

**COLLIER COUNTY  
PUBLIC SERVICES DIVISION**

PUBLICATION SERIES

PR-10-01



**COLLIER COUNTY  
SEA TURTLE PROTECTION PLAN  
ANNUAL REPORT – 2010**

Principal Investigators

Maura C. Kraus, Principal Environmental Specialist

Mary K. Toro, Environmental Specialist

Markus Hennig, Environmental Specialist

Sonja Gonzales, Intern

Prepared by  
Parks and Recreation Department

Naples, Florida  
March 2011



BOARD OF COUNTY COMMISSIONERS

Fred W. Coyle  
CHAIRMAN  
DISTRICT 4

James N. Coletta  
VICE-CHAIRMAN  
DISTRICT 5

Donna Fiala  
COMMISSIONER  
DISTRICT 1

Georiga A. Hiller, Esq.  
COMMISSIONER  
DISTRICT 2

Tom Henning  
COMMISSIONER  
DISTRICT 3

Leo E. Ochs Jr.  
COUNTY MANAGER

PUBLIC SERVICES DIVISION

Marla Olsvig Ramsey  
DIVISION ADMINISTRATOR

Barry Williams  
PARKS AND RECREATION DIRECTOR

Period of Investigation

April 2010 through October 2010

In addition to fulltime staff, the following part-time staff members provided invaluable field assistance:

Helle Brimmekamp  
Mary Nelson  
Sonja Gonzalez

The project on which this publication is based was financed by the Collier County Board of County Commissioners and the Tourist Development Tax Fund for Category A:

Beach Renourishment and Pass Maintenance Projects

The contents of this publication do not necessarily reflect the views and policies of the Collier County Board of County Commissioners. The mention of trade names or commercial products does not constitute their endorsement or recommendation for use by the Collier County Board of County Commissioners.

---

For additional information write to:

Maura C. Kraus, Principal Environmental Specialist  
Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Program  
Parks and Recreation Department  
15000 Livingston Road  
Naples, Florida 34109

## ABSTRACT

Collier County was responsible for the daily survey of 23.7 miles (38.1 km) of beach for sea turtle activities during the 2010 sea turtle season (May through October). The Collier County Parks and Recreation Department surveyed 16.9 miles (27.2 km) of beach including Barefoot, Vanderbilt, Park Shore, and Marco Island. Staff documented 422 nests in 2010, a moderate increase from 297 nests in 2009. Under contract to Collier County, the Conservancy of Southwest Florida documented 72 nests on the 5.6 mile (9.0 km) City of Naples beach. Twenty nests were documented on the 1.2 mile (1.9 km) beach along Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park. During the 2010 nesting season, 3.5% (14) of the documented nests were disoriented. Seven percent (31) of the nests were depredated, which is a increase from the four percent last year. A total of 27,142 hatchlings were estimated to have reached the Gulf of Mexico. The number of successfully emerged hatchlings represents an increase compared to 19,869 hatchlings that reached the Gulf of Mexico in 2009. The number of strandings in Collier County was 47 for 2010. This was a slight increase from the forty in 2009.

## TABLE OF CONTENTS

		Page
ABSTRACT		i
TABLE OF CONTENTS		ii
LIST OF FIGURES		iv
LIST OF TABLES		vi
LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS		viii
SECTION 1	INTRODUCTION	1
SECTION 2	SEA TURTLE MONITORING PROGRAM	4
	2.1 STUDY AREA	4
	2.1.1 Barefoot Beach	6
	2.1.2 Vanderbilt Beach & Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park	6
	2.1.3 Park Shore Beach	8
	2.1.4 City of Naples Beach	9
	2.1.5 City of Marco Island Beach	10
	2.2 MATERIALS AND METHODS	12
	2.2.1 Reconnaissance Surveys & Beach Zoning	12
	2.2.2 Daily Monitoring	12
	2.2.3 Nest Monitoring & Evaluation	15
	2.2.4 Data Analysis	16
	2.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION	17

## TABLE OF CONTENTS (Continued)

		Page
	2.3.1 Emergences	17
	2.3.2 Effects of Beach Renourishment	19
	2.3.3 Historical Trends	21
	2.3.4 Weekly Emergence Analysis	25
	2.3.5 Clutch Depth	26
	2.3.6 Hatching Evaluation	26
	2.3.7 Nest Predation	29
SECTION 3	PUBLIC AWARENESS & BEACH LIGHTING PROGRAM	31
SECTION 4	SEA TURTLE STRANDING AND SALVAGE PROGRAM	34
SECTION 5	SUMMARY	37
SECTION 6	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS	39
SECTION 7	REFERENCES	40
SECTION 8	APPENDIX 1: NESTS & FALSE CRAWLS BY DNR MONUMENT	

## LIST OF FIGURES

		Page
2.1.1	Collier County Surveyed Beaches, 2010	5
2.2.2.1	Sea Turtle Nesting Area Sign	14
2.3.1.1	Sea Turtle Emergences in Collier County, 2010	18
2.3.2.1	Natural Versus Renourished Beaches, 2010	20
2.3.3.1	Collier County Annual Emergences, 1997–2010	23
2.3.3.2	Barefoot Annual Emergences, 1997–2010	23
2.3.3.3	Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park Annual Emergences, 1997–2010	23
2.3.3.4	Vanderbilt Beach Annual Emergences, 1997–2010	24
2.3.3.5	Park Shore Beach Annual Emergences, 1997–2010	24
2.3.3.6	City of Naples Beach Annual Emergences, 1997–2010	24
2.3.3.7	City of Marco Island Beach Annual Emergences, 1997–2010	25
2.3.4.1	Collier County Emergences Per Week, 2001–2010	25

**LIST OF FIGURES (continued)**

		Page
3.1	Disoriented Nests in Collier County, 1996–2010	33
4.1	Collier County Monthly Sea Turtle Strandings, 2010	35
4.2	Collier County Sea Turtle Strandings, 1996 - 2010	35



## LIST OF TABLES

		Page
2.1.1.1	Barefoot Beach Renourishment History	6
2.1.2.1	Vanderbilt Beach and Delnor-Wiggins Renourishment History	7
2.1.3.1	Park Shore Beach Renourishment History	8
2.1.4.1	City of Naples Beach Renourishment History	9
2.1.5.1	City of Marco Island Beach Renourishment History	11
2.3.1.1	Emergences, 2010	17
2.3.3.1	Sea Turtle Nest and False Crawl Historical Trends, 1997–2010	22
2.3.5.1	Clutch Depths in Renourished Sand Types, 2010	26
2.3.6.1	Collier County Mean Clutch Size, 2010	26
2.3.6.2	Nest & Hatching Evaluations by Beach Unit, 2010	27
2.3.6.4	Mean Incubation Rates in Natural and Renourished Sand Types, 2010	28
2.3.6.5	Hatching and Emergence Success in Natural and Renourished Sand, 2010	29
2.3.7.1	Egg Depredation in Collier County, 2010	30
5.1	Summary of All Monitored Beaches, 2010	37
5.2	Summary of All Monitored Beaches, 2010	38

## LIST OF ABBREVIATIONS

ANOVA	Analysis of Variance
ATV	All Terrain Vehicle
BG	Bonita Grande – Upland Sand Source
BI	Big Island – Upland Sand Source
CCCL	State Coastal Construction Control Line
CITES	Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora
CSWF	The Conservancy of Southwest Florida
DNR	Florida Department of Natural Resources (now called FWC)
DNWSP	Delnor Wiggins State Park
ERJ	E.R. Jahna – Upland Sand Source
ESD	Collier County Environmental Services Department
FDACS	Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services
FWC	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission
GPS	Global Positioning System
HWL	High Water Line

IUCN	International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources
NAD	North American Datum
NERR	National Estuarine Research Reserve
NMFS	National Marine Fisheries Service
NOV	Notice of Violation
P&R	Collier County Parks and Recreation Department
STSSN	Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network
TED	Turtle Excluder Device
USFWS	United States Fish and Wildlife Service

## SECTION 1

### INTRODUCTION

Sea turtles have inhabited the earth for millions of years. They are believed to have evolved from marsh dwelling species that existed between the Upper Triassic and the Jurassic periods (190 –135 million years ago). Fossil records indicate an early transition from the marsh into the marine environment. By the Cretaceous period (65 million years ago) four families of sea turtles were distributed throughout the oceans of the world (Pritchard, 1979). Today marine turtles are limited to two families: Cheloniidae (six species) and Dermochelyidae (one species) (National Research Council, 1990).

Sea turtles are air-breathing reptiles that emerge from the sea and deposit their eggs on tropical and subtropical beaches around the world. The loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) is the most abundant nesting sea turtle species in Collier County. Loggerheads, named for their disproportionately large head, emerge on Florida's beaches from May through August to lay their eggs. Clutches, containing an average of 100 eggs, incubate for approximately two months before hatchlings, less than two inches in length, emerge and head to the water. Within 12 to 30 years loggerhead turtles reach sexual maturity and return to the beach to lay eggs every two to four years. It is estimated that only one hatchling in 1,000 will survive to repeat this cycle.

All but one species of sea turtle [Australian flatback (*Natator depressus*)] is listed as endangered and/or threatened by one or more of the following agencies: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC), and the Convention on International Trade in Endangered Species of Wild Fauna and Flora (CITES). Furthermore, the loggerhead sea turtle is classified by the International Union for the Conservation of Nature and Natural Resources [IUCN (although without statutory authority)], as a 'vulnerable' species

(Groombridge, 1982). Extensive exploitation by man for food, leather, decorative pieces, cosmetics and other uses, as well as incidental catch by commercial fisheries have drastically decreased populations of all remaining sea turtle species.

Coastal development and natural erosion have significantly reduced the number of suitable nesting beaches. Developed beaches used by nesting sea turtles can become hazardous to emerging hatchlings. Human disturbances on nesting beaches include: human activity, artificial lighting, erosion induced by shoreline hardening with seawalls, rock revetment, beach renourishment, vehicular traffic on or near the beach, beach raking, pollution, shading of beaches by large buildings and exotic vegetation, beach furniture and recreational accessories, as well as egg and hatchling predation associated with human activities (Carr and Ogren, 1960; Daniel and Smith, 1947; Dickerson and Nelson, 1989; Mann, 1978; Mortimer, 1987; Mortimer and Portier, 1989; Moulding and Nelson, 1988; National Research Council, 1990; Nelson, 1988; Nelson, 1991; Nelson and Dickerson, 1989; Nelson *et al*, 1987; Raymond, 1984b; Salmon and Wynekin, 1990; Schmeltz and Mezich, 1988; Witherington, 1990; Witherington, 1991; Witherington and Bjorndal, 1991). Sea turtles have encountered some or all of these problems on many of Florida's beaches, including Collier County. As human activity and development on nesting beaches increases, a more complete understanding of the plight of the sea turtle must be developed so that remedial actions can be taken.

Collier County is responsible for surveying 23.7 miles (38.1 km) of beach for sea turtle activities. The Sea Turtle Protection Program within the Collier County Parks and Recreation Department (CCPRD) monitored 16.9 miles (27.2 km) of shoreline on Barefoot, Vanderbilt, Park Shore, and Marco Island. The remaining 5.6 miles (9.0 km) of beach in the City of Naples is subcontracted to the Conservancy of Southwest Florida (CSWF). Delnor-Wiggins Pass SRA

surveys 1.2 miles (1.9 km) of beach within the park boundary. The surveyed beaches not included in this report are Keewaydin Island (monitored by the CSWF), Cape Romano Complex (monitored by the CCPRD), and Coconut and Sea Oat Islands (monitored by Rookery Bay NERR).

The purpose of the Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Program is to protect nests and collect data on sea turtle nesting and hatching activities in order to fulfill permit requirements for beach raking and beach renourishment. Protecting sea turtle nests also allows beachfront property owners to obtain permits for certain activities seaward of the State Coastal Construction Control Line (CCCL).

This report details the methods established by the CCPRD with updates based on the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Sea Turtle Conservation Guidelines (FWC, 2002). The report includes an analysis of sea turtle emergences, effects of beach renourishment, historical trends, nesting and hatching, depredation, strandings, beach lighting, and public awareness. Program research and management recommendations are also provided.

## SECTION 2


### SEA TURTLE MONITORING PROGRAM

#### 2.1 STUDY AREA

Collier County, Florida is the southern terminus of the southwest barrier island chain that begins at Anclote Key in Pasco County, 175 miles (282 km) to the north. The Collier barrier island coastline extends 37 miles (60 km) from the Lee/Collier County line, southward to Cape Romano. The beaches comprise a wide variety of physiographic types including a coastal headland, barrier beach ridge, barrier islands, migrating overwash ridges, and a coastal cape. Ten major barrier beach units are recognized in the County, separated by nine tidal passes. Five of the ten barrier beach units are surveyed daily (May 01–October 31) for sea turtle activities including Barefoot, Vanderbilt (including Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park), Park Shore, City of Naples, and City of Marco Island beaches (Figure 2.1.1).

Since 1990, beach renourishment activities have occurred in Collier County. The following sections outline the year (1990–2008), DNR monument location, and sand source (hydraulic, mechanical, or upland) for each renourishment event. Hydraulic sand is transported by pipe from an offshore sand source or from a pass, with seawater as a transport medium. Mechanical sand is excavated from a pass, stockpiled and placed onto the beach. Upland sand is trucked from an inland quarry source and spread onto the beach.

Figure 2.1.1. Collier County Surveied Beaches, 2010.





### 2.1.1 Barefoot Beach

Barefoot Beach is the northern-most beach unit in Collier County, which encompasses 3.1 linear miles (5.0 km) of barrier beach extending from the County line south to Wiggins Pass (DNR monument R-1 to R-16). The Barefoot Beach unit is surveyed for sea turtle activities as part of the Wiggins Pass Inlet Management Plan and to assist in the permitting process for the maintenance of Wiggins Pass. Table 2.1.1.1 summarizes the renourishment history of Barefoot Beach since 1990.

Table 2.1.1.1. Barefoot Beach Renourishment History.

Year	DNR Location	Sand Source	Cubic Yards	Linear Feet of Beach
1990	R-13 to R-14	Hydraulic	33,460	1,000
1991	250' North R-13 to 30' North R-15	Hydraulic	34,010	2,264
1998	R-12.5 to R-13.5	Hydraulic	11,980	913
2002	250' North R-8 South 250'	Upland (ERJ) *Dune Only	n/a	ca. 500
2002	250' North R-5.5 South 250'	Upland (ERJ)	n/a	ca. 500
2005	250' South R-5 to 250' South of R-8	Big Island *Dune Only	n/a	3,000

ERJ indicates an upland sand source known as E.R. Jahna. \* Upland sand placed into dune only, this is not a beach renourishment.

### 2.1.2 Vanderbilt Beach / Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park

The Vanderbilt Beach coastal barrier unit includes 4.7 miles (7.6 km) of beach from Wiggins Pass south to Clam Pass (DNR monument R-17 to R-41.5). The northern most mile of the Vanderbilt Beach unit, Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park (R-17 to R-22.5) is surveyed for sea turtle activities by park staff. The data from Delnor-Wiggins is included in this report.

Vanderbilt Beach is surveyed for sea turtle activities as part of permit requirements for beach

restoration and beach raking. Table 2.1.2.1 summarizes the renourishment activity of Vanderbilt Beach and Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park since 1990.

Table 2.1.2.1. Vanderbilt Beach and Delnor-Wiggins Renourishment History.

Year	DNR Location	Sand Source	Cubic Yards	Linear Feet of Beach
1994	*R-18 to R-19	Hydraulic	35,250	1,000
1995	*R-19 to R-20	Hydraulic	46,580	1,000
1996	100' North R-22.5 to R-29	Hydraulic	322,800	7,490
	R-29 to 50' South R-30.5	Upland	3,000	1,588
	R-40 to R-41 (North of Clam Pass)	Mechanical	4,500	1,000
1998	*R-19 to R-20	Hydraulic	19,550	1,000
2000	*R-18 South 850'	Hydraulic	16,960	850
2002	*R-18 to 400' South R-20	Hydraulic	50,614	2,400
	500' South of R-23 to R30 (Dune Protection)	Upland (ERJ)	22,138	6,500
	150' South R-39 415' South (Dune Protection)	Upland (ERJ)	655	265
	500' South R-36 to 322' South R-38 (Dune Protection)	Upland (ERJ)	4,445	1,822
2006	R-22 to 37	Hydraulic	178,442	14,900
2007	*R-18 south to 19.5	Hydraulic	48,405	1,591

\* Indicates an area within the Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park. ERJ is an upland sand source known as E.R Jahna.

### 2.1.3 Park Shore Beach

The Park Shore coastal barrier unit extends 3.2 miles (5.1 km) south from Clam Pass to Doctors Pass (DNR monument R-41.5 to R-57). Clam Pass County Park extends from Clam Pass southward approximately 2,000ft (610 m) to the Naples Cay development (R-42 to R-44). Park Shore Beach is monitored for sea turtle nesting activities as part of beach renourishment and beach raking permit requirements. Table 2.1.3.1 summarizes the renourishment history of Park Shore Beach.

Table 2.1.3.1. Park Shore Beach Renourishment History.

Year	DNR Monument	Sand Source	Cubic Yards	Linear Feet of Beach
1995	Clam Pass to R-43.5	Mechanical	4,500	2,889
1996	Clam Pass to R-42.5 350' South R-50 to 350' North R-54	Mechanical	6,000	1,788
		Hydraulic	90,700	3,589
1997	Clam Pass to R-42.5 350' North R-48 to 350' South R-50	Mechanical	6,000	1,788
		Mechanical	8,000	2,751
1998	Clam Pass to 143' North R-45	Mechanical	8,000	4,208
1999	Clam Pass to 270' North R-42 430' South R-42 to 250' South R-43.5	Mechanical & Hydraulic	3,500	310
		Hydraulic	26,500	1,365
2000	R-50.5 to 100' South R-53	Upland (ERJ)	35,000	2,600
2001	R-50.5 to R-54	Upland (ERJ)	28,268	3,500
2002	Clam Pass to 40' South R-43 700' South R-49 to 40' South R-54	Hydraulic	11,725	1,975
		Upland (ERJ)	9,067	4,700
2006	R-45 to R-55	Hydraulic	140,336	10,543
2007	R-42 + 180 South to R-43 +500	Hydraulic	20,603	1,464
2011	R 45- R 46	Upland	7,836	1,000

ERJ indicates an upland sand source known as E.R. Jahna.

#### 2.1.4 City of Naples Beach

The City of Naples beach unit encompasses approximately 5.6 miles (9.0 km) of shoreline from Doctors Pass south to Gordon Pass (DNR monument R-57.5 to R-89). The Conservancy of Southwest Florida monitors the City of Naples beach for sea turtle activities, contracted by Collier County, as part of the Beach Renourishment Program permit requirements. Naples beach monitoring results are included in this report and also in an annual report by the Conservancy of Southwest Florida. Table 2.1.4.1 summarizes the renourishment history of the City of Naples beach.

Table 2.1.4.1. City of Naples Beach Renourishment History.

Year	DNR Location	Sand Source	Cubic Yards	Linear Feet of Beach
1996	Doctors Pass (R-57) to 350' North R-78	Hydraulic	759,150	18,253
	R-69.5 to R-72	Upland/Hydraulic	55,000	2,438
1998	R-69.5 to R-72	Upland (BG)	8,820	2,438
	R-75 to 400' South R-76	Upland (BG)/Hydraulic	6,696	1,213
1999/ 2000	500' North R-63 to R-64 (Naples Beach Club)	Upland (BG)	8,036	1,500
	Doctors Pass (R-57) to R-58	Upland (BG)	6,804	1,000
2000	R-88 to R-89	Upland (BI)	6,000	1,000
2002	Doctors Pass (R-57) to R-68	Upland (ERJ)	45,047	11,000
2006	R-58A to R-79	Hydraulic	345,307	18,935
2010	R-57 to R57 A +100 ft.	Upland (IM)	3,000	1,000
2011	R-57 to R-58A	Upland (IM)	22,393	2,000

BG indicates an upland sand source known as Bonita Grande. BI indicates an upland sand source known as Big Island. ERJ indicates an upland sand source known as E.R. Jahna.

### 2.1.5 City of Marco Island Beach

The City of Marco Island coastal barrier unit encompasses 7.1 miles (11.4 km) of beach, from inside Big Marco Pass [Hideaway Beach (DNR monument H-16 to H-1)] south to Caxambas Pass (DNR monument R-131 to R-148). The City of Marco Island is a highly developed beach with high-rise condominiums and hotels. This beach has been monitored for sea turtle activities since 1990 as part of the permit requirements for beach renourishment and raking. Table 2.1.5.1 summarizes the renourishment history for the City of Marco Island.

Table 2.1.5.1. City of Marco Island Beach Renourishment History.

Year	DNR Monument	Sand Source	Cubic Yards	Linear Feet of Beach
1990	*H-3 to H-7	Hydraulic	70,000	2,063
	R-136.5 to R-138.5	Hydraulic	284,600	2,189
	R-142.5 to R-148	Hydraulic	715,400	5,533
1997	*130' South H-9 to 45' South H-11	Upland (BG)	1,000	1,345
	*370' South H-1 to 131' South H-3	Upland (BG)	4,000	1,636
	R-145.5 to R-148	Upland (BG)	80,000	1,781
1998	*H-9 to H-11	Upland (BG)	15,000	1,250
	*400' South H-1 to H-2	Upland (BG)	10,000	900
1999	*H-1 to H-3	Upland (BG)	3,528	985
	R-148 South to Caxambas Pass	Upland (BG)	9,000	625
2000	*200' North H-1 to H-3	Upland (BI)	3,600	950
		Hydraulic	2000	
2001	*H-1 to H-4	Upland (ERJ)	15,000	1,500
	*H-9 to H-13.5	Hydraulic	24,078	2,300
2002	R-136 to R-136.5	Upland (ERJ)	148	300
	*140' South H-9 to 140' North	Upland (ERJ)	359	280
2003	*200' South H-1 to 40' North H-4	Upland (ERJ)	11,096	1,740
	*H-9 to H-11	Upland (ERJ)	11,096	1,000
2005	H1 to H-9	Hydraulic	316,770	6,300
2007	R-144 to R-148 +549	Hydraulic	168,431	4,288
2010	H4 to H9	Hydraulic	130,000	2,500

\* Indicates an area within Hideaway Beach where the H-monuments are numbered consecutively from southwest to northeast. BG indicates an upland sand source known as Bonita Grande. BI indicates an upland sand source known as Big Island. ERJ indicates an upland sand source known as E.R. Jahna

## 2.2 METHODS AND MATERIALS

### 2.2.1 Reconnaissance Surveys and Beach Zoning

Pre-season reconnaissance surveys of the monitored beaches were conducted in April. The objective of the surveys was to develop daily monitoring strategies, note the condition of the beaches, zone the beaches for management purposes, and conduct cone penetrometer readings to determine if the beaches required tilling pre-season.

Metal signs on 6' metal posts were placed within the dune area in approximately 1,000ft increments from the Lee/Collier County line south through Marco Island. In addition, wooden stakes were installed 500 ft south of every DNR marker. Beaches were measured along the high tide line using a Rolatape survey wheel.

### 2.2.2 Daily Monitoring

Prior to beach raking, daily surveys for emergence activity were performed along the high water line (HWL) utilizing all-terrain-vehicles (ATVs) equipped with low-pressure tires. Upon discovery of an emergence, staff visually determined if the emergence resulted in a nest or a false crawl (non-nesting emergence). Nests and false crawls were sequentially numbered and mapped on 1:100 or 1:200 scale aerial photographs. Characteristics and measurements of the emergences were recorded on data sheets for evaluation. A GPS reading was taken for each emergence location.

All nests were marked with stakes, flagging tape, and a sign to provide protection and facilitate evaluations. Four 36-inch (91 cm) long wooden stakes were placed in the corners of each disturbed area. Yellow ribbon with the word "caution" printed on it, was then placed around the stakes and a Sea Turtle Nest Sign (Figure 2.2.2.1) was affixed to alert and direct

beach rakers and the public away from nests. In addition, the stakes were marked with their direction (SW, NW, SE, NE) to facilitate clutch location if some stakes were lost during storms.

Nests laid in areas known for high predation were covered with a protective screen. Nest screening was applied on undeveloped portions of Barefoot, Vanderbilt, and Park Shore beach. Screening involved anchoring a self-releasing four-foot (1.2 m) square wire mesh screen over the clutch with metal tent stakes. The 2 by 4 inch screen openings (5.1 by 10.2 cm) were large enough to allow the natural escape of hatchlings, but were small enough to prevent mammalian depredation. Screened nests were observed on a daily basis for evidence of predation. If a raccoon disturbed the sand under the screen, the sand was replaced, the area flattened out, and the event recorded. If fire ants were observed, they were gently swept off the nest.



Figure 2.2.2.1. Sea Turtle Nesting Area Sign.

**DO NOT DISTURB  
SEA TURTLE  
NEST**

**VIOLATORS SUBJECT  
TO FINES AND  
IMPRISONMENT**

<p><b>FLORIDA LAW CHAPTER 370</b></p> <p>No person may take, possess, disturb, mutilate, destroy, cause to be destroyed, sell, offer for sale, transfer, molest, or harass any marine turtle or its nest or eggs at any time.</p> <p>Upon conviction, a person may be imprisoned for a period of up to 60 days or fined up to \$500, or both, plus an additional penalty of \$100 for each sea turtle egg destroyed or taken.</p>	<p><b>U.S. ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT OF 1973</b></p> <p>No person may take, harass, harm, pursue, hunt, shoot, wound, kill, trap, or capture any marine turtle, turtle nest, and/or eggs, or attempt to engage in any such conduct.</p> <p>Any person who knowingly violates any provision of this act may be assessed a civil penalty up to \$25,000 or a criminal penalty up to \$100,000 and up to one year imprisonment.</p>
---	---

**SHOULD YOU WITNESS A VIOLATION, OBSERVE AN INJURED  
OR STRANDED TURTLE, OR MISORIENTED HATCHLINGS,  
PLEASE CONTACT FWC AT**

**1-888-404-FWCC OR \*FWC (MOBILE PHONE)**  
FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION  
MARINE TURTLE PROTECTION PROGRAM

COASTLINE 386-761-1414

### 2.2.3 Nest Monitoring and Evaluation

Daily monitoring for hatched nests began as the first nest approached its expected hatch date (approximately 60 days). All nests were observed for signs of hatching, such as an obvious depression in the sand or hatchling tracks around the nest. Each nest was excavated for evaluation approximately 72 hours (3 days) following signs of the first emergence or, in the case of unhatched nests, 70 days from deposition or 80 days if the nest was inundated with water.

Excavation included removing all contents from the egg cavity by hand. The depth of the egg cavity was measured and recorded. Data from each nest evaluation was recorded on CCPRD Sea Turtle Nesting Forms. Empty eggshells accounted for live hatchlings that escaped from the nest, live turtles found within the nest, and dead turtles found within the nest. Unhatched eggs included undeveloped eggs, dead embryos, and eggs depredated prior to hatching. Pipped eggs refer to hatchlings (dead or alive) that puncture the eggshell but did not fully emerge from the shell. Unhatched eggs were opened and inspected to determine the stage of development at the time of death. If live hatchlings were found in the nest, they were either released immediately or transferred to a bucket of moist sand for night release, depending on the presence or absence of predatory birds in the area. Hatchling releases were conducted according to the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission Sea Turtle Conservation Guidelines (FWC, 2002).

Nests were also inspected for evidence of predation. If signs of predation were discovered, the information was recorded. The collection of predator data aids in quantifying and determining the extent nest predation in Collier County.

#### 2.2.4 Data Analysis

Sea turtle emergence and hatchling data were compiled using the relational database Microsoft Access. Maps were produced using ArcMap and Collier County Property Appraiser's aerial photographs taken in 2008. Shoreline and monument points were based on North American Datum (NAD) 1927 and then converted to NAD 1983, Florida State Plane Coordinate East Zone. Shoreline data and emergence locations were collected with a Garmin GPS 76 marine navigator. Graphs and plots were created using Microsoft Excel. Data was analyzed with personal computers utilizing Microsoft Excel and Microsoft Access.

Data was analyzed at each study area for factors relating to both nest and hatching characteristics. Nesting factors included nests per emergences (nesting success), emergences per mile (e/mi.), and nest placement characteristics. Factors relating to hatching success included cavity depth, incubation duration, egg counts, inundation, and depredation. Linear regression analysis was used to search for any factors directly affecting hatching success. Plots were prepared showing comparisons between and within study areas.

## 2.3 RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

### 2.3.1 Emergences

Sea turtles emerged upon Collier County beaches from May 17, 2010 through August 26, 2010. A total of 819 emergences (422 nests and 397 false crawls) occurred along the 23.7 miles (38.1 km) of the daily surveyed shoreline. A breakdown of emergence activity for each beach is listed in Table 2.3.1.1. Aerial maps showing emergence location by beach are available as an additional appendix separate from this report. A comparison of nests and false crawls for each beach segment is given in Figure 2.3.1.1. A breakdown of emergences per mile on each beach is illustrated in Table 2.3.1.1. Barefoot beach recorded the most sea turtle activity with an average of 57 emergences per mile. The City of Naples beach received the least activity with an average of 19 emergences per mile.

Table 2.3.1.1. Emergences, 2010.

	Barefoot	Delnor Wiggins	Vanderbilt	Park Shore	Naples	Marco	Total
Total Nests	87	20	111	86	72	46	422
Total False Crawls	90	20	88	74	35	90	397
Total Emergences	177	40	199	160	107	136	819
Nest / Emergence (%)	49	50	56	54	67	34	52
Beach Length (mi.)	3.1	1.2	3.5	3.2	5.6	7.1	23.7
Emergences / mi.	57	33	57	50	19	19	34
Nests / mi.	28	17	32	27	13	6	18
False Crawls / mi.	29	17	25	23	6	13	17

Figure 2.3.1.1. Sea Turtle Emergences in Collier County, 2010.




Table 2.3.1.1 shows some variation in total nests and false crawls between beaches. This variation is difficult to explain since nest-site selection of the female turtle is still poorly understood. Some important factors include, but are not limited to: beach compaction, artificial lighting, human activity, structures on the beach, and scarps.

Above normal beach compaction can impede nest excavation contributing to the rejection of a nesting site, thus increasing the number of false crawls and aborted egg cavities on renourished beaches (Raymond, 1984a; Nelson, 1991). Witherington (1991) found that the “presence” of lights in beach areas “sharply reduce” the number of sea turtles that emerge to nest. Human activities on the beach can also contribute to the disruption of nest site selection by adult sea turtles (LeBuff, 1990; Kraus, 1992). Obstacles in the paths of emerging turtles may contribute to the failure of a nesting attempt. These obstacles include, but are not limited to:

scarps, beach furniture, seawalls, boardwalks, stairs, fences, pilings, groins, sand castles, sand pits, Australian pine trees (*Casuarina* spp.), and boats stored on the beach.


Abandoned nesting attempts (false crawls) are a common occurrence for loggerheads and have been recorded at all nesting beaches (Dodd, 1988). Raymond (1984b) reported that on natural beaches, 46% to 49% of emergences resulted in false crawls. The 397 false crawls in Collier County, represents 48% of the total emergences. The reasons for the 2010 false crawl ratio may include: lighting violations, human activity, furniture and vending materials left on the beach overnight, escarscarpments, and boardwalks.

It is possible that a limited number of false crawls occur from the female's instinctive preferences for a specific site. These are false crawls not provoked by human disturbance and interference; but by physical factors such as temperature, sand composition, and possibly other unknown characteristics.

### 2.3.2 Effects of Beach Renourishment

Figure 2.3.2.1 compares the 2010 nests and false crawls per mile on natural and renourished beach areas on the combined beaches of Barefoot, Vanderbilt (including Delnor Wiggins Pass State Park), Park Shore, City of Naples, and City of Marco Island.

Figure 2.3.2.1. Natural Versus Renourished Beaches, 2010.



Dodd (1998) reported that loggerhead sea turtle nest site selection might be influenced by “micro-habitat cues” that initiate the nesting process. Microhabitat cues may be significantly different on renourished beaches when compared to natural, non-renourished beaches, and these differences may influence nesting preferences and success. Collier County beaches are continually nourished and renourished, therefore, continued research and data collection is imperative. Studying the historical nesting data from different sand types will ensure the best selection of sand to reduce negative impacts of future renourishments.

### 2.3.3 Historical Trends

Marco Island beach was first surveyed for sea turtle activities in 1990, followed by Barefoot in 1991 and Clam Pass Park (from Clam Pass south to Seagate beach access) in 1992. In 1994, the “Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Program” was developed to survey mainland beaches in response to area-wide beach renourishment. Consecutive years of consistent data collection will assist biologists in detecting local population trends of loggerhead sea turtles, and the local impacts of beach renourishment.

Most loggerhead sea turtles do not nest every year. In the “Synopsis of the Biological Data on the Loggerhead Sea Turtle”, Dodd (1988) Compiled studies reporting that 90% of loggerhead sea turtles nest on a 2 to 4 year cycle. This factor requires many years of consistent data collection before any trends can be accurately detected. Historical sea turtle emergences are presented in Table 2.3.3.1 and Figures 2.3.3.2 – 2.3.3.6 for all beaches. Figure 2.3.3.1 reflects the overall County beach totals.



Table 2.3.3.1. Historical Trends of Sea Turtle Nests and False Crawls (FCs), 1997–2010.

Beach Unit	1997	1998	1999	2000	2001	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2009	2010
Barefoot Nests Barefoot FCs	117 93	108 90	104 89	96 85	104 84	62 28	88 66	84 73	72 67	56 55	40 33	75 85	59 50	87 90
Delnor Nests Delnor FCs	22 22	29 24	33 33	17 32	23 25	15 22	21 49	11 38	15 46	10 12	18 20	17 33	22 36	20 20
Vanderbilt Nests Vanderbilt FCs	141 118	186 175	170 111	167 136	125 118	90 131	159 125	90 45	61 91	78 81	55 69	82 64	62 65	111 88
Park Shore Nests Park Shore FCs	134 120	150 133	106 119	154 186	105 79	81 75	122 188	73 64	40 58	68 78	67 60	73 52	50 43	86 74
Naples Nests Naples FCs	45 51	49 70	87 74	68 70	52 49	31 49	59 52	61 39	31 55	30 40	42 43	50 38	50 42	72 35
Marco Nests Marco FCs	39 71	91 117	91 113	50 52	79 115	28 54	55 80	59 97	39 75	56 107	40 96	34 52	54 94	46 90
Total Nests Total FCs	498 475	613 603	591 539	552 541	488 470	307 359	504 560	378 356	258 392	298 373	262 321	331 324	297 330	422 397

Figure 2.3.3.1. Collier County Annual Emergences, 1997 – 2010.




Figure 2.3.3.2. Barefoot Annual Emergences, 1997 – 2010.




Figure 2.3.3.3. Delnor-Wiggins Pass SRA Annual Emergences, 1997 – 2010.




Figure 2.3.3.4. Vanderbilt Beach Annual Emergences, 1997 – 2010.




Figure 2.3.3.5. Park Shore Beach Annual Emergences, 1997 – 2010.




Figure 2.3.3.6. City of Naples Annual Emergences, 1997 – 2010.






Figure 2.3.3.7. City of Marco Island Annual Emergences, 1997 – 2010.



2.3.3 Weekly Emergence Analysis

Sea turtle weekly emergence (nest and false crawls) trends are depicted in Figure 2.3.3.1 for 2009 and 2010. There are typically two peaks of sea turtle emergences for each season. The peaks for the 2010 season occurred in the middle of June and the first week of July, which is representative of an average season.



### 2.3.5 Clutch Depth

Measurements of the egg cavity were taken for each excavated nest when possible. Clutch depths were recorded from 358 of the 422 nests deposited. The clutch width was measured from the widest portion of the egg cavity and the clutch depth was measured from the sand surface to the firm bottom of the egg cavity. A significant difference was found when the clutch depths were compared between renourished and non-renourished beaches ( $p = 3.98 \times 10^{-6}$ ;  $df = 1,355$ ;  $F = 21.96$ ).

Table 2.3.5.1. Clutch Depth in Renourished Sand Types, 2010.

	Natural	Renourished
Mean Clutch Depth (Inches)	19.08	20.53
Number of Nests	162	195

### 2.3.6 Hatching Evaluation

In 2010, 422 nests were marked for evaluation. Of these nests, the Sea Turtle Protection Program, The Conservancy of Southwest Florida, and Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park staff evaluated a total of 372 nests. Forty-eight (11%) were lost due to storms during the 2010 season. Tidal flooding inundated 16% ( $n = 70$ ) of all nests. Tidal flooding and washed out nests combined accounted for 28% of all nests compared to 34% in 2009.

The average number of eggs per nest (clutch size) was 102 (range = 8–160). Loggerhead sea turtles average 110 to 120 eggs per nest throughout their range, but the clutch size is highly variable (Ernst *et al.*, 1994).

Table 2.3.6.1. Collier County Mean Clutch Size, 2010.

	Barefoot	Delnor Wiggins Pass	Vanderbilt	Park Shore	Naples	Marco
Mean Egg Count / Nest	94	111	101	100	101	106

A total of 37,650 eggs were deposited into the evaluated nests and 27,045 hatchlings entered the Gulf of Mexico (Table 2.3.6.2). The total number of hatchlings that entered the Gulf of Mexico includes 26,516 that emerged on their own and 529 that were found alive in the nest cavity.

Table 2.3.6.2.Nest / Hatchling Evaluations by Beach Unit, 2010.

	Barefoot	Delnor Wiggins Pass	Vanderbilt	Park Shore	Naples	Marco	Total
Total Nests	87	20	111	86	82	46	422
Lost Nests	10	1	7	10	18	2	48
Total Eggs	7,305	2,121	10,576	7,669	5,298	4,681	37,650
Emerged Hatchlings	5,512	1,299	7,725	5,261	3,996	2,818	26,611
Hatchlings Alive in Nest	26	79	69	103	97	157	531
Hatchlings Dead in Nest	130	110	72	151	100	93	656
Undeveloped Eggs	1,097	345	1,981	1,632	622	675	6,352
Dead Embryos	240	114	627	421	201	819	2,422
Predated Eggs	280	103	52	0	226	27	688
Pipped Live Eggs	0	20	22	0	7	18	67
Pipped Dead Eggs	20	51	28	101	51	74	325
Overall Hatch Success of Evaluated Nests	78%	70%	74%	72%	79%	66%	73.8%
Overall Hatchling Emergence Success	75%	61%	73%	69%	75%	60%	70.7%

Unhatched eggs (9,462) were opened to identify fertility and embryonic development. Dead embryos comprised 26% of the unhatched eggs, depredated eggs made up 7%, and the remaining 67% were labeled as undeveloped due to lack of evidence of advanced embryological development. The undeveloped eggs may be a result of infertility or early embryological death. Each dead embryo was carefully inspected and the developmental stage was determined based on the 30 stages described by Miller (1985). Stages 1 through 20 are difficult to distinguish and were recorded together and labeled as “less than stage 21”. Stages 21 through 30 are determined relatively easily with the naked eye and were recorded separately. Embryos too decomposed for identification were labeled as “undetermined”.

The mean incubation rate for nests deposited in non-renourished areas was 59.1 days. This rate is only slightly higher than the 58.9 days experienced for nests deposited in renourished sands. This included hydraulic and upland renourished sands. Finally, there was no significant difference in the mean incubation rate between nests that were fully exposed to the sun and nests that were shaded by vegetation or buildings ( $p = 0.89$ ;  $df = 1,182$ ;  $F = 2.92$ ).

Table 2.3.6.4. Mean Incubation Rate in Natural and Renourished Sand Types, 2010.

	Natural	Hydraulic	Upland
Mean Incubation Rate (days)	59.1	58.8	59.3
Number of Nests	154	167	19

The incubation success of a nest was measured by its overall hatching success and emergence success. The hatching success was calculated as the number of hatched eggs including live hatchlings and dead hatchlings found in the nest divided by the total egg count. The emergence success was calculated as the number of naturally emerged hatchlings divided by

the total egg count. The mean emergence success was 64% and the mean hatching success was 66% for all beaches and sand types (Table 2.3.6.5). The emergence success of nests found on natural, non-renourished beaches versus renourished beaches was not significantly different ( $p = 0.54$ ;  $df = 1,420$ ;  $F = 0.38$ ). When comparing the hatching successes on natural non-renourished beaches with those of renourished beaches, there was also no significant difference found ( $p = 0.59$ ;  $df = 1,420$ ;  $F = 0.29$ ).

Table 2.3.6.5. Hatching and Emergence Success in Natural and Renourished Sand, 2010.

Natural Sand or Renourishment Type	Natural	Renourished	Overall
Mean Hatching Success	62.4%	64.4%	63.5%
Mean Emergence Success	59.4%	61.7%	60.6%

### 2.3.7 Nest Predation

Depredation by raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), fire ants (*Solenopsis invicta*), ghost crabs (*Ocypode quadrata*), roots and humans affected 7.3% (31 nests). Most depredations occurred on Marco Island Beach, where 10 nests (2.3%) were depredated. The damage caused by predators to sea turtle eggs was not significant. Of 37,650 eggs deposited in 2010, 688 (1.8%) were lost to predators, an increase from 110 (0.4%) in 2009. Hatchlings were affected by ants and ghost crabs with 16 (0.06%) taken from a total of 26,611 hatchlings. Table 2.3.7.1 provides a breakdown of egg predation during 2010.



Table 2.3.7.1. Egg Depredation in Collier County, 2010.

Predator(s)	Number of Eggs Taken	Percentage By Predator
Raccoons	324	47.1
Fox	26	3.7
Ants	77	11.3
Human	201	29.2
Roots	36	5.4
Ants and Raccoons	3	0.4
Ghost Crabs	20	2.9
Total	688	100

Nests that are investigated by raccoons typically are predated during the first few days after deposition. Gallagher *et al.* (1972) found that of the 398 nests on Hutchinson Island that were predated by raccoons, 34 percent were discovered and taken within 48 hours of having been deposited. Davis and Whiting (1977) reported even higher (87%) raccoon predation during the first 24 hours after deposition at Cape Sable, Florida. However, in 1997 and 1998, raccoons were getting into nests throughout most stages of nest incubation, unlike previous years. In 1999, Vanderbilt Beach nests were depredated throughout most stages of development, but the remainder of Collier County beaches had raccoon depredations confined to within 24 hours of deposition, or as a nest hatched. In 2000, all beaches that exhibited raccoon predation were depredated throughout most stages of development. In 2001–2006, the majority of the nests were raccoon-depredated within 24 hours of deposition.

### **Section 3**

#### **Public Awareness and Beach Lighting**

Public education plays a vital role in conservation. Many beach goers are unaware of the problems that sea turtles encounter. The CCPRD staff provides an important link to knowledge and understanding of the characteristics and natural history of the sea turtles that inhabit our area. In 2010, staff responded to the inquiries of approximately 3,786 people during morning surveys. Through public presentations, mail distributions and related local events, the CCPRD staff works to make sea turtle conservation a community challenge that brings to light the importance of our common natural environment. Our local beaches are an important habitat requirement for sea turtles and making homeowners and visitors aware of the possible impact of artificial lighting is also an important aspect of the public education program.

Artificial lighting on nesting beaches, distant sources of illumination (“city glow”) and other sources of light pollution can interfere with the normal nesting behavior of sea turtles and cause hatchling orientation problems. Light pollution has been proven to discourage sea turtles from emerging out of the water to nest (Witherington, 1996). The negative effects of artificial lights on hatchling sea turtles are well documented (Danial and Smith, 1947; Dickerson and Nelson, 1989; Witherington, 1990). Artificial lighting interferes with a hatchling sea turtle’s ability to correctly orient, causing them to crawl towards sources of the light pollution (disorientations). Disorientations affect sea turtles by leaving them vulnerable to dehydration, exhaustion, and predation (Witherington, 1999). Hatchling loggerhead turtles appear to be more

susceptible to disorientation on wider beaches where nests are placed further from the vegetation, implying a protective benefit of the dune vegetation, by shading landward light sources.


In accordance with the “Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Regulations” (Land Development Code Sec.3.10, 1994), CCPRD developed a program to minimize the damages caused by light pollution. The program is composed of two annual mail-outs prior to season, night lighting compliance inspections, violation notices, and code enforcement action. The first annual mail-out is a sea turtle information package sent to beachfront establishments. The mail-out illustrates the importance of shielding or turning off lights during sea turtle nesting season and suggests inexpensive methods of reducing and minimizing beach lighting. It also reminds the residents to remove any obstacles to nesting and hatching sea turtles such as beach furniture or recreational accessories, and reminds them to refrain from trimming beachfront vegetation during and prior to season. The 2<sup>nd</sup> mail out is a post card/sticker and is sent a few days prior to May 1.

Throughout sea turtle nesting season (May 01 – October 31), the CCPRD staff conducts monthly lighting compliance inspections. The monthly inspections are conducted as close to the new moon phase as possible. Light sources that create a visible shadow on the beach are considered a violation. When a violation is identified, efforts are made to work with the property managers and owners to correct the problem. Violations with no attempt to correct are sent to Collier County’s Code Enforcement Department for formal action. If the violation is not corrected when the Code Enforcement Inspector arrives, the establishment receives formal “Notice of Violation”. Additional violations may result in citations and court actions.

By working with property owners, managers, and renters, the beach lighting program decreased the amount of hatchling sea turtles affected by light pollution. In 1996, ESD staff

documented 42 disorientations (7% of the nests), since that time the amount of disorientations has decreased. In 2010, there were 14 disorientations (3.5% of the nests) caused by severe beach lighting violations, including a beach renourishment that was conducted during sea turtle season on Hideaway Beach. Ten disorientations were documented during this event. Figure 3.1 shows a yearly decrease in disorientations beginning one year after the initiation of the beach lighting program and continuing through 2010.

Figure 3.1. Disoriented Nests in Collier County, 1996–2010.



In addition to documenting lighting violations, Parks and Recreation staff also recorded objects left on the beach that could be an obstacle to nesting and hatchling sea turtles. The Collier County Land Development Code section 3.13.3 requires that any structure such as beach umbrellas and furniture not requiring a building permit, be removed nightly from the beach. Objects left on the beach over-night were documented and a NOV sticker adhered to the object to inform the owner of the need for furniture or equipment to be removed. Staff hopes to reduce this number by notifying people about the harm furniture and other equipment can cause on nesting or hatchling sea turtles.

## **SECTION 4**

### **SEA TURTLE STRANDING AND SALVAGE PROGRAM**

Stranded sea turtles are that which wash ashore or are found floating, dead or alive in a weakened condition. The ESD has been actively involved in assisting the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission's (FWC) Sea Turtle Stranding and Salvage Network (STSSN) with data collection on dead, sick or injured sea turtles since 1994. Prior to 1994, not all strandings in Collier County were reported and many sea turtles were disposed of without notification to the ESD or the FWC. The FWC is required to send all stranding data to the National Marine Fisheries Service (NMFS) on a weekly basis. The NMFS uses this data to further our knowledge of sea turtle biology, species composition, distribution, seasonality, migratory patterns, habitat use and sources of mortality.

Sources of sea turtle mortality include, but are not limited to the following: incidental catch by commercial fisheries (trawling gear, gill nets, drift nets, long lines and crab traps), entanglement and ingestion of marine debris, boat strikes, poaching, injury from shark attack, disease, and natural causes. The cause of mortality is determined when possible and used to identify ways of aiding in population sustainability; although it is estimated that only 27% of the carcasses are detected and therefore reported (Murphy, T.M. and Sally Hopkins Murphy, 1989). The STSSN program is critical to the future conservation and recovery efforts of sea turtles.

In 2010, 47 sea turtles were reported stranded along the Collier County coastline (Figure 4.2). Strandings occurred almost every month, with the exception of September, November and December (Figure 4.1).

Figure 4.1. Collier County Sea Monthly Turtle Strandings 2010





Figure 4.2. Collier County Sea Turtle Strandings, 1996-2010.



Strandings in 2010 included 25 loggerheads, five (5) Kemp's ridleys', two (2) hawksbill, twelve (12) green turtles, one leatherback and two unidentified turtles. Eight of the 47 sea turtles were alive at the time of stranding. One was returned to the Gulf immediately, seven were transported to the rehabilitation facilities, Mote Marine Lab (2), CROW (4) and Clearwater Marine Aquarium (1). Four of the 47 reported turtle strandings were not recovered.

Abnormalities of dead and live sea turtles ranged from boat and/or obvious propeller damage with visible markings or hull paint (5), shark bite (2) and fishing line entanglement (3) there were no major red tide blooms along the coast or offshore Collier County in 2010. The remaining turtles either had no obvious cause of death or were too decomposed to assess. In many cases it is not known if boat damage or shark bites were the cause of death or a post-mortem injury.

Increased public awareness of the reporting requirements may result in better coverage for the STSSN. Stranding and salvage personnel are not in the field on a daily basis outside of the nesting season and rely on the Florida Marine Patrol and the public for stranding locations. Stranded sea turtles outside the developed beaches may not be found or reported, some are lost at sea, and others buried by persons unfamiliar with the reporting procedures.

The Parks and Recreation Department responded to 33 of the 47 sea turtle strandings. The other strandings were responded to by the following; the Conservancy of Southwest Florida (3), USFWS (4), and Rookery Bay NERR (3).

## SECTION 5

### SUMMARY

Adult loggerhead sea turtle (*Caretta caretta*) emergences were recorded on Collier County beaches from May 17th through August 26th, 2010. A total of 422 nests and 397 false crawls were identified on Barefoot Beach, Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park, Vanderbilt Beach, Park Shore Beach, City of Naples Beach, and City of Marco Island. Weekly emergence data revealed a double peak of increased emergence activity during the middle of June and the last week of July. The summary for each beach is given in Table 5.1.

Table 5.1 Summary of Monitored Beaches, 2010.

	Barefoot	Delnor Wiggins Pass	Vanderbilt	Park Shore	Naples	Marco Island	Total
Beach Length (miles)	3.1	1.2	3.5	3.2	5.6	7.1	23.7
Nests	87	20	111	86	72	46	422
Nests / Mile	28.1	16.7	31.7	26.9	12.9	6.5	17.8
False Crawls	90	20	88	74	35	90	397
False Crawls/ Mile	29	16.7	25.1	23.1	6.3	12.7	16.8
Mean Clutch Size	94	111	101	100	101	106	102
Nests Depredated	6	5	3	0	4	9	27
Nests Inundated	13	7	22	9	6	13	70
Nest Washed Out	10	1	7	10	18	2	48
Mean Incubation (days)	57.6	56.4	57	58.6	58.1	59.7	57.9
Disoriented Nests	0	0	1	2	0	10	13
Mean Hatching Success	67.3%	69.3%	67.8%	60.8%	56.%	60.8%	63.7%
Mean Emergence Success	65.5%	61.4%	66.3%	57.9%	52.9%	54.8%	59.8%
Eggs Deposited	7,305	2,121	10,576	7,669	5,300	4,681	37,652
Hatchlings Emerged	5,512	1,299	7,725	5,261	3,996	2,818	26,611



Data showed no nesting preference for the natural (non-renourished) beach areas. In natural beach areas, a mean of 11.8nests/mile were recorded while 13.3nests/mile were recorded on renourished beach areas (Table 6.2). There was no significant difference found when the clutch depths were compared between renourished and non-renourished beach areas.

Table 5.2 Summary of Natural Beaches Versus Renourished Beach Areas, 2010.

	Natural Beaches	Renourished Beaches	All Beaches
Beach Length (mile)	12.2	11.5	23.7
Nests	230	192	422
Nests Per Mile (mean)	15.7	20.0	17.8
False Crawls	233	164	397
False Crawls Per Mile (mean)	19.1	14.3	16.8
Mean Clutch Depth (in)	19.2	20.5	19.8
Mean Incubation (days)	59.1	58.8	58.4
Mean Hatching Success	62.5	64.5	63.5

There were 37,650 eggs deposited in 2010, 688 (1.8%) were lost to predators, an increase from 137 (.5%) in 2009.

Strandings in 2010 included 25 loggerheads, 5 Kemp's ridleys and 12 green sea turtles 2 hawksbills, one leatherback and 2 unidentifiable due to decomposition. Seven of the 47 sea turtles were alive at the time of stranding. One was returned to the Gulf immediately and six were transported to a rehabilitation facility.

## **SECTION 6**

### **ACKNOWLEDGMENTS**

The Collier County Parks and Recreation Department would like to extend our thanks and appreciation to the following persons and organizations for their contributions: Harold Saylor, Helle Brimmekamp, Mary & Richard Nelson, Sonja Gonzalez, Julie Ross, Beverly Shipe, Harold Bruens, Scott Aldrich, Dan Flaherty, Linda Heacock, Sue Hebbe, Logan Kraus, Emily Porter, Marty and Debbie Roddy, Ashley Mc Gregor, and the countless other volunteers and community service students for their volunteer services. We would also like to thank Melissa Hennig, Facilities Management; Mac Hatcher, David Addison and interns, CSWF; Dr. Michael Bauer, Katie Laakkonen, Monique Barnhart, and Roger Jakobsen, City of Naples; Carolyn Shaw, Mark Nikoletti and staff, Delnor-Wiggins Pass State Park; Robbin Trindell, Meghan Koperski, Beth Brost and Karrie Minch, FWCC; Jill Schmid, Cheryl Metzger, Greg Curry, Rookery Bay NERR; Nancy Richie, City of Marco Island; the City of Naples Police Department-Beach Patrol; and the FWCC Marine Patrol.

The CCPRD would also like to extend appreciation to the Tourist Development Council, the Collier County Board of County Commissioners, the Beach Nourishment/Maintenance Committee, and all others we may have failed to mention.

## SECTION 7

### REFERENCES

- Carr, A. and L. Ogren. 1960. The ecology and migrations of sea turtles, IV. The Green Turtle in the Caribbean Sea. *American Museum Natural History Bulletin*. 121:1-48.
- Daniel, R. and K. Smith. 1974. The sea-approach behavior of the neonate loggerhead turtle. *Journal of Comparative Physiology and Psychology*. 40:413-420.
- Davis, G. and M. Whiting. 1977. Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nesting in Everglades National Park, Florida, U.S.A. *Herpetologica*. 33:18-28.
- Dickerson, D. and D. Nelson. 1989. Beachfront lighting issues regarding sea turtles. *Proceedings of Beach Preservation Technology*. Florida Shore and Beach Preservation Association. Tampa, Florida.
- Dodd, C. 1988. Synopsis of the Biological Data on the Loggerhead Sea Turtle, *Caretta caretta*. US Fish & Wildlife Service, Biol Rep. 88:1-110.
- Erhart, L. 1979. Patterns of Sea Turtle Mortality on the East-central Florida Coast, 1977-1978. *Florida Scientist*, 42 (Supplement 1). Pp 26.
- Erhart, L. and P. Raymond. 1983. The Effects of Beach Restoration on Marine Turtles Nesting in South Brevard County, Florida. U.S. Army Corps Of Engineers. Jacksonville, Florida.
- Ernst, C., J. Lovich, and R. Barbour. 1994. *Turtles of the United States and Canada*. Smithsonian Institution Press. Pp 59-73.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2002. *Sea Turtle Conservation Guidelines*. Bureau of Protected Species Management. Tequesta, Florida.
- Gallagher, R., M. Hollinger, R. Ingle, and C. Futch. 1972. Marine Turtle Nesting on Hutchinson Island, Florida in 1971. Florida Department of Natural Resources, Special Scientific Report. 37:1-11.
- Groombridge, B., (Compiler). 1982. *The IUCN Amphibia-Reptilia Red Data Book. Part 1. Testudines, Crocodylia, Rhynchocephalia*. IUCN, Gland, Switzerland. 426 Pp.
- Johnson, A. 1970. Biology of the Raccoon in Alabama. Auburn University Agriculture Station Bulletin. 402:1-148.

- Kraus, M. 1991. Marco Island Sea Turtle Monitoring. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-91-01.
- Kraus, M. 1992. Human Disturbances and Protection of Sea Turtles on Nesting Beaches in Collier County. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-B-93-02.
- Kraus, M., J. Staiger, and D. Sutor. 1993. Observations on Loggerhead Sea Turtle Nesting at Three Beaches in Collier County. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-B-93-02.
- Kraus, M., D. Sutor, and L. Douglass. 1995. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-95-01.
- Kraus, M, D. Sutor, and K. Maheuron. 1996. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-96-01.
- Kraus, M, D. Sutor, and K. Maheuron. 1997. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-97-01.
- Kraus, M., D. Sutor, and K. Maheuron. 1998. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-98-01.
- Kraus, M., D. Sutor, and K. Maheuron. 1999. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-99-01.
- Kraus, M., P. Allman, and J. Seitz. 2000. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-01-01.
- Kraus, M., J. Seitz, M. Toro, and S. Gonzalez. 2001. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-02-01.
- Kraus, M., J. Seitz, M. Toro, and S. Gonzalez. 2002. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-03-01.
- Kraus, M., J. Seitz, M. Toro, and S. Gonzalez. 2003. Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR-SP-04-01.

- Kraus, M., J. Seitz, M. Toro, M. Hennig and S. Gonzalez. 2004 Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR- SP 05-01.
- Kraus, M., M. Toro, M. Hennig and S. Gonzalez. 2005 Collier County Sea Turtle Protection Plan. Sea Turtle Monitoring Program. Collier County Environmental Services Division. Publication Series NR- SP 06-01.
- LeBuff, C. 1990. The Loggerhead Turtle in the Eastern Gulf of Mexico. Caretta Research, Inc. Sanibel Island, Florida. 216 pp.
- Mann, T. 1978. Impact of developed coastline on nesting and hatchling sea turtles in southeastern Florida. Florida Marine Resource Publication 33:53-55.
- Miller, J. 1985. Embryology of marine turtles. In C Gans, F Billet and P Maderson (eds), *Biology of the Reptilia*, Vol 14. Academic Press, New York. Pp 269-328.
- Mortimer, J. 1987. Management and research needs: Research needed for the management of beach habitat. Proceedings of the Second Western Atlantic Turtle Symposium. US Department of Commerce, NOAA, NMFS, Southeast Fisheries Service, Panama City, Florida. Pp. 236-246.
- Moulding, J., and D. Nelson. 1988. Beach renourishment issues related to sea turtle nesting. Proceedings American Water Resources Association: Symposium on Coastal Water Resources. Wilmington, NC. Pp 87-93.
- Murphy, T.M. and S.R. Hopkins-Murphy. 1989. Sea Turtle and Shrimp Fishing Interactions: a summary and critique of relevant information. Center for Marine Conservation. Washington, D.C. 52 pp.
- National Research Council. 1990. Decline of the Sea Turtle: Causes and Prevention. National Academy Press. Washington, DC. 259 Pp.
- Nelson, D. 1988. Life History and Environmental Requirements of Loggerhead Turtles. US Fish & Wildlife Service Biol Rep. 88:1-34.
- Nelson, D. 1991. Issues associated with beach renourishment and sea turtle nesting. In Proceedings Fourth Annual National Beach Preservation Technology Conference. Charleston, SC. Pp 227-294.
- Nelson, D. and D. Dickerson. 1989. Effects of beach renourishment on sea turtles. In Proceedings of the Ninth Annual Workshop of Sea Turtle Conservation. Jekyll Island, GA. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-232.

- Nelson, D., K. Mauck, and J. Fletemeyer. 1987. Physical Effects of Beach Nourishment on Sea Turtle Nesting. Delray Beach, Florida. Technical Report EL-87-15.
- Pritchard, P. 1979. Encyclopedia of Turtles. TFH Publications, Inc. Neptune, New York. 895 Pp.
- Raymond, P. 1984. The effects of beach restoration on marine turtles nesting in south Brevard County, Florida. University of Central Florida MS Thesis. Orlando, Florida. 121 Pp.
- Ryder, J. 1997. Sea Turtle Monitoring Report, 1997. The Conservancy of Southwest Florida. Unpublished report. Naples, FL.
- Salmon, M., and J. Wynekin. 1990. Do swimming loggerhead sea turtles (*Caretta caretta*) use light cues for offshore orientation? *Marine Behavior and physiology*. 17:233-246.
- Schmeltz, G., and R. Mezich. 1988. A preliminary investigation of the potential impact of Australian pines on the nesting activities of the loggerhead turtle. In Proceedings of the Eighth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Conservation and Biology. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC-214. Pp 63-66.
- Williams-Walls, N., O'Hara J, Gallagher R, Worth D, Peery B and J Wilcox. 1983. Spatial and temporal trends of sea turtle nesting on Hutchinson Island, Florida, 1971-1979. *Bulletin of Marine Science*. 33:55-66.
- Witherington, B. 1990. Photo pollution on sea turtle nesting beaches: problems and next best solutions. In Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Workshop on Sea Turtle Biology and Conservation. NOAA Technical Memorandum NMFS-SEFC.
- Witherington, B. 1991. Orientation of hatchling loggerhead turtles at sea off artificially lighted and dark beaches. *Journal of Experimental Marine Biology and Ecology*. 149:1-11.
- Witherington, B. 1999. Reducing Threats to Nesting Habitat. In Research and Management Techniques for the Conservation of Sea Turtles. Eckert, K, K Bjorndal, F Abreu- Grobois, M. Donnelly (Editors). IUCN/SSc Marine Turtle Specialist Group Publication No. 4, 1999.
- Witherington, B. and K. Bjorndal. 1991. Influences of artificial lighting on the seaward orientation of hatchling loggerhead turtles *Caretta caretta*. *Biological Conservation*. 55:139-149.
- Witherington, B. and R. Martin. 1996. Understanding, Assessing and Resolving Light-Pollution Problems on Sea Turtle Nesting Beaches. FMRI Technical Report. St. Petersburg, Florida.

