Minnesota, Twin Cities. 160 pp.
- Wemmer, L. C. and F. J. Cuthbert. 1999. Banding piping plovers in the Great Lakes: an evaluation and new insights. Pages 125-129 in: K. F. Higgins, M. R. Brashier and C.D. Kruse, editors. Proceedings, piping plovers and least terns of the Great Plains and nearby. South Dakota State University, Brookings.
- Wemmer, L. C., A.W. Doolittle, and F. J. Cuthbert. 1993. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the State of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located

at: the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, Lansing. 16 pp.

Wemmer, L. C., A.W. Doolittle, and F. J. Cuthbert. 1994. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the State of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, Lansing. 20 pp.

Wemmer, L. C., F. J. Cuthbert, and S. T. Feirer. 1996. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the State of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, Lansing. 22 pp.

Wemmer, L. C., S. T. Feirer, and F. J. Cuthbert. 1997. Piping plover breeding biology and management in the State of Michigan. Unpublished report. Located at: the Michigan Department of Natural Resources, Wildlife Division, Lansing. 29 pp.

Whyte, A. J. 1985. Breeding ecology of the piping plover in central Saskatchewan. M.S. Thesis, University of Saskatchewan, Saskatoon, Canada. 153 pp.

Wiens, T. P. 1986. Nest-site tenacity and mate retention in the piping plover. MS thesis, University of Minnesota, Duluth. 34 pp.

Wiens, T. P. and F. J. Cuthbert. 1988. Nest-site tenacity and mate retention of the piping plover. *Wilson Bulletin* 100:545-553.

Wilcox, L. 1959. A twenty year banding study of the piping plover. *Auk* 76:129-152.

Zonick, C. and M. Ryan. 1994. Ecology and conservation of piping plovers and snowy plovers wintering along the Texas Gulf Coast. An interim report to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Located at: Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Galveston. Page numbers unknown.

Zonick, C. and M. Ryan. 1995. Ecology and conservation of piping plovers wintering along the Texas Gulf Coast. A final report to the Texas Parks and Wildlife Department and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Located at: Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, Galveston.

Zonick, C., K. Drake, K. Drake, L. Elliot, and J. Thompson. 1998. The effects of dredged material on the ecology of the piping plover and the snowy plover. A report to the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. Galveston, Texas. 147 pp.

Zonick, C.A. 2000. The winter ecology of piping plovers (*Charadrius melodus*) along the Texas Gulf Coast. PhD Dissertation. University of Missouri-Columbia. 169 pp.

E. Additional References

- Byrd, G. V., J. L. Sincock, T. C. Telfer, D. I. Moriarty, and B.G. Brady. 1984. A cross-fostering experiment with Newell's race of Manx shearwater. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 48:1041-1045.
- Drake, K. R., J. E. Thompson, K. L. Drake, and C. Zonick. 2001. Movements, habitat use, and survival of non-breeding piping plovers. *Condor* 103:259-267.
- Harris, M. P. 1969. Abnormal migration and hybridization of *Larus argentatus* and *L. fuscus* after interspecies fostering experiments. *Ibis* 112:488-498.
- Nicholls, J. and G. A. Baldassarre. 1990. Winter distribution of piping plovers along the Atlantic and Gulf Coast of the United States. *Wilson Bulletin* 102:400-412.
- Rowley, I. and G. Chapman. 1986. Cross-fostering, imprinting and learning in two sympatric species of cockatoo. *Behaviour* 96:1-16.
- Vaske, J. J., D. W. Rimmer, and R. D. Deblinger. 1994. The impact of different predator exclosures on piping plover nest abandonment. *Journal of Field Ornithology* 65:201-209.

III. IMPLEMENTATION

The following Implementation Schedule outlines actions and estimates costs over the next three years for recovery of the Great Lakes piping plover population. Some tasks and expenses (e.g., those broadly pertaining to winter populations and habitat) may be repeated in the U.S. Atlantic Coast, Northern Great Plains, and Canadian recovery plans because of overlapping winter distributions. Recovery teams for these regions will collaborate to implement shared tasks in the most cost effective manner. Tasks appear in order of priority.

A. Key to Priority Descriptions in Column 1:

Priority 1: An action that must be taken to prevent extinction or to prevent the species from declining irreversibly.

Priority 2: An action that must be taken to prevent a significant decline in species population/habitat quality, or some other significant negative impact short of extinction.

Priority 3: All other actions necessary to provide for full recovery of the species. (Recognizing that the ultimate success of the Program is species recovery, some priority 3 actions likely to lead to full recovery and delisting of a species in the foreseeable future will tend to rank higher than other priority 3 actions).

B. Key to Agency Designations (Columns 5 and 6):

AZA	American Zoo and Aquarium Association
CWS	Canadian Wildlife Service
ES	USFWS Division of Ecological Services (includes Endangered Species and Environmental Quality)
FEMA	Federal Emergency Management Agency
LE	USFWS Division of Law Enforcement
LMAO	Land Management Agencies and Other Cooperators: This designation includes other local land management agencies (e.g., municipal and county governments), conservation organizations and land trusts (e.g., Little Traverse Conservancy, local and National Audubon Societies, Whitefish Point Bird Observatory), and private individuals that own or manage piping plover wintering or breeding habitat or assist in protection efforts.
MDNR	Michigan Department of Natural Resources
NPS	National Park Service
OMNR	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
R2	USFWS Region 2 (Texas)

R3	USFWS Region 3 (Great Lakes)
R4	USFWS Region 4 (North Carolina to Louisiana)
RSCH	Research institutions
RW	USFWS Division of Refuges and Wildlife (includes Realty)
SCRA	State Coastal Regulatory Agencies
SWA	State Wildlife Management Agencies
TNC	The Nature Conservancy
USACE	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers
USCG	U.S. Coast Guard
USFS	U.S. Forest Service
USFWS	U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
WS	U.S. Department of Agriculture, Wildlife Services (formerly Animal Damage Control)

Key to Columns 7, 8, 9: **FY#** = fiscal year # year(s) after plan was accepted.
TBD = to be determined.

C. Implementation Schedule

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
1	Coordinate survey, monitoring and management efforts in breeding range	1.11	biannual	R3 ES R5 ES	MDNR, NPS, USFS, SWA, LMAO,RS CH, OMNR	1	1	1	
1	Survey known, historic and potential breeding sites to locate breeding piping plovers	1.12 1.21	annual	R3 ES	MDNR, NPS USFS,RSC H LMAO	3	3	3	Costs for travel to census sites.
1	Identify survey coordinators and survey sites for other Great Lakes states and Ontario	1.13	annual	R3 ES R5 ES CWS	SWA, LMAO, OMNR,	2			Initial cost to identify sites and coordinators; additional costs contingent on number of areas to be censused and existence of other funding.
1	Develop standard, range wide monitoring and reporting protocol; develop guidelines and conduct annual training workshops for seasonal piping plover monitors	1.14 1.15	annual	R3 ES	MDNR, NPS, USFS, LMAO	1		cost included in tasks 1.221 1.222	Initial cost to develop protocol and produce manuals.
1	Continue to support a coordinator to oversee data collection, maintain databases, analyze field data and disseminate results	1.16	on-going	R3 ES		25	25	25	

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
1	Develop agreements with private landowners and townships to allow monitoring and management efforts on private and municipal lands	1.17	on-going	R3 ES	TNC, LMAO	80	80	80	
1	Develop and implement protection guidelines for unoccupied or historic breeding habitat on state and Federal lands via MOU/MOA	1.18	annual	R3 ES R5 ES	MDNR, NPS, SWA, CWS/OMN R	60	20	20	
1	Protect nests with predator exclosures and signs/fencing; enforce dog leash laws; evaluate and enhance current use of vehicle blockades	1.221 1.223 1.224	annual	R3 ES LE	MDNR- LE, NPS, USFS, LMAO	130	130	130	Enhancement of vehicle blockades will incur additional cost contingent on need.
1	Clarify policies and protocol for predator control/removal and implement when and where warranted	1.222	as needed	R3 ES	WS, LMAO, SWA, NPS		contingent on areas and numbers of predators		Assess need for predator removal annually.

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
1	Identify and update essential habitat in Great Lakes region	1.31	on-going	R2 ES R3 ES R4 ES R5 ES	RSCH, LMAO, SWA	5	5	5	\$5K each year for breeding; \$3K for updates every 3 years after FY3.
1	Work to minimize development and encourage activities that prevent degradation or destruction of essential habitat on public lands in the breeding range	1.32	on-going	R2 ES R3 ES R4 ES	USACE, SWA, NPS, MDNR, LMAO, USCG	contingent on number of development projects			
1	Protect breeding population from oil spills in Great Lakes waterways	1.33	as needed	R3 ES R5 ES	SWA	dependent on occurrence and magnitude of spills			
1	Create a Wintering Grounds Coordination Group to organize protection efforts on piping plover's wintering range	2.11	annual	R2 ES R3 ES R4 ES R5 ES R6 ES	LMAO, SWA	2	2	2	
1	Organize winter surveys to locate banded birds and identify key wintering areas for the Great Lakes population	2.12	annual	R2 ES RW R4 ES RW	SWA, NPS, LMAO	50	50	50	

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
1	Monitor wintering populations at sites with sightings of birds banded in the Great Lakes	2.13	annual	R2 ES R4 ES		40	40	40	
1	Reduce disturbance to piping plovers at wintering sites by humans and pets	2.14	annual	R2 ES RW LE R4 ES RW LE	SWA	40*	40*	40*	*Costs shared by Atlantic Recovery plan.
1	Protect wintering populations from oil spills	2.15	as needed	R2 ES R4 ES	USCG, SWA, SCRA	contingent on num-ber and magnitude of oil spills			
1	Identify and reduce additional threats to winter populations	2.16	on-going	R2 ES RW R4 ES RW	RSCH	TBD			
1	Identify and update essential wintering habitat	2.21	3 years	R2 ES R3 ES R4 ES R5 ES	RSCH, LMAO, SWA	10	10	10	\$10 K for wintering; \$3K for updates every 3 years after FY3.
1	Work to minimize development and encourage activities that will prevent degradation or destruction of essential wintering habitat	2.22	on-going	R2 ES R4 ES	USACE, USCG, FEMA	contingent on number of development projects			

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
1	Determine if registered pesticide use poses threat to breeding or wintering piping plovers or food base	4.53	2 years	R2 ES R4 ES	RSCH	30	30	2	FY3 cost to compile data and produce reports.
1	Evaluate criteria for population augmentation strategies on the Great Lakes population	7.1	3 years	R3 ES	RSCH	20	20	20	This task should not divert funding from tasks aimed at protecting the wild population or reproductive success
1	Develop population augmentation protocol	7.21 7.22	1 year for development	R3 ES	RSCH	5			Costs may be greater if new information requires update.
2	Organize and train volunteers to patrol nesting areas	1.19	annual	R3 ES	MDNR	3	3	3	
2	Incorporate protection of breeding areas into land use plans and existing permitting processes; develop HCP guidelines.	1.341 1.342	on-going	R3 ES		10	10	10	

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
2	Purchase habitat (breeding and wintering) and increase protection through conservation easements, deed restrictions, etc.	1.362 2.24	on-going	R2 RW R3 RW R4 RW R5 RW	TNC, LMAO		cost dependent on number and area of purchases	Potential costs could exceed 1 million dollars.	
2	Compile information from ornithological literature to identify probable migration sightings in each of the Great Lakes states and Ontario and along migratory pathways	3.1	1 year	R3 ES	RSCH	5			
2	Target birding groups to locate migrating piping plovers; identify and reduce threats at migration sites	3.2 3.3	on-going	R3 ES CWS	SWA, LMAO, OMNR	5	5	5	Additional costs for site protection, depending on number and magnitude of sites and threats.
2	Continue to study survival, recruitment, dispersal, and ecology by color-banding Great Lakes population	4.1	TBD	R3 ES	RSCH	3	3	3	Re-evaluate need for continued banding after 2003; expenses are for travel and may be shared with tasks 1.21 and 1.221 if bander is involved in monitoring and management.

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
2	Quantify factors limiting piping plover use of current and historic breeding sites	4.212	annual	R3 ES R5 ES	SWA, LMAO	5	5	5	
2	Continue to investigate winter distribution	4.41	every 5 years	R2 ES R4 ES	LMAO, SWA				Began in 2001.
2	Characterize physical characteristics of wintering habitat.	4.42	2 years	R2 ES R4 ES	RSCH	30	30		
2	Analyze contaminant residues in salvaged eggs and carcasses	4.51	As needed	R3 ES	RSCH				
2	Investigate genetic variation within the Great Lakes population and among the three breeding populations	4.6	TBD	R3 ES	RSCH		TBD		
2	Conduct landowner contact and education programs to promote awareness of status and threats to piping plovers	5.2	every 3 years	R3 ES	TNC, LMAO	20	20	20	

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
2	Prepare several press releases annually to apprise the public of the piping plover's special status, biology and management	5.4	annual	R3 ES		1	1	1	
2	Design a piping plover sign appropriate for use on privately-owned land	5.6	1 year	R3 ES		1			
3	Assess and foster compatibility of Great Lakes and wintering management with efforts that benefit other threatened and endangered species	1.35 2.23	on-going	R3 ES	TNC, SMA, MDNR				
3	Control vegetation and conduct cobble nourishment at marginal breeding sites when and where appropriate	1.361	on-going	R3 ES R5 ES	MDNR, NPS, SWA	50	50	50	Costs outlined for habitat enhancement only; habitat acquisition will incur additional costs depending on habitat to be purchased.
3	Identify and reduce threats to habitat and migrating piping plovers at key migration sites	3.3	on-going	R3 ES CWS	SWA, LMAO, OMNR	5	5	5	Additional costs for site protection, depending on number and magnitude of sites and threats.

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
3	Study food resources at occupied and unoccupied breeding habitat	4.211	3 years	R3 ES	RSCH	5	5	5	
3	Investigate relationship of brood home range size to biotic and abiotic factors	4.22	3 years	R3 ES	RSCH	5	5	5	
3	Study migration ecology if important migration sites can be identified	4.3	TBD	R3 ES	RSCH	TBD			TBD
3	Determine spatial and temporal use of wintering habitat by piping plovers with focus on sites known to be used by Great Lakes population	4.43	2 years	R2 ES R4 ES	RSCH, SWA, LMAO	30	30		
3	Analyze contaminant levels in prey at known wintering sites for Great Lakes population	4.52	5 years	R3 ES	RSCH	60	60	60	
3	Refine population viability models as new data become available	4.7	1 year	R3 ES	RSCH	5			Contingent on availability of data.

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
3	Develop and promote seasonal natural history programs for state parks and National Lakeshore users in Great Lakes region	5.1	annual	R3 ES	MDNR, SWA, NPS	1			
3	Make educational presentations to citizen groups in communities in or near piping plover habitat	5.3	as needed	R3 ES					
3	Evaluate and improve current educational materials and methods of distributing them	5.5	every other year	R3 ES		1	1		
3	Evaluate and improve educational opportunities and materials in zoos	5.7	every 5 years	R3 E5	AZA	3			
3	Identify similar or overlapping conservation efforts by other agencies to reduce redundancy and increase complementarity	6.1	on-going	R3 ES	TNC, LMAO				

C. Implementation Schedule (cont.)

Priority	Description	Task Number	Task Duration	Responsible Organization		Est. Cost (\$1,000)			Comments
				USFWS	Other	FY1	FY2	FY3	
3	Create regional interagency task forces to develop funding initiatives for recovery efforts on wintering and breeding grounds	6.2	on-going	R3 ES R5 ES		6	6	6	
3	Re-evaluate the role of zoos in piping plover conservation efforts through annual review of zoo section 10 permits; Coordinate with AZA and appropriate zoos to develop desired elements of captive breeding program and reintroduction techniques	7.241 7.242	annually	R3 ES R6 ES	AZA				
3	Review progress toward recovery and revise recovery tasks	8	annual	R3 ES	SWA	3	3	3	

IV. APPENDICES

Appendix A. Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

The following table outlines reproductive patterns in terms of total numbers of breeding pairs, total fledglings produced, maximum number of breeding pairs, last year occupied, and average reproductive success (fledglings per pair) observed at each Michigan site between 1984-1998. The tables also identify recent threats (LL = periodic lake level rises, HD = human disturbance, DG = domestic dogs, SC = succession, DV = intensified development, PR = predator problems, ER = long-term beach erosion, VH = vehicles) observed at each site and management needs based on recurring threats, piping plover use, and current ownership of each site. Some management needs may be on-going. Tables reflect recent and historic records of use by piping plovers and potential for use based on physical characteristics and threats. GIS databases provided approximate shoreline lengths and area of site. Estimated maximum number of breeding pairs that could potentially occupy each site annually were based on approximate shoreline length and densities of one breeding pair per 200 m (656 ft) of shoreline which mirrors high density sites on the Atlantic Coast (S. Melvin, Professor, Department of Forestry and Wildlife, University of Massachusetts, Amherst, pers. comm., 1998). These estimates were designed to aid in a habitat based population viability analysis (see Wemmer et al. 2001) and do not account for differences in habitat dimensions or other factors that may influence carrying capacities at sites. For these reasons and because breeding pair capacities of sites undoubtedly change over time, estimates should not be construed as management targets. This list is not all inclusive and is subject to modification as monitoring efforts and new findings dictate.

Key to “management needs” column with corresponding recovery task numbers:

- 1) increase survey effort to identify piping plover use (1.11, 1.12, 1.13, 1.21)
- 2) intensify monitoring of breeding piping plovers (1.2)
- 3) employ an on-site piping plover warden to monitor piping plovers and deter human disturbance (1.19, 1.221)
- 4) install vehicle blockades or otherwise restrict vehicle access (1.224)
- 5) control predators on sites where they are repeatedly problematic (1.222)
- 6) institute full or partial beach closure to protect piping plovers from high levels of human disturbance (1.19, 1.221)
- 7) educate landowners about status of piping plovers on their land in breeding and wintering ranges (5.2)
- 8) restrict domestic dogs in breeding areas (1.223)
- 9) develop management agreements with landowners (1.17)
- 10) assess need for cobble nourishment or vegetation removal (1.361)
- 11) restrict or regulate building or development at breeding sites (1.32, 1.34)
- 12) assess threats for sites where they are not well known (4.212)
- 13) acquire property or conservation easement (1.362)

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

- 14) conduct public education on public land, including installation of interpretive signs (5.1)

Many breeding sites contain other federally listed species that may require consideration in implementing piping plover management. Rare species or features identified in the Michigan Natural Features Inventory database that occur in or are adjacent to piping plover habitat include: interdunal wetland, open dune system, wooded dune/swale complex, Pitcher's thistle, Houghton's goldenrod, dwarf lake iris, ram's head lady-slipper (*Cypripedium arietinum*), Lake Huron locust, and bald eagle (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*). Only three rare coastal species, rock whitlow-grass (*Draba arabisans*), prairie dunewort (*Botrychium campestre*), and moonwort (*B. acuminatum*), and two community types, cobble beach and bedrock beach, have no known occurrences within essential breeding habitat. Houghton's goldenrod (HG) and Pitcher's thistle (PT) have the largest proportion of all federally listed coastal species falling within piping plover habitat. The table indicates their presence if known from current databases (note: some areas have not been adequately surveyed for these species). The tables also indicate sites nominated as Critical Dune Areas under Michigan's Coastal Zone Management Act of 1972.

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

Site Name	Owner	Approx. area unforested dunes in ha (ac)	Approx. shoreline length in km (mi)	Record Type	Total # pairs (1984-)	Max # pairs in a given yr. '84-98 (estimated)	Reproductive success (fledglings per pair)	Year of last known nest	Critical Dune ?	Recent Threats	Management Needs	Other Fed. Listed Species Present
RECENT SITES : (Nest record from 1984-1998)												
UPPER PENINSULA Alger Co.												
Grand Marais Superior Beach	Federal (NPS) multiple private	27.72 (68.5)	1.20 (0.75)		12	2 (6)	1.08	1998		HD, DV, DG	hire warden, building restrictions, restrict dogs, educate public	
Grand Marais Inner Bay	multiple private	18.22 (45.02)	1.80 (1.12)		16	3 (8)	1.88	1994		DV	educate landowners, building restrictions	
Grand Marais Lonesome Point/ East bay Sucker River	multiple private	5.06 (12.5)	1.05 km (0.65 mi)		13	3 (4)	1.46	1998		HD, PR, DV, VH	restrict dogs, restrict ORV, building restrictions, control predators	
Luce Co.												
Deer Park	state	48.80 (120.58)	2.78 (1.73)		4	1 (13)	1.00	1988		HD	survey effort	
West Beach Little Lake Harbor	private	9.27 (22.91)	1.57 (0.98)		1	1 (7)	0	1987		VH	survey effort, landowner education,	
Crisp Point	municipal	3.05 (7.54)	1.00 (0.62)		4	1 (5)	0.75	1987		HD, ER	survey effort	
Chippewa Co.												
Vermilion/ Weatherhogs	multiple	37.32 (92.22)	2.32 (1.44)		41	7 (11)	1.51	1998		VH, PR	intensify monitoring vehicle blockades, control predators, conservation easement	HG

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

Site Name	Owner	Approx. area unforested dunes in ha (ac)	Approx. shoreline length in km (mi)	Record Type	Total # pairs (1984-)	Max # pairs in a given yr. '84-98 (estimated)	Reproductive success (fledglings per pair)	Year of last known nest	Critical Dune ?	Recent Threats	Management Needs	Other Fed. Listed Species Present
Whitefish Point	private Federal (USCG)	25.59 (63.23)	2.52 (1.57)		2	1 (12)	0	1985		HD	beach closure during migratory period	
Mackinac Co.												
Pointe Aux Chenes	Federal (USFS)	35.96 (88.86)	1.73 (1.08)		9	2 (8)	1.67	1996		SC, PR	cobble nourishment, assess need for vegetation removal,	PT HG
LOWER PENINSULA Emmet County												
Wilderness State Park: Temperance Island	state	2.15 (5.31)	0.14 (0.09)		8	1 (1)	3.00	1998		SC	vegetation removal	PT
Wilderness State Park- Waughshance Point	state	33.32 (82.33)	4.81 (2.99)		38	4 (24)	1.66	1998		PR, HD	beach closure, hire warden	PT HG
Wilderness State Park- Sturgeon Bay	state	43.84 (108.33)	3.91 (2.43)		23	3 (19)	1.61	1998	U	PR, HD	beach closure, hire warden	PT HG
Bliss Township Park	municipal	25.0 (61.77)	1.09 (0.68)		1	1 (5)	3.00	1998	U	HD, DG	restrict dogs, beach closure, hire warden,	
Cross Village Shores	multiple private	42.68 (105.46)	2.35 (1.46)		12	4 (11)	0.67	1998	U	HD, DG, DV	educate landowners, management agreement,	PT HG

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

Site Name	Owner	Approx. area unforested dunes in ha (ac)	Approx. shoreline length in km (mi)	Record Type	Total # pairs (1984-)	Max # pairs in a given yr. '84-98 (estimated)	Reproductive success (fledglings per pair)	Year of last known nest	Critical Dune ?	Recent Threats	Management Needs	Other Fed. Listed Species Present
Cross Village Township Beach and south	municipal multiple private	13.2 (32.62)	1.27 (0.79)		7	2 (6)	1.29	1998		HD, DG, DV, VH	vehicle blockades, management agreement, beach closures, building restrictions,	PT
Cross Village South—Rentrop Property	private	1.97 (4.87)	0.45 (0.28)		1	1 (1)	0	1994		LL, HD	landowner education	
Cross Village South	private	7.60 (18.78)	0.90 (0.56)		10	1 (4)	0.60	1997	U	HD, PR, SC, DG	acquire easement, vegetation removal, restrict dogs	PT
Thome-Swift Preserve	private	2.28 (5.63)	0.42 (0.26)		1	1 (2)	0	1995		HD, DG	survey effort, public education, landowner education	PT
Charlevoix Co.												
Fisherman's Island State Park	state	11.24 (27.77)	1.29 (0.8)		1	1 (6)	0	1996	U	HD, PR, DG	beach closure, intensify monitoring, hire	PT HG
Beaver Island—Donegal Bay	multiple private	28.70 (70.92)	2.04 (1.27)		5	1 (10)	1.20	1995	U	HD, DG, DV	survey effort, building restrictions, landowner education,	PT HG
Beaver Island—McCauley's Point	state	7.74 (19.13)	0.52 (0.32)		1	1 (2)	0	1993	U	SC, DG	landowner education, restrict dogs, survey effort, vegetation	
Beaver Island—McFadden Point	state	22.20 (54.86)	0.76 (0.47)		1	1 (3)	0	1989	U	DV, HD, DG	survey effort, building restrictions, landowner education, restrict dogs	PT

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

Site Name	Owner	Approx. area unforested dunes in ha (ac)	Approx. shoreline length in km (mi)	Record Type	Total # pairs (1984-)	Max # pairs in a given yr. '84-98 (estimated)	Reproductive success (fledglings per pair)	Year of last known nest	Critical Dune ?	Recent Threats	Management Needs	Other Fed. Listed Species Present
High Island	state	43.91 (108.5)	1.84 (1.14)		16	3 (8)	1.38	1997	U	PR	survey effort	PT
Leelanau Co.												
Leelanau State Park—Cathhead Bay	state multiple private	85.31 (210.8)	3.43 (2.13)		9	3 (17)	0.78	1998	U	DV, HD	beach closure, building restrictions, intensify monitoring,	PT
North Manitou Island—Dimmick Point	Federal (NPS)	45.04 (111.29)	2.26 (1.4)		19	3 (11)	1.15	1998		PR	beach closure, control predators intensify monitoring	PT
North Manitou Island—Donner Point	Federal (NPS)	15.47 (38.23)	1.00 (0.62)		3	2 (3)	0.67	1996	U	PR, LL	survey effort, beach closure	PT
Benzie Co.												
Sleeping Bear Dunes—Platte River Mouth and Bay to south	Federal (NPS)	119.01 (294.07)	4.86 (3.02)		6	2 (25)	2.17	1998	U	HD, DG	beach closures, restrict dogs, hire warden, public education	PT
Cheboygan Co.												
Cheboygan State Park – Lighthouse Point	state	8.35 (20.63)	1.36 (0.85)		1	1 (6)	3.00	1989		HD, SC	survey effort, vegetation removal	PT

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

Site Name	Owner	Approx. area unforested dunes in ha (ac)	Approx. shoreline length in km (mi)	Record Type	Total # pairs (1984-)	Max # pairs in a given yr. '84-98 (estimated)	Reproductive success (fledglings per pair)	Year of last known nest	Critical Dune ?	Recent Threats	Management Needs	Other Fed. Listed Species Present
HISTORIC SITES (before 1984)												
Port Inland* (Schoolcraft Co)	state	NA ^A	NA	nest record		(5)		1956		NA	survey effort, assess threats	
De Tour State Forest (Chippewa Co.)	state	NA	NA	nest record		(1)		1979		LL, HD	survey effort	
Grass Bay Preserve* (Cheboygan Co.)	TNC	12.88 (31.83)	1.57 (0.98)	nest record, specimens		(7)		1937		LL, SC	survey effort, protect transient birds	PT HG
South Fox Island (southern tip) (Leelanau Co.)	state	28.32 (69.98)	0.98 (0.61)	specimens		(4)		----	U	HD	survey effort, restrict horses	PT
South Manitou (Leelanau Co.)	Federal (NPS)	NA	NA	sighting		(5)				PR	survey effort, assess threats	
Point Betsie (Benzie Co.)	Federal (USCG) TNC	108.77 (268.77)	2.74 (1.7)	nest record		(4)		1926	U	HD	survey effort, public education, interpretative signs	

^A NA= No data available.

* = Nesting occurred at Port Inland in 1999 and at Grass Bay in 2000.

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

Site Name	Owner	Approx. area unforested dunes in ha (ac)	Approx. shoreline length in km (mi)	Record Type	Total # pairs (1984-)	Max # pairs in a given yr. '84-98 (estimated)	Reproductive success (fledglings per pair)	Year of last known nest	Critical Dune ?	Recent Threats	Management Needs	Other Fed. Listed Species Present
Ludington State Park (Mason Co.)	state	NA	NA	sighting		(41)* shared with Nordhouse Dunes		-----	U	HD	survey effort, public education interpretative signs	PT
Muskegon State Park (Muskegon Co.)	state	NA	NA	nest record		(5)		1954		HD	survey effort	
POTENTIAL SITES												
Two-Hearted River State Park (Luce Co.)	state	3.15 (7.78)	0.84 (0.52)			(4)			U	HD	survey effort	
Harbor Springs—Sevenmile Point (Emmet Co.)	multiple private	5.83 (14.41)	0.50 (0.31)			(2)				LL, HD	landowner education	PT
Petoskey State Park (Emmet Co.)	state	22.88 (56.54)	1.99 (1.24)			(9)			U	HD		PT
North Point Charlevoix (Charlevoix Co.)	municipal	10.70 (26.44)	1.13 (0.7)			(5)			U	HD	survey effort	PT
Cathhead Point (Leelanau Co.)	private	2.90 (7.17)	4.67 (2.9)			(2)			U	LL	landowner education, survey effort	PT

Appendix A (cont.) Characteristics of essential piping plover breeding sites in Michigan

Site Name	Owner	Approx. area unforested dunes in ha (ac)	Approx. shoreline length in km (mi)	Record Type	Total # pairs (1984-)	Max # pairs in a given yr. '84-98 (estimated)	Reproductive success (fledglings per pair)	Year of last known nest	Critical Dune ?	Recent Threats	Management Needs	Other Fed. Listed Species Present
Sleeping Bear Dunes-Platte Bay (Otter Creek) (Leelanau Co.)	Federal (NPS)	NA	NA			(35)			U	HD	survey/monitoring effort	PT
Nordhouse Dunes Wilderness Area (Mason Co.)	Federal (USFS)	NA	NA			see Ludington			U	HD	survey effort, assess threats	PT
P.H. Hoelt State Park (Presque Isle Co.)	state	NA	NA			(2)				HD, DV	survey effort	PT
Thompson Harbor State Park (Presque Isle Co.)	state	NA	NA			NA				NA	survey effort, assess threats	PT HG
Tawas Point State Park (Iosco Co.)	state	NA	NA			(2)				HD	beach closure during migration, public education, interpretive signs	

Appendix B. Federal and state laws applicable to the protection of piping plover

Federal laws

Endangered Species Act of 1973, (16 U.S.C. 1531-1544), as amended. Regulations, in part, at 50 CFR 17 and 50 CFR 402.

Water Pollution Control Act of 1948,(33 U.S.C. 1251-1376) as amended (“Clean Water Act”). Regulations at 33 CFR 320-338.

Migratory Bird Treaty Act of 1918 (16 U.S.C. 703-712), as amended. Regulations at 50 CFR 10.

National Environmental Policy Act of 1969, (U.S.C. 4321-4347), as amended.

State Laws

Alabama All listed species are state protected. There is no state endangered species act. Alabama Code 9-2-2 (1), the Department of Conservation and Natural Resources has the responsibility to protect, conserve, and increase the wildlife of the state.

Florida Florida Endangered and Threatened Species Act, Sections 372.072, 372.0725 of Title 28

Georgia Endangered Wildlife Act (1973)

Illinois Illinois Endangered Species Protection Act-520 ILCS (Illinois Compiled Statutes) 10/

Indiana IC (Indiana Code) 14-22-34

Louisiana RS (Revised Statutes) 56:1901, RS 56:1903, RS 56:1904

Michigan State of Michigan, Part 17, Michigan Environmental Protection Act, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, PA 451 of 1994. MCL Sections 324.1701 to 324.1706.

State of Michigan, Part 21, General Real Estate Powers, Subpart 11: Conservation and Historic Preservation Easement, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, PA 451 of 1994. MCL Sections 324.2140 to 324.2144.

Appendix B (cont.) Federal and state laws applicable to the protection of piping plover

State of Michigan, Part 353, Sand Dunes Protection and Management, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, PA 451 of 1994. MCL Section 324.35302.

State of Michigan, Part 365, Endangered Species Protection, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, PA 451 of 1994. MCL Sections 324.36501 to 324.36507.

State of Michigan, Part 637, Sand Dune Mining, of the Natural Resources and Environmental Protection Act, PA 451 of 1994. MCL Section 324.63702.

Minnesota	Minnesota Endangered Species Statute, Section 84.0895; Minnesota Rules, Chapter 6134; Minnesota Rules 6212.1800-6212.2300
New York	6 NYCRR (New York Code of Rules and Regulations), Part 182; New York State Environmental Conservation Law, 11-0535[1]-[2], 11-0536[2],[4]
N. Carolina	North Carolina General Statutes, Chapter 113, Article 25
Ohio	Ohio Revised Code, Section 1531.25
Texas	Texas Parks and Wildlife Code, Chapters 67 & 68; Texas Administrative Code, Sections 65.171-65.184 of Title 31
Wisconsin	Wisconsin Statutes, Section 29.604; Wisconsin Administrative Codes, Chapter NR (Natural Resources) 27

Appendix C. An assessment of banding impacts for the Great Lakes population

Ed Pike (MDNR, Michigan Recovery Team leader) banded piping plovers in Michigan from 1976-1985. In 1986 the USFWS declared a moratorium on piping plover banding in response to reports of leg injuries in banded birds on rivers in the Great Plains (Lingle and Sidle 1993; Lingle et al. 1999). In 1993 Dr. Francie Cuthbert and Lauren Wemmer (University of Minnesota) reinitiated banding Great Lakes population piping plovers after the USFWS decided survival and recruitment information was needed to determine appropriate management strategies for this population.

Since 1993, Wemmer or Cuthbert, and banding assistants, captured and color-banded approximately 80% of piping plover adults and 70% of all chicks that fledged using methods pursuant to permits issued by the USFWS. Banders take many safety precautions to minimize disruption of nesting plovers. Attempts to capture adults occur only after the first week of incubation and during fair weather (temperatures 16-32°C, (60-90°F), no precipitation). Banders carefully observe piping plover behavior during capture and banding, and after release until the bird returns to the nest to incubate. Piping plover monitoring following banding often continues until the returning adult switches incubation duties with its mate. At most sites, nest monitoring occurs every 1-3 days and allows detection of any significant negative effects of banding. Monitoring occurs less frequently at nests that are logistically difficult to visit (e.g., island nests), and therefore discerning banding effects at these sites is more difficult. Following the banding of the chicks, banders observe piping plover families from a distance (at least 100 m (330 ft) depending on the site) to verify that chicks and adults reunite. At most sites, monitors continue to observe piping plover broods frequently until they disappear or fledge.

Wemmer and Cuthbert (1999) analyzed banding data from 1993-1997 to quantify obvious indications (e.g., injuries, nest desertion, hatching failure, and chick mortality) of negative impacts of banding activity on breeding piping plovers. Only one of 156 re-sightings of 46 piping plovers banded as adults was observed with a leg injury. The injury could neither be definitively attributed to the metal band, which appeared in good condition, or to some other cause (e.g. traumatic injury during a storm). The injury eventually resulted in the loss of the lower leg and foot. This bird continued to nest and raise young successfully at Wilderness State Park. Injuries to piping plovers during trapping were also infrequent. Occasionally (ca. 1 out of 10) captured adults abraded their cere or alula against the trap. Most individuals successfully hatched young. Rates of nest desertion and hatching success did not differ significantly for nests where birds were captured and banded and those undisturbed by banding efforts. The overall abandonment rate of 8% approximated rates reported for piping plover nests with and without exclosures on the Atlantic Coast (Vaske et al. 1994; Cairns 1977). Evaluating effects of capture and banding on chicks is difficult. Most chicks that disappear do so within the first 10 days after hatching (Loeagering and Fraser 1995; Wemmer and Cuthbert 1999), and age specific mortality makes it difficult to determine what impact capture and banding has on survival. However, fledging rates have increased, rather than decreased, since banding was reinitiated in 1993.

Appendix D. Guidelines for predator exclosure use to protect piping plover nests

1. Authorization

Any person constructing predator exclosures must have a letter of authorization from the state wildlife department designating him/her an agent of the state for the purpose of constructing and monitoring the exclosures. Persons authorized to erect exclosures should be very familiar with the biology and behavior of piping plovers.

2. Exclosure materials and design

Materials list:

- C 15 m (50 ft) roll of 5 cm x 10 cm (2x4 in) welded wire fencing ~ 14 gauge
- C 4 heavy steel fence posts at least 1.5 m (5 ft) long
- C several rolls of monofilament ~ 8.2 kg (18 lb) test (wind onto spools that fit through fencing for ease of use)
- C sledge hammer
- C wire cutters
- C pliers
- C thin aluminum wire for securing fencing to stakes
- C pocket knife

Circular or square exclosures are recommended. Construct exclosure fences at least 1.5 m (5 ft) from the nest or use a minimum 3 m (10 ft) diameter for a circular exclosures. Bury stakes in the sand so that tops are at least 2.5 cm (1 in) below the top of the fence so that avian predators cannot use the stakes as perches. Bury the bottom edge of the fencing but ensure the bottom of the squares are flush with the sand to allow piping plovers to easily walk through them. String parallel lines of monofilament tautly across the top of the enclosure at intervals of 10-15 cm (4-6 in). Do NOT crisscross monofilament as birds may become entangled if they fly out the top of the exclosure.

Construct exclosures after confirmation of a full clutch of eggs and only during good weather (rainy, very windy, cold or extremely hot weather should be avoided), and preferably when people (who may become curious) are not around. Construct exclosures earlier in the incubation or laying period (after second or third egg) if piping plover monitors determine a predator risk or if the nest is located in an area where it might be easily crushed. Use psychological fencing (bailing twine attached to posts with piping plover "Closed Area" signs) in concert with exclosures to prevent curious people from approaching exclosures.

Appendix D (cont.) Guidelines for predator exclosure use to protect piping plover nests

Exclosure construction is most easily accomplished with a crew of two to four people. Crews should first practice construction around a “dummy nest” until the operation can be done quickly and smoothly. Record construction time and ensure completion does not exceed 20 minutes. Place a baseball cap or similar device on the nest to mark its location during construction.

3. Monitoring

Monitor piping plover behavior throughout exclosure construction and continue from a distance out of sight of the birds after the exclosure is complete. Monitor the nest until an adult returns to nest, resumes incubation, and then exchanges with its mate. Remove the exclosure if neither adult returns to the nest within 60 minutes, or either birds’ behavior appears abnormal. Continue to monitor the nest to determine if egg abandonment has occurred.

Monitors should look for evidence of predators near exclosures. Birds repeatedly perching on the exclosure tops or predators circling exclosures may cause piping plovers to abandon the nest. In these cases, removal of predators may be warranted; alert the USFWS and MDNR to the problem so they may pursue removal if necessary.

In cases of a nest failure due to predation or abandonment, make a thorough investigation of the site to document species of predator, if possible, and means of entry into the exclosure. In cases of suspected nest abandonment, make a thorough search of the area for signs of adult mortality (predator tracks, piping plover remains) and for sightings of both adults. Salvage the carcass according to guidelines outlined in monitoring handbook and take pictures of nest site and remains prior to removal if possible.

To avoid disturbance, remove exclosures after chicks have fledged or when the piping plover family has left the nest territory. Mark the nest cup with a small stake to facilitate recording the location later with a Geographic Positioning System receiver.

Appendix E. Guidelines for determining egg abandonment and protocol for salvage

Reaching piping plover recovery goals requires taking actions to fledge as many chicks as possible without jeopardizing natural incubation, hatching, and rearing by the parents. Achieving this goal requires detecting egg abandonment soon after it occurs and collecting the eggs for incubation. Researchers and volunteers need to carefully observe nests on a daily or more frequent interval to ensure they are only collecting truly abandoned eggs.

Observation of one or more instances noted from the Abandonment Criteria will constitute abandonment. For suspected abandonment, observers should monitor the nest for one hour from a location where piping plovers cannot detect, or do not react to the observer. Eggs under water or buried by sand do not require this observation period. Observers should record the presence and behavior of any piping plovers.

Eggs and young may be collected for salvage and delivered to University of Michigan Biological Station (UMBS) in Pellston, Michigan only after observation of strong evidence of parental abandonment (one or more of the abandonment Criteria below is true) and one of the following experts agrees the eggs should be collected for salvage:

- Dr. Cuthbert, University of Michigan Biological Station, Phone: (616) 539-8406 or 8408,
- Max Holden, Sleeping Bear Dunes National Lakeshore, Phone: (616) 326-5134,
- Jeannette Morss, Whitefish Point Bird Observatory, Phone: (906) 492-3596.

Abandonment Criteria

- C Adults making a new nest scrape elsewhere in the territory and not defending previous nest.
- C Adults not incubating for more than two hours, unless due to disturbance by potential predators, humans, or other piping plovers.
- C Lack of adult nest attendance at night.
- C Adults tending chicks in another portion of the territory, but incubation of remaining eggs has not occurred for at least two hours and adults do not defend eggs when they are approached.
- C Nest cup and/or eggs buried by sand or partially covered by high water. Eggs buried or under water do not require an hour of observation nor an expert to confirm collection is necessary.)

Appendix E (cont.) Guidelines for determining egg abandonment and protocol for salvage

The University of Michigan Biological Station (UMBS) in Pellston, Michigan, has facilities for incubating eggs and rearing piping plover chicks. If abandoned eggs or chicks are found, please contact UMBS piping plover team immediately at (231) 539-8408.

Egg Collection Procedures:

- C Record exact location of nest and reasons for abandonment.
- C Record approximate age of eggs (incubation is 25-30 days, usually 28).
- C Place eggs in a padded container (NOT airtight); a small box filled with cotton works well. Water bottles filled with warm water and well padded may be placed in the container (but not in contact with the eggs) to provide warmth.
- C Do NOT let eggs warm greater than 37°C (99°F), or cool below 18°C (65°F); eggs can tolerate cooling for up to 24 hours, but must **never** overheat. If you think overheating or cooling has occurred, please record that observation but continue to follow procedures because **the eggs may still be viable**.
- C Observe nest from which eggs have been removed for an additional hour.
- C Observe and record the presence and behavior of any adult piping plover in the nesting territory (and band combinations if banded).
- C Nest abandonment must be reported within 24 hours to the USFWS East Lansing Field Office (ELFO) 517/351-2555; TTY users may contact this office through the Federal Relay Service at 1-800-877-8339. If subsequent adult behavior indicates eggs had not been abandoned, return eggs to the nest immediately. Further egg salvage activities may not continue without approval from the ELFO.
- C Arrange for transport to UMBS.
- C **Note:** occasionally one egg of a clutch does not hatch and is left behind in the nest cup after the chicks have left the nest cup. Following the observations described above, transfer these eggs to the UMBS team who will send them to ELFO for contaminant monitoring.

UMBS Team: If eggs are determined infertile or otherwise inviable, wrap them in aluminum foil, place in a plastic bag to reduce moisture loss, and keep refrigerated. Do not freeze the eggs. Send wrapped eggs, carefully packaged in coolers with ample cushioning, water ice, and detailed collection information to ELFO for contaminant analysis.

Appendix E (cont.) Guidelines for determining egg abandonment and protocol for salvage

Chick Collection Procedures:

- C Record exact location, reasons for abandonment, and age of chicks.
- C Keep chicks together in a box without visual contact of people or the outdoors; make sure box has sufficient air holes.
- C Reduce visual stress and noise levels.
- C Keep chicks less than 7 days old warm with a heat lamp (or lightbulb for the short-term); 34°C (93°F) is ideal. Keep older chicks at approximately 29°C (85°F).
- C Supply chicks with water at all times in a shallow dish or pie pan.
- C For dehydrated and weak chicks, apply drops of water to the edge of the beak using an eye-dropper; do NOT attempt to force food or water by prying beak open -- this is too stressful to the bird.
- C Observe territory from which chicks have been removed for an additional hour.
- C Observe and record the presence and behavior of any adult piping plovers in the nesting territory (and band combinations if banded).
- C Report chick abandonment within 24 hours to the ELFO. If subsequent adult behavior indicates chicks had not been abandoned, consideration must be given to reuniting chicks with adults immediately. Further chick salvage activities may not continue without approval from the ELFO.
- C Arrange for transport to UMBS.

Appendix F. Federal and state contacts in the breeding and wintering range

ALABAMA

Roger Clay
Alabama Department of Conservation
P.O. Box 245
Spanish Fort, Alabama 36527
(334) 626-5153

FLORIDA

Patty Kelly
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
6620 Southpoint Drive South, Suite 310
Jacksonville, Florida 32216-0912
(904) 232-2580
patty_kelly@fws.gov

GEORGIA

Mike Harris/Brad Winn
Georgia DNR/Nongame Wildlife
1 Conservation Way
Brunswick, GA 31520
(912) 264-7218
bwinn@dnr.state.ga.us

ILLINOIS

John Rogner
Chicago Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1000 hart Road, Suite 180
Barrington, Illinois 60010
(847) 381-2253
john_rogner@fws.gov

INDIANA

Elizabeth McCloskey
Northern Indiana Suboffice
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
120 S. Lake St., Suite 230
Warsaw, Indiana 46580
(219) 269-7640
elizabeth_mccloskey@fws.gov

INDIANA (cont.)

Randy Knutson
Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore
1100 N. Mineral Springs Rd.
Porter, Indiana 46304
(219) 926-7561
Randy_Knutson@nps.gov

LOUISIANA

Steve Shively
Louisiana Natural Heritage Program
Department of Wildlife and Fisheries
P.O. Box 98000
Baton Rouge, Louisiana 70898-9000
(504) 765-2820

MICHIGAN

Craig A. Czarnecki
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
2651 Coolidge Road, Suite 101
East Lansing, Michigan 48823
(517) 351-2555
craig_czarnecki@fws.gov

Pat Lederle
Wildlife Division
Michigan Department of Natural Resources
P.O. Box 30444
Lansing, Michigan 48909-7944
(517) 373-1263
lederlep@michigan.gov

MINNESOTA

Bonita Eliason
Minnesota Department of Natural
Resources
P.O. Box 7, 500 Lafayette Road
St. Paul, Minnesota 55155
(612) 297-2276
bonita.eliason@dnr.state.mn.us

Appendix F (cont.) Federal and state contacts in the breeding and wintering range

MISSISSIPPI

Mark Woodrey
Mississippi Natural Heritage Program
Museum of Natural Science
111 North Jefferson St.
Jackson, Mississippi 39201-2897
(601) 354-7303

NEW YORK

Robyn Niver
Cortland Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
3817 Luker Rd.
Cortland, New York 13045
(607) 753-9334
robyn_niver@fws.gov

NORTH CAROLINA

David Rabon
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 33726
Raleigh, North Carolina 27636
(919) 856-4520
david_rabon@fws.gov

OHIO

Angela Boyer
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
6950-H Americana Parkway
Reynoldsburg, Ohio 43068
(614)469-6923 ext 13
angela_boyer@fws.gov

Jennifer L. Windus
Division of Wildlife
Ohio Dept. of Natural Resources
Columbus, Ohio 43224
(614) 265-6309
jennifer.windus@dnr.state.oh.us

OHIO (cont.)

Gary J. Obermiller
Sheldon Marsh Preserve
2715 Cleveland Rd.
Huron, Ohio 44839
(419) 433-4919
sheldonmarsh1@hotmail.com

ONTARIO

Jon McCracken
Program Manager
Bird Studies Canada/Long Point
Observatory
P.O. Box 160
Port Rowan, ON
CANADA N0E 1M
(519) 586-3531
jmccracken@bsc-eoc.org

Leo Heyens
Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources
808 Robertson Street
Kenora, Ontario P9N3X9
(807) 468-2546
lheyens@bsc-eoc.org

PENNSYLVANIA

Carol Copeyon
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
315 South Allen St. Suite 322
State College, Pennsylvania 16801
(814) 234-4090
carol_copeyon@fws.gov

SOUTH CAROLINA

Phil Wilkenson
South Carolina WMRD
420 Direlton
Georgetown, South Carolina 29440
(803) 546-3226

Appendix F (cont.) Federal and state contacts in the breeding and wintering range

TEXAS

Wendy Brown
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
P.O. Box 1306
Albuquerque, New Mexico 87103
(505) 248-6664
wendy_brown@fws.gov

Lee Elliot
Texas Department of Parks and Wildlife
Natural Resources Center, Suite 2501
6300 Ocean Drive
Corpus Christi, Texas 78412
(512) 980-3246
txpw@falcon.tamucc.edu

WISCONSIN

Janet M. Smith
Green Bay Field Office
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
1015 Challenger Court
Green Bay, Wisconsin 54311-8331
(920) 465-7440
janet_smith@fws.gov

Sumner Matteson
Wisconsin Department of Natural
Resources
Bureau of Endangered Resources
Box 7921
Madison, Wisconsin 53707
(608) 266-1571
matts@mail01.dnr.state.wi.us

Region 3
U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Bishop Henry Whipple Federal Building
1 Federal Drive
Fort Snelling, MN 55111-4056

July 2002

