

## **Recovery Plan for the Endangered Key Largo woodrat (*Neotoma floridana smalli*)**

<https://www.fws.gov/verobeach/MSRPPDFs/KeyLargoWoodrat.pdf>

**Original Approved:** May 18, 1999

**Original Prepared by:** South Florida Ecological Services Office staff

### **DRAFT AMENDMENT 1**

We have identified the need to amend recovery criteria for Key Largo woodrat (*Neotoma floridana smalli*; KLWR) with the best available information discovered since the recovery plan was completed. In this proposed modification, we synthesize the adequacy of the existing recovery criteria, show amended recovery criteria, and provide rationale supporting the proposed recovery plan modification. The proposed modification is shown as an addendum that supplements the South Florida Multi-Species Recovery Plan (MSRP; USFWS 1999) by adding delisting criteria for the KLWR that were not developed at the time this recovery plan was completed. The original recovery objectives and the step-down outline are described on page 4-209 of the MSRP. Recovery plans are a non-regulatory document that provide guidance on how best to help recover species.

**For  
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service  
Region 4  
Atlanta, Georgia**

**December 2018**

### **METHODOLOGY USED TO COMPLETE THE RECOVERY PLAN AMENDMENT**

The proposed amendments to the recovery criteria were developed using the most recent and best available information for the species. This information was prepared by the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) biologists and managers in the South Florida Ecological Services Field Office in order to develop the recovery criteria for the KLWR.

### **ADEQUACY OF RECOVERY CRITERIA**

Section 4(f)(1)(B)(ii) of the Endangered Species Act (Act) requires that each recovery plan shall incorporate, to the maximum extent practicable, “objective, measurable criteria which, when met, would result in a determination...that the species be removed from the list.” Legal challenges to recovery plans (see *Fund for Animals v. Babbitt*, 903 F. Supp. 96 (D.D.C. 1995)) and a Government Accountability Audit (GAO 2006) also have affirmed the need to frame recovery criteria in terms of threats assessed under the five factors.

### **Recovery Criteria**

The MSRP only provides downlisting criteria for the KLWR, and they can be found on page 4-209 of the document (<https://www.fws.gov/verobeach/MSRPPDFs/KeyLargoWoodrat.pdf>).

## Synthesis

New information, obtained after the MSRP was finalized, is detailed in the KLWR 5-Year Status Reviews (USFWS 2008; 2018) and synthesized below. The assessment of threats, suggested recovery actions, and life history information included in the MSRP largely remain applicable and relevant. Issues related to habitat (i.e., loss, fragmentation, need for management or restoration; Factor A) and predation and competition from non-native, invasive species and free-roaming pets (i.e., black rats, dogs, cats, fire ants; Factor C) are still directly pertinent to the KLWR's recovery.

However, some important advances in our understanding of the KLWR have been made since the MSRP. For example, research studies determined that detection probabilities of KLWR through typical live-trapping methods are very low (Potts et al. 2012), which led to the development of a stick nest-based occupancy modeling approach to assess population trends (Cove et al. 2017). Also, several years of captive propagation indicated that due to the species' social structure and taming issues, an effective captive propagation and release program would likely require an *in situ* program and complex colony management (Alligood et al. 2011; Gore 2012; McCleery et al. 2014). Furthermore, the loss of most of the released individuals to cat predation revealed an impact of free-roaming cats that exceeded previous assessments of this threat (Service 2011). Predation by Burmese pythons (*Python bivittatus*) was also not a threat, or known to be a threat, at the time of the MSRP, but was first documented in 2007. Over 25 pythons have been captured in Key Largo since then (EDDMapS 2017), and evidence of a breeding population (three 18-inch hatchlings) was observed in 2016. Thousands of black and white tegus (*Salvator merianae*) have been observed in the Florida City area, and there have been two found in Key Largo (Klug et al. 2015; EDDMaps 2018). While not a documented predator of the KLWR, this omnivore is highly intelligent, capable of running at relatively high speeds, and known to consume small vertebrates.

The MSRP does not specifically address climate change or sea level rise in the KLWR recovery criteria or recovery actions. The KLWR's distribution appears to be undergoing a constriction due to encroaching mangrove areas from the coast and human infrastructure expanding from the island's interior toward the coast (i.e., "coastal squeeze"; Factor D, E). Recent models suggests that particularly at three to four feet of sea level rise, water levels will severely fragment habitat and several habitat bottlenecks will materialize (FWC 2017). This level of sea level rise is forecasted to occur in 42 to 80+ years (2060-2100; NOAA 2017), but does not account for reduction of KLWR habitat due to habitat changes (i.e., hardwood hammock transitioning into mangroves) that are likely to occur decades prior to inundation (Saha et al. 2011).

Additional information needs and data gaps still remain that could impede recovery. For example, uncertainties exist related to the genetic structure of the population and the level of historical and present fragmentation. Fortunately, results from a current research project should lessen ambiguity. Questions still remain with respect to the KLWR's habitat preference (tropical hardwood hammock age). Impacts to habitat from hurricane Irma may allow for some habitat

comparisons to be added to current research efforts, or a specific treatment study will need to be developed. Finally, several predators, diseases, and parasites (e.g., raccoon roundworm, toxoplasmosis, rat lungworm) have the potential to severely impact KLWR populations, particularly during vulnerable periods (i.e., drought, post-hurricane, natural population low). Further surveillance of these predators, diseases, and their vectors, are needed to determine the scope and severity of these threats.

## **AMENDED RECOVERY CRITERIA**

Recovery criteria serve as objective, measurable guidelines to assist in determining when an endangered species has recovered to the point that it may be downlisted to threatened, or that the protections afforded by the Act are no longer necessary and the KLWR may be delisted. Delisting is the removal of a species from the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants. Downlisting is the reclassification of a species from an endangered species to a threatened species. The term “endangered species” means any species (species, sub-species, or distinct population segment) which is in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range. The term “threatened species” means any species which is likely to become an endangered species within the foreseeable future throughout all or a significant portion of its range.

Revisions to the Lists, including delisting or downlisting a species, must reflect determinations made in accordance with sections 4(a)(1) and 4(b) of the Act. Section 4(a)(1) requires that the Secretary determine whether a species is an endangered species or threatened species (or not) because of threats to the species. Section 4(b) of the Act requires that the determination be made “solely on the basis of the best scientific and commercial data available.” Thus, while recovery plans provide important guidance to the Service, States, and other partners on methods of minimizing threats to listed species and measurable objectives against which to measure progress towards recovery, they are guidance and not regulatory documents.

Recovery criteria should help indicate when we would anticipate that an analysis of the species’ status under section 4(a)(1) would result in a determination that the species is no longer an endangered species or threatened species. A decision to revise the status of or remove a species from the Federal Lists of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants, however, is ultimately based on an analysis of the best scientific and commercial data then available, regardless of whether that information differs from the recovery plan, which triggers rulemaking. When changing the status of a species, we first propose the action in the *Federal Register* to seek public comment and peer review, followed by a final decision announced in the *Federal Register*.

Herein, we provide delisting criteria for the KLWR as the MSRP only developed downlisting criteria as discussed above.

### **Downlisting Recovery Criteria**

We are not amending the existing downlisting criteria (please refer to page 4-209 of the MSRP).

### **Delisting Recovery Criteria**

The Key Largo woodrat will be considered for delisting when all the following criteria have been met:

1. Five (5) additional populations are established or discovered that exhibit a stable or increasing population trend for multiple generations, and natural recruitment (Factor A).
2. The five (5) new populations should be located outside of Dagny Johnson Botanical Preserve State Park and Crocodile Lake National Wildlife Refuge and be connected to the extent that genetic diversity can be naturally maintained without translocations or captive breeding (Factor A, D, E).
3. Non-native species (e.g., Burmese pythons, tegus, free-roaming pets, black rats) are reduced or eliminated to a degree that predation and competition is low enough for KLWR to remain viable for the foreseeable future. (Factor C, D)
4. When in addition to the above criteria, it can be demonstrated that habitat loss associated with sea level rise and development are diminished such that enough suitable habitat remains for KLWR to remain viable for the foreseeable future. (Factor E).

### **Justification**

The proposed delisting criteria reflect the best available and most up-to-date information of the KLWR, while incorporating information still relevant from the MSRP. Furthermore, the delisting criteria developed reflect the species' overarching recovery strategy and are consistent with current goals, objectives, and known risk levels.

Specifically, each delisting criterion ensures that the underlying causes of decline and impediments to recovery will be addressed and mitigated by:

Criterion 1. Provides redundancy through multiple populations and sufficient habitat, additionally reaching demographic parameters allows for resiliency to stochastic events. Since populations of many small mammals, including the KLWR, fluctuate cyclically, it is necessary to evaluate population demographics across multiple generations to assess true trends.

Criterion 2. Providing redundancy through multiple sites, resiliency through maintenance of genetic diversity in order to preserve population variability (i.e., maintain unique local adaptations) and population adaptability (i.e., capability to adapt to environmental stressors). Providing natural, functional connectivity is critical because the intensive management actions required to lessen the effects of fragmentation (i.e., translocations, captive breeding) have been shown to be complicated and costly with KLWR.

Criterion 3. Providing a long-term solution to significantly reduce or eliminate the threat of non-native species.

Criterion 4. Ensuring sufficient habitat is expected to remain for long-term persistence, despite habitat changes and habitat loss projected due to sea level rise.

Together, these recovery criteria cover threats related to habitat loss and connectivity, non-native predators, genetic diversity, and climate change; all of which are likely drivers of the KLWR's population demographics and the species' long-term persistence. In achieving these criteria, we expect the KLWR to have a low probability of extinction for the foreseeable future and have large, stable populations needed for long-term recovery. We will work together with our partners to strategically and efficiently implement the new criteria.

### **Rationale for Amended Recovery Criteria**

The existing criteria for KLWR on page 4-209 in the MSRP (Service 1999) ([https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery\\_plan/sfl\\_msrp/SFL\\_MSRP\\_Species.pdf](https://ecos.fws.gov/docs/recovery_plan/sfl_msrp/SFL_MSRP_Species.pdf)) included only downlisting criteria. With these proposed amendments, delisting has been clearly defined with measurable, objective criteria in keeping with the recovery strategy and goals outlined in the MSRP. These criteria address what is necessary to ensure resiliency, redundancy, and representation by addressing factors that threaten the species. In achieving these criteria, we expect the KLWR to have a low probability of extinction for the foreseeable future and have stable populations needed for long-term recovery. We will work together with our partners to strategically and efficiently implement the new criteria.

### **LITERATURE CITED**

- Alligood, C.A., A.J. Daneault, R.C. Carlson, T. Dillenbach, C.J. Wheaton, and A. Savage. 2011. Development of husbandry practices for the captive breeding of Key Largo woodrats (*Neotoma floridana smallii*). *Zoo Biology* 30: 318-327.
- Cove, M.V., T.R. Simons, B. Gardner, A.S. Maurer, and A.F. O'Connell. 2017. Evaluating nest supplementation as a management strategy in the recovery of the endangered rodents of the Florida Keys. *Restoration Ecology* 25: 253-260.
- EDDMapS. 2017. Burmese python. Early Detection & Distribution Mapping System. The University of Georgia - Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health. Available online at <http://www.eddmaps.org/>; accessed November 6, 2017 and March 8, 2018.
- EDDMapS. 2018. Black and white tegu. Early Detection & Distribution Mapping System. The University of Georgia - Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health. Available online at <http://www.eddmaps.org/>; accessed November 6, 2017 and March 8, 2018.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). 2017. Keys terrestrial adaptation planning: Florida Keys case study on incorporating climate change considerations into conservation planning and actions for threatened and endangered species. Unpublished draft report.

- Gore, J.A. 2012. Survival of captive-reared Key Largo woodrats (*Neotoma floridana smalli*) released in the absence of house cats. Unpublished report. Florida Wildlife Research Institute, Panama City.
- Klug, P. E., Reed, R. N., Mazzotti, F. J., McEachern, M. A., Vinci, J. J., Craven, K. K., & Adams, A. A. Y. 2015. The influence of disturbed habitat on the spatial ecology of Argentine black and white tegu (*Tupinambis merianae*), a recent invader in the Everglades ecosystem (Florida, USA). *Biological Invasions* 17: 1785-1797.
- McCleery, R., J.A. Hostetler, and M.K. Oli. 2014. Better off in the wild? Evaluating a captive breeding and release program for the recovery of an endangered rodent. *Biological Conservation* 169: 198-205.
- National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association (NOAA). 2017. Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States. NOAA Technical Report NOS CO-OPS 083. Silver Spring, MD.
- Potts, J., S. Buckland, L. Thomas, and A. Savage. 2012. Estimating abundance of cryptic but trappable animals using trapping point transects: a case study for Key Largo woodrats. *Methods in Ecology and Evolution* 3: 695-703.
- Saha, A.K., Saha, S., J. Sadle, J. Jiang, M. S. Ross, R. M. Price, L. S. L. O. Sternberg, K. S. Wendelberger. 2011. Sea level rise and South Florida coastal forests. *Climate Change* 107: 81-108.
- Soulé, M. E. 1987. Viable populations for conservation. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge. 189 pages.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 1999. South Florida multi-species recovery plan. Atlanta, Georgia.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2008. Key Largo Woodrat – Five-Year Status Review. Vero Beach, Florida.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2011. Letter to Walt Disney World Resort regarding Key Largo woodrat captive propagation program. June 29, 2011. Vero Beach, Florida.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS). 2018. Key Largo Woodrat – Five-Year Status Review: Revision. Vero Beach, Florida.