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Peer review #1 from Boyd Blihovde

From: Boyd_Blihovde@fws.gov
To: Imperiled
Cc: Turner, Bill
Subject: Gopher Frog Review
Date: Tuesday, February 08, 2011 5:33:42 PM

I'm sorry this is late. I did not attach the gopher frog file because I did not find any dramatic errors or lack of information.

The team of reviewers were very thorough and well written when completing the Gopher Frog recommendations. Although I do not agree with a finding that lists the Gopher Frog as "not threatened" (as there review does) I am comfortable with the methods used and the literature search was complete. I understand that the new listing procedures require this new recommendation for each State listed species, and as long as the State of Florida remains consistent, I am confident that species will be managed effectively in Florida if standards such as those used by IUCN are followed. Again, I am not happy with a decrease in protection or fundamental resources for the gopher frog but I agree with the reviewers that places like Ocala National Forest provide a slight level of species survival assurance, and hopefully long term that will remain true.

Thanks,

boyd blihovde
Deputy Refuge Manager
Chassahowitzka National Wildlife Refuge Complex
1502 SE Kings Bay Drive
Crystal River, FL 34429
Peer review #2 from John Palis

From: john palis  
Sent: Wednesday, January 19, 2011 12:29 PM  
To: Turner, Bill  
Subject: capito report comments submission

Hi Bill,

Here's my two cents. I didn't comment on verbage in my review, but there is an odd sentence in the biological review document that implies invertebrates not only eat capito eggs and tadpoles, but also "a variety of vertebrates, such as wading birds and snakes." They must be referring to forms of MACROinvertebrates that I don't know exist. :) When all the reviews are in, how/where can I access them?

Thanks. -- John
Peer review of “Biological Status Review for the Gopher Frog (Lithobates capito)” by John G. Palis (January 2011)

Using the most current occurrence data available, and working within the constraints of State of Florida listing criteria, the 5-member Gopher Frog biological review group (BRG) concluded that the Gopher Frog does not meet the requirements for designation as a threatened species in Florida. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) staff further recommend that the Gopher Frog no longer be listed as a Species of Special Concern. As requested, I reviewed the biological status review of the Gopher Frog and have the following comments.

The BRG appeared to put considerable thought and effort into preparing their biological status review of the gopher frog. The review document is well organized and generally well written. Supporting data are organized in tabular form and assumptions made by the group are provided. Considering the constraints of the listing criteria, it is difficult to disagree with the conclusion of the BRG that the Gopher Frog does not warrant listing by the state of Florida as a threatened species. However, I do see a potential flaw in the Geographic Range analysis and I question the premise that population trends over a ten-year period or during three generations of any species under consideration are sufficient to determine a species’ conservation status.

The FWC listing guidelines appear to ignore historic population declines of species under consideration for listing. Although I consider this a serious flaw in the listing process, I have no further comment as it is beyond the scope of the review requested of me.

A recent review of the status of the Gopher Tortoise in Florida concluded that it warrants listing as a state-threatened species. Therefore, it is difficult to conceive how the Gopher Frog, a species having a more restricted range than its primary upland host, the Gopher Tortoise, can be less endangered than the Gopher Tortoise. This is especially perplexing given the Gopher Frog’s biphasic life history requirements for both suitable breeding non-breeding habitat in close proximity.

The BRG estimated the extent of occurrence of the Gopher Frog in Florida as 80,440 km² based on the total area of the 37 inhabited counties. Recognizing that these counties include habitat types unsuitable for Gopher Frogs, the BRG restricted estimated area of Gopher Frog occupancy within these 37 counties to 8992 km² based on GIS analysis. The estimated area of occupancy was based on 2003 land-cover class estimates of both upland and wetland habitat types deemed suitable for gopher frogs. However, it is not specifically stated whether or not juxtaposition of wetland and upland habitat types was considered in this analysis. This is critically important because, without appropriate breeding habitat, even the best-managed, otherwise suitable upland habitat has no value to gopher frogs. If juxtaposition of suitable upland and wetland habitats was not considered, I recommend re-analysis of estimated area of occupancy incorporating proximity of breeding and non-breeding habitat.

The BRG may also consider using an alternate means of estimating of area of occupancy. Using the 2 km maximum distance Gopher Frogs are known to migrate from breeding sites, a circular area of occupancy around each breeding site of 6.28 km² can be inferred. This, of course, assumes equal upland habitat suitability in every direction from a breeding site. This simple assumption if often not met as a result of nearby unsuitable habitat whether it is natural (e.g., floodplain forest associated with a perennial stream) or anthropogenic (e.g., a shopping mall). However, for illustrative purposes, we will assume all breeding ponds are equally distributed in
the landscape a minimum of 4 km apart, and that all upland around each breeding site is suitable for habitation by Gopher Frogs.

It is not possible to determine the number of extant Gopher Frog breeding sites in Florida based on the biological status review. Apparently, the best estimate of the BRG is “far more than 200 breeding ponds in Florida.” Although equally subjective, I think 300 Gopher Frog breeding ponds in Florida is a fair assumption. Multiplying 6.28 km² by 300 yields an estimate of 1884 km² of Gopher Frog habitat in Florida. This is less than the 2000 km² threshold for a threatened species.

Given that Gopher Frog breeding sites are often clustered in the landscape, the area of occupied upland around each wetland in the cluster would be less than that of isolated breeding sites evenly distributed in the landscape. Therefore, the actual area of Gopher Frog occupancy in Florida may be even less than my rough estimate of 1884 km². In summary, I suspect that the area of occupancy, as determined by the BRG, is likely an over-estimate and should be recalculated.

Although I intuitively agree with the assessment of the BRG that the Gopher Frog is not immediately threatened with extirpation in Florida, I feel strongly that the species’ historic loss of habitat and reduction in range, the continued loss of habitat on private lands, and the degradation of habitat on conservation lands resulting from inappropriate management be accounted for by the FWC. Concern regarding the species’ status in Florida is further justified by the fact that most of the data/information summarized in the biological status review table was based on estimate, inference, and suspicion, not hard data. Based on the biological status review, it is apparent that little is actually known regarding the conservation status of the Gopher Frog in Florida. Unless a future assessment demonstrates that the Gopher Frog is secure as a breeding species in Florida, I recommend retaining some level of legal protection by the state of Florida or inclusion of the Gopher Frog on a “watch” list.
Peer review #3 from Dr. Steve Godley

From: Steve Godley  
To: Imperiled  
Cc: Turner, Bill; Enge, Kevin  
Subject: RE: Gopher frog Draft BSR Report  
Date: Monday, February 21, 2011 11:26:04 AM  

Gopher Frog BSR Peer Review

I concur with the finding of the Biological Review Group (BRG) that the gopher frog (*Lithobates capito*) does not meet any of the FWC criteria for listing included in the definitions in Rule 68A-27.001(3).

However, the modeled Area of Occupancy (8,992 km²), based on a GIS analysis of potential habitat (Stys 2010) as proposed in the BSR, most likely grossly over-estimates the true area of occupancy for this species in Florida. First, this estimate includes 283.7 km² of open water, marshes and wet prairies; given the breeding requirements (small, isolated, fishless wetlands and ponds) and patchy distribution of this species (see below), 1/100th to 1/1,000th of this acreage is probably a better estimate. Secondly, the 8,992 km² is about 66% of the estimated Area of Occupancy for the gopher tortoise (Enge et al. 2006), yet Godley (1992) provided some comparative data indicating the gopher frogs are seemingly absent or rare from a majority of sites with tortoises, at least in central Florida (I acknowledge that gopher frogs use refugia other than gopher tortoise burrows). Kent and Snell (1994) collected 15 gopher frogs from 155 excavated tortoise burrows at a scrub site (with breeding ponds nearby; pers. obs.) in Orange County, but Witz et al. (1991) found none in 1,019 burrows in a Hernando County sandhill (no potential ponds nearby). Mushinsky and McCoy (1991, Vertebrate Species Composition of Selected Scrub Islands on the Lake Wales Ridge of Central Florida, FGFWFC Final Report NG87 - 149) intensively sampled 16 scrubs on the Lake Wales Ridge and detected gopher frogs at only 6 (37.5%); in contrast, gopher tortoises occurred at 15 of the same scrubs. More recently, I (December 2003, IMC’s Mine-wide Gopher Tortoise and Burrow Commensal Management Plan, submitted to the FWC) summarized the results of excavating 12,266 active and inactive tortoise burrows from 42 sites on Mosaic (fka IMC) lands in Polk, Hillsborough, Manatee and Hardee Counties between 1989 – 2003: 6,448 tortoises and 38 species (N = 2,234 individuals) of burrow associates were collected. Gopher frogs (N = 286) occurred at 19 (45%) of the sites, numerically accounted for 12.8% of the burrow associates, and were found in 2.3% of the excavated burrows. On a per acreage basis, gopher frogs were detected at 33.7% of the 31,254 acres sampled, and at sites where they were present, the ratio was 1 gopher frog per 36.8 acres. In my experience, the Mosaic landscape represents good to excellent gopher frog habitat with thousands of suitable breeding ponds and management that favors tortoises and frogs.

J. Steve Godley  
Director Emeritus / Senior Principal  
Cardno ENTRIX  
3905 Crescent Park Drive, Riverview, FL 33578
Peer review #4 from Dr. Bruce Means

From: D. Bruce Means [mailto:means@bio.fsu.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, January 25, 2011 2:17 PM
To: Turner, Bill
Subject: RE: Biol Status Rev of Pine Barrens Treefrog

Greetings, Bill,

Thanks for the kind words about Ryan. My two sons are the apples of my eye, and I am so proud of them. Attached please find my comments for the Biological Status Review for the Gopher Frog. Basically, I find that it is a complete and good review and I only have one comment about sentence structure.

Best regards,
--Bruce

COASTAL PLAINS INSTITUTE
AND LAND CONSERVANCY
1313 Milton Street, Tallahassee, FL 32303
pho 850-681-6208; fax 850-681-6123
means@bio.fsu.edu
www.coastalplains.org

22 January 2011

Bill.Turner@MyFWC.com
Biological Status Review of the
Gopher Frog, Lithobates capito

Dear Bill,

I have carefully reviewed the Biological Status Review of the Gopher Frog and can find no substantive changes that I would recommend. The Gopher Frog committee did a good and thorough job.

I have just one comment about sentence construction to make. Under Threats, paragraph 3 (on page 5), line 7 & 8, I'd change the sentence to read, "Invertebrates and a variety of vertebrates such as wading birds and snakes, can significantly impact population recruitment...."

Other than that, I heartily approve of the text and its content.

Very sincerely yours,

D. Bruce Means, Ph. D.
President and Executive Director
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Peer review #5 from Betsy Roznik

From: Betsy Roznik
To: Imperiled
Subject: Review for gopher frog draft BSR report
Date: Tuesday, February 15, 2011 11:59:00 PM
Attachments: Gopher Frog Final Draft BSR_comments-EAR.doc

Hello,

I have completed my review of the draft biological status report for the gopher frog. In general, I found the information contained in the report to be thorough and accurate, and I agree with most of the interpretations of the data. Please see the attached report for my specific suggestions, which I have added using the track changes tool. I do, however, have two larger concerns that were not addressed in the draft report.

First, gopher frogs are burrow commensals of gopher tortoises. Because gopher tortoises are proposed to be listed as Threatened, it seems appropriate that any species (such as the gopher frog) that strongly relies on tortoise burrows to also be listed as Threatened. I realize that dependency on another Threatened species is not one of the IUCN criteria, but tortoise burrows are an essential habitat requirement for gopher frogs. Although gopher frogs have been reported to use other types of underground refuges, burrow selection has not been studied, and the frequency of use of other refuge types is unknown and should not be overstated. At my study sites in Ocala National Forest, gopher frogs used tortoise burrows as their permanent refuges, but they sometimes used other types of refuges temporarily while traveling to and from breeding ponds. This suggests that tortoise burrows are more important than other types of refugia, but this needs to be studied in further detail. Regardless, gopher frogs are strongly dependent on gopher tortoises and would likely disappear in areas where tortoises decline steeply or become extirpated.

Second, I am concerned about the information that was used to determine the area of gopher frog occupancy throughout the state. To address this sub-criterion, a GIS analysis was used to predict potential habitat for the gopher frog (by B. Stys, FWC). I was not able to evaluate this model fully because the details of the analysis were not available (e.g., how land cover classes were chosen, how breeding ponds were identified, whether these ponds were buffered by surrounding upland habitat, and if so, by how much, etc.). These details are a necessary part of the biological status report because they are not available in a public outlet that is accessible. Also, the assumptions of this model should be explained clearly. I disagree with the assumption that the area of potential habitat is equal to the area of occupancy, and there is an extensive body of literature available in peer-reviewed journals on this topic. In my experience, such GIS analyses vastly overpredict areas of habitat suitability and actual occupancy. This may be especially true for the gopher frog, which requires a combination of high-quality habitat that is actively managed with fire, and high densities of gopher tortoise burrows. We know that sandhill is the land cover class most likely to support large, permanent populations of gopher frogs. According to the report, the amount of potential sandhill habitat is 1,903 km², which is just below the 2,000 km² threshold. However, the actual amount of sandhill used by gopher frogs is presumably less than that, in part due to habitat degradation (such as inappropriate habitat management) and a lack of tortoises. This report acknowledges that a large amount of potential gopher frog habitat on public
and private lands is fire-suppressed (at least 61%), and persistence of gopher frog populations on these lands is unknown. For these reasons, the area of sandhill occupied by gopher frogs is likely less than 2,000 km\(^2\); I strongly suggest erring on the side of caution by scoring the area of occupancy as \(<\ 2,000\ \text{km}^2\). This would mean that the gopher frog would meet two sub-criteria (low area of occupancy, and continued decline) necessary to warrant listing as a Threatened species under the geographic range criterion.

For these two reasons, I believe that the gopher frog should be listed as Threatened. I would be happy to discuss this further, and I would also be happy to evaluate the GIS model if provided with the details of the analysis. (I am experienced in GIS and spatial analysis.) Regardless of the review group’s final decision on the status of the gopher frog, the concerns I have outlined above should be addressed directly in the report and supported with appropriate literature. Please let me know if I can assist in any way, including reviewing a revised draft of the report.

Sincerely,

Betsy Roznik  
PhD Candidate  
School of Marine and Tropical Biology  
James Cook University  
Townsville, QLD 4811  
Australia
Biological Status Review
for the
Gopher Frog
(Lithobates capito)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) directed staff to evaluate all species listed as Threatened or Species of Special Concern as of September 1, 2010. Public information on the status of the gopher frog was sought from September 17 through November 1, 2010. The 5-member biological review group (BRG) met on November 18, 2010. Group members were Kevin Enge (FWC lead), Steve Johnson (University of Florida), Thomas Ostertag (FWC), Rick Owen (Florida Department of Environmental Protection), and David Printiss (The Nature Conservancy) (Appendix 1). In accordance with rule 68A-27.0012 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C), the BRG was charged with evaluating the biological status of the gopher frog using criteria included in definitions in 68A-27.001(3), F.A.C. and following protocols in the Guidelines for Application of the IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Levels (Version 3.0) and Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (Version 8.1). Please visit http://myfwc.com/docs/WildlifeHabitats/Imperiled_EndangeredThreatened_FinalRules.pdf to view the listing process rule and the criteria found in the definitions. The BRG concluded from the biological assessment that the gopher frog did not meet any of the criteria for designation as a Threatened species. FWC staff recommends that the gopher frog not be listed as a threatened species and be removed from the State Species of Special Concern list.

This work was supported by a Conserve Wildlife Tag grant from the Wildlife Foundation of Florida.

BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Taxonomic Classification – Two subspecies of gopher frog were formerly recognized in Florida, the Florida gopher frog (Rana capito aesopus) and the dusky gopher frog (R. c. sevosa). The latter subspecies was thought to occur west of the Apalachicola River (Conant and Collins 1991). However, Young and Crother (2001) analyzed allozyme data that showed no genetic divisions among populations of Rana capito, except for the population in southern Mississippi, which they recommended elevating to specific status by resurrecting Rana sevosa (Goin and Netting, 1940), the dusky gopher frog. Frost et al. (2006) removed New World frogs from the genus Rana and placed them in Lithobates, so the current name for the species occurring in Florida is the gopher frog (Lithobates capito).

Life History and Habitat Requirements – Information on the species has been summarized by Jensen and Richter (2005). The gopher frog primarily inhabits areas with well-drained sandy soils that support gopher tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus) populations (Wright 1932, Franz 1986, Blihovde 2006, Roznik 2007). During the non-breeding season, the gopher frog is generally associated with longleaf pine (Pinus palustris)–xeric oak (Quercus spp.) sandhills but also occurs in upland pine forest, scrub, xeric hammock, mesic and scrubby flatwoods, dry prairie, mixed hardwood-pine communities, and a variety of disturbed habitats (Enge 1997). Gopher frogs extensively use gopher tortoise burrows for underground retreats (Wright 1932, Carr 1940, Franz 1986) but also use southeastern pocket gopher (Geomys pinetis)
burrows, mouse burrows, crayfish burrows, hollow logs, stump holes, root mounds, broken limbs, crevices, dead vegetation, and clumps of grass (Wright and Wright 1949, Gentry and Smith 1968, Lee 1968, Godley 1992, Richter et al. 2001, Nickerson and Celino 2003, Blihovde 2006, K. Enge, FWC, pers. commun. 2010). Underground retreats in uplands are important for avoiding predation and desiccation, and frogs would be unlikely to survive droughts without them (Blihovde 2006). Furthermore, underground retreats are essential for the survival of newly metamorphosed gopher frogs, which experience high predation rates when they are above ground, and are more vulnerable to desiccation than adults (Roznik and Johnson 2009a). Gopher frogs breed in temporary or semipermanent, shallow, fishless ponds with an open canopy and emergent vegetation, including depression marshes, basin marshes, wet prairies, dome swamps, upland sandhill lakes, sinkhole ponds, borrow pits, and ditches (Godley 1992; Jensen and LaClaire 1995; Enge 1997; K. Enge, FWC, pers. commun. 2010).

Gopher frogs will travel up to 2 km to a breeding pond (Franz 1986), typically during heavy winter and spring rains. The breeding season is usually September–April (Palis 1998; Branch and Hokit 2000; Blihovde 2006; S. Morrison, The Nature Conservancy, pers. commun. 2010), but frogs potentially can breed during any month of the year during heavy rains, although summer breeding is probably more common in southern Florida because winter frontal systems are weaker (Godley 1992, Jackson 2004). A female apparently deposits only a single egg mass containing a mean of 1,200–2,200 eggs (see Jensen and Richter 2005). Egg masses are attached to vegetation, and tadpoles transform in 3–7 months (Godley 1992, Palis 1998). Newly metamorphosed frogs leave their natal pond and spend most of their life in the surrounding uplands (Roznik and Johnson 2009b). Males apparently become reproductively mature at 1.5 years and females at 2 years (see Jensen and Richter 2005).

Population Status and Trend – There is no quantitative information, but the population is assumed to have declined as the human population in Florida has increased and converted suitable habitat to urban, agricultural, and other land uses. Based on the lack of recent activity at many historic breeding sites, Franz and Smith (1999) concluded that gopher frog populations had declined east of the Apalachicola River in the last 20 years (1975–95), particularly in coastal counties and in South Florida where most of the human population is concentrated. However, Franz and Smith (1999) considered the species to still be common on protected lands along the central spine of the Peninsula north of Lake Okeechobee. Franz and Smith (1999) compiled records from 258 localities in 45 counties in the peninsula. During surveys in 1990–95, they found gopher frogs at only 3 of 63 historical sites visited but found 83 new sites in 19 counties, including 4 new county records. Of the 12 counties for which Franz and Smith (1999) found no records, there have been recent records for 2 counties, Gilchrist and Hamilton (Tucker and Handrick 2006; K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). In the past 12 years (since 1998), gopher frogs have been recorded in 26 counties: Alachua, Baker, Citrus, Clay, Columbia, Gilchrist, Glades, Hernando, Highlands, Lake, Leon, Levy, Manatee, Marion, Martin, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, Sarasota, Seminole, St. Lucie, Sumter, Taylor, and Volusia (museum and Florida Natural Areas Inventory [FNAI] records; K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). None of these counties is west of the Apalachicola River, because there have not been recent surveys in those counties; however, records in the 1990s exist for Calhoun, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Walton, and Washington counties (museum and FNAI records). Surveys in 2006–10 recorded gopher frogs in 118 ponds on 20 public conservation lands (K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). Of the 63 ponds where gopher frogs were found from July 2009 through June 2010, 50 represented new ponds (K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). Many public lands were not surveyed, such as Avon Park Air Force Range, where Franz et al. (1998) found 11 gopher frog breeding ponds. Surveys for gopher frogs on public lands typically document multiple breeding ponds, such as 20 ponds on Eglin Air Force Base.
(Palis and Jensen 1995) and 21 ponds on Camp Blanding Military Reservation (Hipes and Jackson 1996). At the Ordway–Swisher Biological Station, Franz (1986) marked 100 gopher frogs at tortoise burrows over a 16-month period.

**Geographic Range and Distribution** – The gopher frog occurs in the southeastern Coastal Plain from southeastern Alabama to North Carolina, with disjunct populations in central Alabama and the Cumberland Plateau in Tennessee (see Jensen and Richter 2005). The gopher frog historically occurred throughout Florida except for the Everglades region (Fig. 1), and Florida represents the largest portion of the total global range of the species (Jensen and Richter 2005).

**Quantitative Analyses** – We are not aware of a population viability analysis for the gopher frog. However, we believe that it is unlikely that the species will become extinct within the next 100 years based upon the large acreage of suitable habitat contained in conservation lands throughout Florida, its adaptability to some habitat alteration, and the increased security of gopher tortoise populations because of its new Threatened status (see Enge et al. 2006) and concomitant Gopher Tortoise Management Plan (Gopher Tortoise Management Plan Team 2007). The only factor that might change this scenario would be catastrophic die-offs from disease, but the isolated nature of many populations should keep them protected from disease vectors.

**BIOLOGICAL STATUS ASSESSMENT**

**Threats** – The greatest threat to gopher frogs is loss and alteration of xeric upland habitats resulting from commercial and residential development, silviculture, agriculture, and mining (Jensen and Richter 2005). Intact xerophytic upland ecosystems inhabited by gopher frogs have suffered severe losses in Florida, including longleaf pine-dominated sandhill as well as scrub habitat on the ridges of central and coastal Florida (Means and Grow 1985, Myers 1990, Kautz, 1998, Enge et al. 2006). Losses have been especially severe along the highly developed coastal ridges of both southeastern and southwestern Florida, as well as the central ridges that have been mined, converted to
Fig. 1. Locality records from museums, FNAI, and the literature for the gopher frog. **Comment [BR1]:** Over what time period do these records represent?

Because of their vagility, gopher frog populations can persist in fragmented landscapes, even when breeding ponds occur in unsuitable upland habitat. Gopher frogs do not require intact native ground cover, and dense populations can occur in pastures containing gopher tortoise burrows. For example, 97 gopher frogs were observed using 261 tortoise burrows in an abandoned pasture in Green Swamp West, Pasco County (M. Barnwell, Southwest Florida Water Management District, pers. comm. 2010). The most cited management concerns for gopher frogs are altered fire regimes, resulting in the encroachment of hardwoods and shrubs in the upland habitat, and the loss of gopher tortoise or pocket gopher populations that provide the primary source of upland shelters (Godley 1992, Greenberg et al. 2003, Jensen and Richter 2005, Blihovde 2006, Roznik 2007). Newly metamorphosed gopher frogs emigrating from ponds in Ocala National Forest selected fire-maintained habitat that was associated with an open canopy, few hardwood trees, small amounts of leaf litter, and large amounts of wiregrass (Aristida stricta); this habitat contained higher densities of gopher tortoise and small mammal burrows used as refuges (Roznik and Johnson 2009b). At these same sites, adult gopher frogs also selected fire-maintained habitat over forest that had been fire-suppressed (Roznik and Johnson 2009c). Altered fire regimes have resulted in canopy closure and unnatural shading of the grassy ground cover, which provides food for gopher tortoises and the frog’s invertebrate prey base. Silvicultural practices can degrade upland habitat and impact gopher frog populations. Gopher frog larvae were found in <7% of 444 ponds sampled on forest industry lands (Wigley et al. 1999). On commercial forest lands in the Panhandle, dense stands of sand pine (Pinus clausa) are often planted in sandhill habitat. Gopher frog larvae were found in only 1 of 85 ponds sampled in a Sand Pine plantation on private land, whereas they were found significantly more often in ponds in an adjacent Longleaf Pine forest on Apalachicola National Forest (Means and Means 2005).

Degradation and destruction of wetlands also affect gopher frogs that rely on these ponds for breeding. Exclusion and suppression of fire from wetlands often leads to degradation of breeding ponds through shrub encroachment, peat buildup, and increased evapotranspiration. **Comment [BR2]:** This statement needs to be supported with references and should also be qualified; although gopher frogs can tolerate some fragmentation, it depends on the distances between suitable habitats and what lies between them.
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shortening hydroperiods (LaClaire 2001). Coverage of grassy emergent vegetation decreases, and peat buildup may acidify the water past tolerance levels (Smith and Braswell 1994). Land managers often use fire lines to exclude prescribed fire from dry wetlands to prevent problems with smoke management or muck fires, particularly if the wetlands are associated with wildland urban interface (Bishop and Haas 2005). Erosion from adjacent unpaved roads can lead to siltation and sedimentation of ponds, and runoff from paved roads can pollute ponds with petrochemicals and other toxic substances to frogs (LaClaire 2001). Pond degradation also results from garbage dumping and off-road vehicle (ORV) use (Means and Means 1998, LaClaire 2001). Use of ORVs in pond basins can cause direct mortality of tadpoles and adults, and it can affect habitat quality by altering pond contours, herbaceous vegetation, and hydrology (LaClaire 2001). Loss of herbaceous vegetation decreases cover for tadpoles from predators and can discourage reproduction, because egg masses are attached to stems of herbaceous vegetation (see LaClaire 2001). Large tires of ORVs may break the organic hardpan beneath a pond, causing water to drain out and shortening the hydroperiod (LaClaire and Franz 1990). The hydrology of many of Florida’s depression marsh wetlands may already have been significantly influenced by anthropogenic-caused impacts related to groundwater withdrawals (R. Owen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, pers. commun. 2010). North Florida has already undergone extreme shifts in groundwater potentiometric levels (i.e., “groundwater contours”) (Grubs and Crandall 2007). The hydrologic impact has been documented for the first time across regional hydrologic divides between the Suwannee River and St. Johns River water management districts, and there are numerous examples across the entire state where groundwater withdrawals are significantly shifting the historic directional flow of localized groundwater supplies (R. Owen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, pers. commun. 2010). State regulators and governing water management districts have been forced to plan for future losses of ground water and even develop written recovery strategies, as mandated by legislative law, because of significant damaging groundwater losses (http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/waterman/swuca/). Some ephemeral wetlands are independent of ground water or surface aquifer water, but other wetlands are being impacted by hydrological alterations related to groundwater withdrawal (Guzy et al. 2006). Groundwater withdrawal can shorten hydroperiods or even eliminate ephemeral wetlands, and climate change may be affecting the amount of winter precipitation in peninsular Florida. Long-term droughts may have caused some populations to disappear because of insufficient population recruitment.

The introduction of fish may play a role in population declines of certain anurans breeding in normally fish-free wetlands. Eastern mosquito fish (Gambusia holbrooki) are often introduced into isolated wetlands for mosquito control purposes, and even these small fish may have significant negative effects on gopher frog tadpoles (Gregoire and Gunzburger 2008). A far more serious threat, however, is the stocking of game fish (Lepomis spp. and Micropterus spp.) into ponds used by gopher frogs, or the introduction of predaceous fish into formerly fish-free wetlands during natural flooding events. Invertebrates can significantly impact population recruitment by feeding on eggs and tadpoles (Richter 2000), and a variety of vertebrates, such as wading birds and snakes. Seventy-five percent of 32 metamorphs leaving a natal pond were killed by North American racers (Coluber constrictor), common garter snakes (Thamnophis sirtalis), or mammals (Roznik and Johnson 2009a). The long distances sometimes traveled by gopher frogs to breed, or following metamorphosis, can make them susceptible to highway mortality. A metamorph leaving a natal pond moved 691 m before being killed, and 3 of 32 metamorphs were killed by vehicles on lightly traveled dirt roads (Roznik and Johnson 2009a) that they apparently used as migration corridors (Roznik and Johnson 2009b).
A chytridiomycete fungus (*Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis*), or *Bd*, has been implicated as a primary or suspected cause of disease epidemics and subsequent population declines of amphibians in many parts of the world, but chytrid fungus is not known to be responsible for any amphibian die-offs in the Southeast US. None of 18 gopher frog tadpoles examined from Florida and Georgia tested positive for *Bd* (Rothermel et al. 2008). Ranaviruses are likely a greater threat to amphibians, particularly tadpoles, than *Bd* in North America (Gray et al. 2009a, b). A die-off of hundreds of ranid tadpoles, including gopher frogs, in 2 ponds in Withlacoochee State Forest, Hernando County, was apparently caused by an unnamed *Perkinsus*-like (or alveolate) microorganism (Davis et al. 2007, Rothermel et al. 2008). A newly identified mesomycetozoan pathogen, *Anuraperkinsus emelandra*, has been the cause of massive ranid tadpole mortalities in 10 states, including a 2003 die-off of almost all tadpoles at the only known breeding pond of the federally endangered dusky gopher frog (http://www.nwhc.usgs.gov/disease_information/amphibian_malformation_and_decline/index.jsp).

**Statewide Population Assessment** – Findings from the BRG are included in Biological Status Review Information tables.

**LISTING RECOMMENDATION**

The BRG found the gopher frog did not meet any of the criteria for listing as a threatened species. Staff recommends that the gopher frog not be listed as a threatened species.

**SUMMARY OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW**
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Hi Bill - Hope you're well.

I'm attaching the gopher frog draft report with my (few) comments and edits embedded using track changes. Mainly I thought the report could benefit from a more thorough discussion of potential impacts of climate change, and plans for monitoring potential gopher frog population declines due to climate change or from other sources.

Overall the report looks really good - thorough, and well written! I'm also attaching a couple of references that you might find useful (or not!). One is a final report I submitted to you back in 2008, but I never was clear as to whether it was published as you've done with my final reports in the past. If it was, I'd really appreciate it if you could send me the citation (and report) or link (if it was online); if not, here it is!

Thanks for the opportunity to review this - it was informative, and a pleasure to review

- Katie
Katie Greenberg
Project Leader & Research Ecologist
USDA Forest Service
Bent Creek Experimental Forest
1577 Brevard Road
Asheville, NC 28806
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) directed staff to evaluate all species listed as Threatened or Species of Special Concern as of September 1, 2010. Public information on the status of the gopher frog was sought from September 17 through November 1, 2010. The 5-member biological review group (BRG) met on November 18, 2010. Group members were Kevin Enge (FWC lead), Steve Johnson (University of Florida), Thomas Ostertag (FWC), Rick Owen (Florida Department of Environmental Protection), and David Printiss (The Nature Conservancy) (Appendix 1). In accordance with rule 68A-27.0012 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C), the BRG was charged with evaluating the biological status of the gopher frog using criteria included in definitions in 68A-27.001(3), F.A.C. and following protocols in the Guidelines for Application of the IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Levels (Version 3.0) and Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (Version 8.1). Please visit http://myfwc.com/docs/WildlifeHabitats/Imperiled_EndangeredThreatened_FinalRules.pdf to view the listing process rule and the criteria found in the definitions. The BRG concluded from the biological assessment that the gopher frog did not meet any of the criteria for designation as a Threatened species. FWC staff recommends that the gopher frog not be listed as a threatened species and be removed from the State Species of Special Concern list.

This work was supported by a Conserve Wildlife Tag grant from the Wildlife Foundation of Florida.

BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Taxonomic Classification – Two subspecies of gopher frog were formerly recognized in Florida, the Florida gopher frog (Rana capito aesopus) and the dusky gopher frog (R. c. sevosa). The latter subspecies was thought to occur west of the Apalachicola River (Conant and Collins 1991). However, Young and Crother (2001) analyzed allozyme data that showed no genetic divisions among populations of Rana capito, except for the population in southern Mississippi, which they recommended elevating to specific status by resurrecting Rana sevosa (Goin and Netting, 1940), the dusky gopher frog. Frost et al. (2006) removed New World frogs from the genus Rana and placed them in Lithobates, so the current name for the species occurring in Florida is the gopher frog (Lithobates capito).

Life History and Habitat Requirements – Information on the species has been summarized by Jensen and Richter (2005). The gopher frog primarily inhabits areas with well-drained sandy soils that support gopher tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus) populations (Wright 1932, Franz 1986, Blihovde 2006, Roznik 2007). During the non-breeding season, the gopher frog is generally associated with longleaf pine (Pinus palustris)–xeric oak (Quercus spp.)
sandhills but also occurs in upland pine forest, scrub, xeric hammock, mesic and scrubby flatwoods, dry prairie, mixed hardwood-pine communities, and a variety of disturbed habitats (Enge 1997). Gopher frogs extensively use gopher tortoise burrows for underground retreats (Wright 1932, Carr 1940, Franz 1986) but also use southeastern pocket gopher (Geomys pinetis) burrows, mouse burrows, crayfish burrows, hollow logs, stump holes, root mounds, broken limbs, crevices, dead vegetation, and clumps of grass (Wright and Wright 1949, Gentry and Smith 1968, Lee 1968, Godley 1992, Richter et al. 2001, Nickerson and Celine 2003, Blihovde 2006, K. Enge, FWC, pers. commun. 2010). Underground retreats in uplands are important for avoiding predation and desiccation, and frogs would be unlikely to survive droughts without them (Blihovde 2006). Gopher frogs breed in temporary or semipermanent, shallow, fishless ponds with an open canopy and emergent vegetation, including depression marshes, basin marshes, wet prairies, dome swamps, upland sandhill lakes, sinkhole ponds, borrow pits, and ditches (Godley 1992; Jensen and LaClaire 1995; Enge 1997; K. Enge, FWC, pers. commun. 2010).

Gopher frogs will travel up to 2 km to a breeding pond (Franz 1986), typically during heavy winter and spring rains. The breeding season is usually September–April (Palis 1998, Branch and Hokit 2000; Blihovde 2006; S. Morrison, The Nature Conservancy, pers. commun. 2010), but frogs potentially can breed during any month of the year during heavy rains; summer breeding is probably more common in southern Florida because winter frontal systems are weaker (Godley 1992, Jackson 2004). A female apparently deposits only a single egg mass containing a mean of 1,200–2,200 eggs (see Jensen and Richter 2005). Egg masses are attached to vegetation, and tadpoles transform in 3–7 months (Godley 1992, Palis 1998). Newly metamorphosed frogs leave their natal pond and spend most of their life in the surrounding uplands. Males apparently become reproductively mature at 1.5 years and females at 2 years (see Jensen and Richter 2005).

Population Status and Trend – There is no quantitative information, but the population is assumed to have declined as the human population in Florida has increased and converted suitable habitat to urban, agricultural, and other land uses. Based on the lack of recent activity at many historic breeding sites, Franz and Smith (1999) concluded that gopher frog populations had declined east of the Apalachicola River in the last 20 years (1975–95), particularly in coastal counties and in South Florida where most of the human population is concentrated. However, Franz and Smith (1999) considered the species to still be common on protected lands along the central spine of the Peninsula north of Lake Okeechobee. Franz and Smith (1999) compiled records from 258 localities in 45 counties in the peninsula. During surveys in 1990–95, they found gopher frogs at only 3 of 63 historical sites visited but found 83 new sites in 19 counties, including 4 new county records. Of the 12 counties for which Franz and Smith (1999) found no records, there have been recent records for 2 counties, Gilchrist and Hamilton (Tucker and Hendrick 2006; K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). In the past 12 years (since 1998), gopher frogs have been recorded in 26 counties: Alachua, Baker, Citrus, Clay, Columbia, Gilchrist, Glades, Hernando, Highlands, Lake, Leon, Levy, Manatee, Marion, Martin, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, Sarasota, Seminole, St. Lucie, Sumter, Taylor, and Volusia (museum and Florida Natural Areas Inventory [FNAI] records; K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). None of these counties is west of the Apalachicola River, because there have not been recent surveys in those counties; however, records in the 1990s exist for Calhoun, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Walton, and Washington.
counties (museum and FNAI records). Surveys in 2006–10 recorded gopher frogs in 118 ponds on 20 public conservation lands (K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). Of the 63 ponds where gopher frogs were found from July 2009 through June 2010, 50 represented new ponds (K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). Many public lands were not surveyed, such as Avon Park Air Force Range, where Franz et al. (1998) found 11 gopher frog breeding ponds. Surveys for gopher frogs on public lands typically document multiple breeding ponds, such as 20 ponds on Eglin Air Force Base (Palis and Jensen 1995) and 21 ponds on Camp Blanding Military Reservation (Hipes and Jackson 1996). At the Ordway–Swisher Biological Station, Franz (1986) marked 100 gopher frogs at tortoise burrows over a 16-month period.

**Geographic Range and Distribution** – The gopher frog occurs in the southeastern Coastal Plain from southeastern Alabama to North Carolina, with disjunct populations in central Alabama and the Cumberland Plateau in Tennessee (see Jensen and Richter 2005). The gopher frog historically occurred throughout Florida except for the Everglades region (Fig. 1), and Florida represents the largest portion of the total global range of the species (Jensen and Richter 2005).

**Quantitative Analyses** – We are not aware of a population viability analysis for the gopher frog. However, we believe that it is unlikely that the species will become extinct within the next 100 years based upon the large acreage of suitable habitat contained in conservation lands throughout Florida, its adaptability to some habitat alteration, and the increased security of gopher tortoise populations because of its new Threatened status (see Enge et al. 2006) and concomitant Gopher Tortoise Management Plan (Gopher Tortoise Management Plan Team 2007). The only factor that might change this scenario would be catastrophic die-offs from disease, but the isolated nature of many populations should keep them protected from disease vectors.

**BIOLOGICAL STATUS ASSESSMENT**

**Threats** – The greatest threat to gopher frogs is loss and alteration of xeric upland habitats resulting from commercial and residential development, silviculture, agriculture, and mining (Jensen and Richter 2005). Intact xerophytic upland ecosystems inhabited by gopher frogs have suffered severe losses in Florida, including longleaf pine-dominated sandhill as well as scrub habitat on the ridges of central and coastal Florida (Means and Grow 1985, Myers 1990, Kautz, 1998, Enge et al. 2006). Losses have been especially severe along the highly developed coastal ridges of both southeastern and southwestern Florida, as well as the central ridges that have been mined, converted to
agriculture, and more recently developed (Jackson 2004). Because of their vagility, gopher frog populations can persist in fragmented landscapes, even when breeding ponds occur in unsuitable upland habitat. Gopher frogs do not require intact native ground cover, and dense populations can occur in pastures containing gopher tortoise burrows. For example, 97 gopher frogs were observed using 261 tortoise burrows in an abandoned pasture in Green Swamp West, Pasco County (M. Barnwell, Southwest Florida Water Management District, pers. comm. 2010). The most cited management concerns for gopher frogs are altered fire regimes, resulting in the encroachment of hardwoods and shrubs in the upland habitat, and the loss of gopher tortoise or pocket gopher populations that provide the primary source of upland shelters (Godley 1992, Greenberg et al. 2003, Jensen and Richter 2005, Blihovde 2006, Roznik 2007). Newly metamorphosed gopher frogs emigrating from ponds in Ocala National Forest selected fire-maintained habitat that was associated with an open canopy, few hardwood trees, small amounts of leaf litter, and large amounts of wiregrass (Aristida stricta); this habitat contained higher densities of gopher tortoise and small mammal burrows used as refuges (Roznik and Johnson 2009b). Altered fire regimes have resulted in canopy closure and unnatural shading of the grassy ground cover, which provides food for gopher tortoises and the frog’s invertebrate prey base. Silvicultural practices can degrade upland habitat and impact gopher frog populations. Gopher frog larvae were found in <7% of 444 ponds sampled on forest industry lands (Wigley et al. 1999). On commercial forest lands in the Panhandle, dense stands of sand pine (Pinus clausa) are often planted in sandhill habitat. Gopher frog larvae were found in only 1 of 85 ponds sampled in a sand pine plantation on private land, whereas they were found significantly more often in ponds in an adjacent Longleaf Pine forest on Apalachicola National Forest (Means and Means 2005).
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Degradation and destruction of wetlands also affect gopher frogs that rely on these ponds for breeding. Exclusion and suppression of fire from wetlands often leads to degradation of breeding ponds through shrub encroachment, peat buildup, and increased evapotranspiration shortening hydroperiods (LaClaire 2001). Coverage of grassy emergent vegetation decreases, and peat buildup may acidify the water past tolerance levels (Smith and Braswell 1994). Land managers often use fire lines to exclude prescribed fire from dry wetlands to prevent problems with smoke management or muck fires, particularly if the wetlands are associated with wildland urban interface (Bishop and Haas 2005). Erosion from adjacent unpaved roads can lead to siltation and sedimentation of ponds, and runoff from paved roads can pollute ponds with petrochemicals and other toxic substances to frogs (LaClaire 2001). Pond degradation also results from garbage dumping and off-road vehicle (ORV) use (Means and Means 1998, LaClaire 2001). Use of ORVs in pond basins can cause direct mortality of tadpoles and adults, and it can affect habitat quality by altering pond contours, herbaceous vegetation, and hydrology (LaClaire 2001). Loss of herbaceous vegetation decreases cover for tadpoles from predators and can discourage reproduction, because egg masses are attached to stems of herbaceous vegetation (see LaClaire 2001). Large tires of ORVs may break the organic hardpan beneath a pond, causing water to drain out and shortening the hydroperiod (LaClaire and Franz 1990). The hydrology of many of Florida’s depression marsh wetlands may already have been significantly influenced by anthropogenic-caused impacts related to groundwater withdrawals (R. Owen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, pers. commun. 2010). North Florida has already undergone extreme shifts in groundwater potentiometric levels (i.e., “groundwater contours”) (Grubs and Crandall 2007). The hydrologic impact has been documented for the first time across regional hydrologic divides between the Suwannee River and St. Johns River water management districts, and there are numerous examples across the entire state where groundwater withdrawals are significantly shifting the historic directional flow of localized groundwater supplies (R. Owen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, pers. commun. 2010). State regulators and governing water management districts have been forced to plan for future losses of ground water and even develop written recovery strategies, as mandated by legislative law, because of significant damaging groundwater losses (http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/waterman/swiuca/). Some ephemeral wetlands are independent of ground water or surface aquifer water, but other wetlands are being impacted by hydrological alterations related to groundwater withdrawal (Guzy et al. 2006). Groundwater withdrawal can shorten hydroperiods or even eliminate ephemeral wetlands, and climate change may be affecting the amount of winter precipitation in peninsular Florida. Long-term droughts may have caused some populations to disappear because of insufficient population recruitment.

The introduction of fish may play a role in population declines of certain anurans breeding in normally fish-free wetlands. Eastern mosquitofish (Gambusia holbrooki) are often introduced into isolated wetlands for mosquito control purposes, and even these small fish may have significant negative effects on gopher frog tadpoles (Gregoire and Gunzburger 2008). A far more serious threat, however, is the stocking of game fish (Lepomis spp. and Micropterus spp.) into ponds used by gopher frogs, or the introduction of predaceous fish into formerly fish-free wetlands during natural flooding events. Invertebrates can significantly impact population recruitment by feeding on eggs and tadpoles (Richter 2000), and a variety of vertebrates, such as wading birds and snakes. Seventy-five percent of 32 metamorphs leaving a natal pond were killed by North American racers (Coluber constrictor), common garter snakes (Thamnophis
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sirtalis), or mammals (Roznik and Johnson 2009a). The long distances sometimes traveled by gopher frogs to breed can make them susceptible to highway mortality. A metamorph leaving a natal pond moved 691 m before being killed, and 3 of 32 metamorphs were killed by vehicles on lightly traveled dirt roads (Roznik and Johnson 2009a) that they apparently used as migration corridors (Roznik and Johnson 2009b).

A chytridiomycete fungus (Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis), or Bd, has been implicated as a primary or suspected cause of disease epidemics and subsequent population declines of amphibians in many parts of the world, although chytrid fungus is not known to be responsible for any amphibian die-offs in the Southeast. None of 18 gopher frog tadpoles examined from Florida and Georgia tested positive for Bd (Rothermel et al. 2008). Ranaviruses are likely a greater threat to amphibians, particularly tadpoles, than Bd in North America (Gray et al. 2009a, b). A die-off of hundreds of ranid tadpoles, including gopher frogs, in 2 ponds in Withlacoochee State Forest, Hernando County, was apparently caused by an unnamed Perkinuslike (or alveolate) microorganism (Davis et al. 2007, Rothermel et al. 2008). A newly identified mesomycetozoaan pathogen, Anuraperkinsus emelandra, has been the cause of massive ranid tadpole mortalities in 10 states, including a 2003 die-off of almost all tadpoles at the only known breeding pond of the federally endangered dusky gopher frog (http://www.nwhe.usgs.gov/disease_information/amphibian_malformation_and_decline/index.jsp).

Statewide Population Assessment – Findings from the BRG are included in Biological Status Review Information tables.

LISTING RECOMMENDATION

The BRG found the gopher frog did not meet any of the criteria for listing as a threatened species. Staff recommends that the gopher frog not be listed as a threatened species.

SUMMARY OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW
Letters and emails received during the solicitation of information from the public period of September 17, 2010 through November 1, 2010

Email from Mark Fredlake

From: Fredlake Mark J Civ 23 WG DET 1 OL A/CEVN
To: Impersiled
Subject: Surveys of Sensitive Species on Avon Park Air Force Range: Sherman's fox squirrel, gopher frog, Florida mouse, Florida pine snake, Burrowing owl, etc.
Date: Monday, November 01, 2010 3:35:56 PM
Attachments: CHAP_7_APAFR_TortReport_2009.docx
BUOW data.xlsx
BO observations.jpg

I am currently reviewing our files to determine if we have any information regarding the 61 species under review. I currently have found several reports of interest:

AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE PROJECT: DISTRIBUTION AND ABUNDANCE OF SENSITIVE WILDLIFE SPECIES AT AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE FINAL REPORT PROJECT RWO-169 DECEMBER 1998 authors: Richard Franz, David Maehr, Alton Kinlaw, Christopher O'Brien, and Richard D. Owen
This report contains information regarding population levels of the following species: Florida mouse: found commonly in well-drained soils through APAFR, in oak scrub and scrubby flatwoods. Live trapping effort yielded 274 captures of Florida mouse in 8160 trap nights, spread over a 16 month period.

Sherman's fox squirrel: Found in both native and planted pine stands, Sherman's fox squirrels prefer slash pine plantations over native long-leaf stands in APAFR. Population of fox squirrel for plantations in APAFR (7948 hectares) was estimated in the range of 433 to 867.

Florida gopher frog: documented in eleven breeding sites in APAFR mostly in the southern portion of the Bombing Range scrub ridge. Six to ten dry ponds were identified as potential breeding sites during wet seasons.

The report also documents the occurrence on APAFR of Florida pine snake based on one record along old Bravo Road, APAFR.

I suspect you probably have a copy of this report in your files. Nevertheless it can be downloaded from: http://aquacomm.fcla.edu/1072/1/OCRFranz%2C_R._1998.pdf

It can be downloaded from:
The third report: (Population Survey and Monitoring of the Gopher Tortoise (*Gopherus polyphemus*) at Avon Park Air Force Range. ANNUAL REPORT. October 2008 - September 2009 Authors: Betsie Rothermel, Ph.D. Traci Castellón, Ph.D. February 2010 Archbold Biological Station) contains some locations of Gopher Frog and Florida Pine
CHAPTER 7 (COMMENSAL SPECIES) EXCERPT FROM:
POPULATION SURVEY AND MONITORING OF THE GOPHER TORTOISE
(GOPHERUS POLYPHEMUS) AT AVON PARK AIR FORCE RANGE. ANNUAL
REPORT. October 2008 - September 2009

Authors:
Betsie Rothermel, Ph.D.
Principal Investigator
Traci Castellón, Ph.D.
Post-doctoral Research Fellow
February 2010

Archbold Biological Station
P.O. Box 2057
Lake Placid, FL 33862
(863) 465-2571 (phone); (863) 699-1927 (fax)
brothermel@archbold-station.org

CHAPTER 7
COMMENSAL, MORTALITY, AND DISEASE MONITORING

Observations of Commensal Species

An additional objective of our research at APAFR was to document and gather data on Gopher Tortoise burrow commensals, especially for species of conservation concern (e.g., the Eastern Indigo Snake, Drymarchon couperi). In total, we encountered at least 11 species of vertebrate commensals since fieldwork began in March 2009 (Table 7). Observations were derived from examination of tortoise burrows using the video scope, records from field cameras with motion sensors located outside burrow entrances, and other opportunistic encounters. Commensals were observed inside tortoise burrows at 30 sites, and included 26 anurans (12 Gopher Frogs, one unidentified treefrog, and 13 unidentified anurans), six snakes (one Eastern Coachwhip, three Eastern Diamondback Rattlesnakes, one Pine Snake, and one Eastern Indigo Snake), and one unidentified mouse (possibly a Florida Mouse, Podomys floridanus).

Other vertebrates that were observed entering or exiting burrows included Eastern Cottontails at eight sites, Eastern Spotted Skunks at six sites, Nine-banded Armadillos at five sites, unidentified mice (Family Cricetidae, possibly the Florida Mouse) at nine sites, and a Hispid Cotton Rat at one site (Table 7). Two bird species (Bachman’s Sparrow and Eastern Towhee) were also observed foraging in front of, entering, and leaving three different burrows. One Eastern Indigo Snake was also observed while driving along Frostproof Road.
Table 7. Observations of commensal species obtained from burrow scoping activities, motion-sensor field cameras and opportunistic sightings. Species, habitat type and UTM locations are provided. Habitats include the scrub stratum (Scrub) and the flatwoods and pine plantation strata (FW & PL).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>Habitat</th>
<th>GPS Northing</th>
<th>GPS Easting</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Frogs and Toads</td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3066118</td>
<td>463999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Order Anura</td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3056124</td>
<td>476147</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3063795</td>
<td>462598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3055430</td>
<td>484694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3048967</td>
<td>467312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064155</td>
<td>461833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3063997</td>
<td>471771</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3046819</td>
<td>468667</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064217</td>
<td>461853</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3046812</td>
<td>468546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3063968</td>
<td>471957</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064181</td>
<td>472290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3048791</td>
<td>474287</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treefrog</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3049025</td>
<td>474458</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Hylidae</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gopher Frog</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060890</td>
<td>472404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Rana capito</em></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3054510</td>
<td>474003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3048157</td>
<td>474347</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3059387</td>
<td>472678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3053088</td>
<td>474309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3055451</td>
<td>484575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3054760</td>
<td>475692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3048278</td>
<td>474332</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3048274</td>
<td>474490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3046769</td>
<td>474355</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3049130</td>
<td>474690</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3047054</td>
<td>474238</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Coachwhip</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064573</td>
<td>472035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Coluber (formerly Masticophis)</em> flagellum</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Indigo Snake</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060890</td>
<td>472404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Drymarchon couperi</em></td>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td>3067011</td>
<td>459803</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Species</td>
<td>Habitat</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pine Snake</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3056513</td>
<td>474555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pituophis melanoleucus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Diamondback Rattlesnake</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3057414</td>
<td>474260</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Crotalus adamanteus</em></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3057484</td>
<td>474413</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FW&amp;PL</td>
<td></td>
<td>3057080</td>
<td>473331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Towhees</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060683</td>
<td>472265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Pipilo erythrophthalmus</em></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060744</td>
<td>472560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bachman’s Sparrow</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064570</td>
<td>472159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Aimaphila aestivalis</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nine-banded Armadillo</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3061106</td>
<td>472168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Dasypus novemcinctus</em></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060890</td>
<td>472404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060683</td>
<td>472265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064574</td>
<td>472035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060744</td>
<td>472560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mouse</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064261</td>
<td>472038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Cricetidae</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3061106</td>
<td>472168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060486</td>
<td>472518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060890</td>
<td>472404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060824</td>
<td>472382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060683</td>
<td>472265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060744</td>
<td>472560</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064570</td>
<td>472159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064574</td>
<td>472035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060792</td>
<td>472092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hispid Cotton Rat</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3061106</td>
<td>472168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sigmodon hispidus</em></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Cottontail</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3061106</td>
<td>472168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Sylvilagus floridanus</em></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060486</td>
<td>472518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060890</td>
<td>472404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060824</td>
<td>472382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060683</td>
<td>472265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064570</td>
<td>472159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064574</td>
<td>472035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060792</td>
<td>472092</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Spotted Skunk</td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3061106</td>
<td>472168</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><em>Spilogale putorius</em></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060486</td>
<td>472518</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060890</td>
<td>472404</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3060824</td>
<td>472382</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064570</td>
<td>472159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Scrub</td>
<td>3064574</td>
<td>472035</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Background

Extensive loss and degradation of wetlands are among the most pervasive impacts by humans on the environment in Florida (Frayar and Hefley 1991). Diverse taxa depend on these declining habitats, and wetlands are the most highly ranked ecological communities in Florida, after coastal strand, for importance in supporting wildlife of conservation concern (Uhlje et al. 1998). The most obvious effects of wetland loss and degradation are reductions in habitat amount and quality. Furthermore, wetland species may exhibit a metapopulation structure (Sjögren-Olsson and Bay 1995, Jolly et al. 2001, Pechmann et al. 2003) in which subpopulations occur in relatively discrete patches of suitable habitat, experience repeated extinction and colonization events, and are connected by inter-patch dispersal (Hanski 1999). Hence, wetland loss further fragments already naturally patchy wetland systems, increases wetland isolation, and may affect dispersal success and regional persistence of metapopulations. Moreover, the functional connectivity (Wissel 1996) of wetlands may be decreased due to modifications of the terrestrial habitat matrix that hinder movements of organisms among wetlands. Understanding how landscape context affects wetland quality is a key step in assessing their value as wildlife habitats.

There also is a conspicuous lack of knowledge regarding the importance of small, isolated wetlands for wetland-associated species. Small wetlands (<4 ha) may be critical for maintaining adequate landscape connectivity for species with a metapopulation spatial structure (Gibbs 1995, Semlitsch and Bodie 1998), but empirical data for evaluating this proposition are sparse. For most wetland species, we also are uninformed whether there is a minimum critical patch size required for occupancy, and how such a size might correspond to existing wetland regulations (Kaiser 1998, Semlitsch and Bodie 1998).

The Avon Park Air Force Range (APAFR) contains >24,000 acres of wetlands. The relative use of these wetlands by different vegetation species is unknown. APAFR has diverse upland plant communities (Hedges 2000) and assorted land uses, including military training, forestry, cattle grazing, and recreation. APAFR is one of the largest tracts of federal land in south-central Florida, and thus it is a key conservation area. Overall, APAFR is an ideal location for investigating the effects of natural landscape heterogeneity and land management on the distribution of wetland species.
This project is focusing on the use of wetlands by wading birds and round-tailed muskrats (Ondatra zibethicus). These species were selected because they use the landscape at different spatial scales (Blecken 1963, Huang et al. 1998) and should provide complimentary perspectives regarding landscape effects on APAFR wetlands. Moreover, wading birds are state and federally listed in categories ranging from “Species of Special Concern” to “Endangered” and Neotoma is listed as a Species of Special Concern (Wumphrey 1992) because of presumed statewide population declines due to wetland losses (Lehtinen and Thiem 1992).

**Project Objectives**

1. Obtain baseline data for assessing the potential impacts of military operations on wetland conditions and connectivity as indicated by focal species.

2. Provide information on the distribution and abundance of wading birds and round-tailed muskrats and the characteristics of their wetland habitats at APAFR.

3. Develop and test a predictive habitat model for round-tailed muskrats.

4. Provide recommendations concerning management and future research directions for wetlands at APAFR.

**Main activities during this year**

1. Designed a sampling protocol for aerial surveys of wading birds at APAFR.

2. Conducted three aerial surveys of wading birds.

3. Completed ground surveys of 459 wetlands for habitat characteristics and occupancy by wading birds, round-tailed muskrats, and marsh rice rats (Oryzomys palustris

4. Initiated live trapping and movement studies of round-tailed muskrats and marsh rice rats.
Methods

Aerial surveys of wading birds: distribution patterns and habitat covariates

We designed our aerial surveys after the Systematic Remoteness Flights (SRF) that are used for monitoring wading birds in the Florida Everglades. The SRF approach has been effective in relating the distribution and abundance of wading birds to hydrological patterns (Russell et al. 2002) and to nutrient enrichment (Cowles and Gawlik 2002). In general, evenly spaced transects following lines of latitude are flown at a low altitude in a fan-sweep aircraft, and two observers on opposite sides of the airplane count all birds observed within a predeterminded strip width. We established 15 transects across the entire APAFR that were separated by 1.5 km and flown in a Cessna 172 in alternating directions (west-to-east and east-to-west) at an altitude of 250 feet (76 m). Each of the two flight-crew observers counted birds in a 150-m strip. Hence, for each transect we sampled a 300-m combined strip, which resulted in a 20% sample of the total area (300 m east of 1500 m). For comparison, the Everglades SRF are flown on transects separated by 2 km at an altitude of 200 ft. (60 m) using 150-m strips for a 15% sample of the area (Cowles and Gawlik 2002, Russell et al. 2002).

Each observer recorded the number of individuals of each species seen within the viewing strip into a binoculars recorder. The potential species included wood storks (*Mycteria americana*), great egrets (*Ardea alba*), white ibis (*Eudocimus albus*), great blue herons (*Ardea herodias*), sandhill cranes (*Grus canadensis*), and “small white herons.” This last group mainly consisted of cattle egrets (*Bubulcus ibis*) and perhaps occasionally snare egrets (*Egretta thula*). For each observation, we also recorded the longitude along the transect using an onboard GPS system. Thus, we have spatial locations for all observed wading bird individuals or groups.

For analysis, we will divide the study area into 2.5-km² cells. The flight transects pass through the center of the cells. Various predictor variables will be measured for each cell and correlated with the number of individuals of each species per cell and the total number of individuals per cell (Cowles and Gawlik 2002, Russell et al. 2002). The explanatory variables...
will include the total area of wetland habitat, diversity of wetland types, density and median size of wetlands, perimeter-to-area ratios for wetlands, cover of matrix habitat, distance to major rivers and lakes, and land use (including percent of each cell within an active breeding range). We will also aggregate the cells into larger cell sizes (e.g., 4.8-km$^2$ 9.6-km$^2$) and repeat the analysis. This multi-scale approach should help to identify particular spatial scales at which wading birds are responding most strongly to their environment. Insights from this type of analysis should be valuable for designing future monitoring programs for wading birds at APAFR.

We flew a practice flight on 14 February 2003 (2.7 hours total flight time) and conducted our first regular survey on 26 February 2003 (2.8 hours). Unfortunately, we were not given final clearance for the survey flight from the Air Force until 24 hours before takeoff. This late notification caused us to lose our regular pilot (that we used for the practice flight), and forced us to use a substitute pilot. Due to some miscommunication with the new pilot, our survey transects were not flown on the correct latitudes. Hence, the flight on 28 February must be considered a preliminary survey, and we will only report some summary statistics for counts of wading birds. We conducted another survey on 1 May 2003 (2.8 hours) following the correct flight path. The May survey was conducted toward the end of the period when shallow wetlands dry out, and also it provides a useful contrast with the February survey when most wetlands still held water.

Statistical analyses of the wading bird counts will be performed after we finish creating a spatially referenced GIS map layer of wetlands for the entire APAFR. We currently have one for the southern half of the study area only (see below).

Ground survey of wetlands:

We focused our sampling of wetlands on the southern half of APAFR because it contains most of the landscape-scale variation in plant communities and land use found within APAFR. Moreover, we detected a higher occupancy rate for 

Neotomia in the southern half of the APAFR during our preliminary surveys in the spring-summer of 2002.
We recorded habitat characteristics of each wetland during our surveys. Our methodology is designed to allow for rapid assessment without detailed vegetation measurement. Such procedures allowed us to sample a large number of wetlands, and they should be useful for future monitoring of wetland conditions.

We visually estimated the percent of each marsh covered by different plant zones (34) and measured traits of three macrodominant species, cover, height of emergent plants, and water depth. For each marsh, we also recorded the substrate type, percent of marsh with water, presence of trees and shrubs, and the upland plant communities in the immediate neighborhood.

Wetland mammals and wading birds

We surveyed marshes for water-tailed muskrats and for marsh rice rats by searching for their lodges, feeding platforms, and runs. Because rice rats are more of a generalist species with an omnivorous diet (Wolfe 1982) compared to the relatively specialized and herbivorous muskrats, we expected that rice rats would have a higher occupancy rate than that of muskrats. The wider distribution might enable us to detect impacts on rice rats from military operations or other management that are not revealed for the more sparsely distributed muskrat.

Initially, we surveyed the entire marsh for sign of the two mammal species. We always began the searches in the plant zones where we were most likely to find muskrats or rice rats in lodges. To facilitate a more rapid survey method, we recorded how much time it took until positive sign (a lodge) was first encountered in occupied marshes. We used these data to set a standardized maximum search time for marshes.

Based on conditions of lodges, we classified muskrats and rice rats sign within wetlands as either current use (Y) or past use (P). For this report, we calculated occupancy rates using all sign (i.e., muskrats classified as Y or P). We present occupancy patterns for all surveys conducted between 1 July 2002 and 15 February 2003.

We also recorded the species and number of wading birds observed in wetlands during our ground surveys. Most species were seen during our initial approach to the marshes. One exception was the American bittern (Botaurus lentiginosus), which is a secretive bird that
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We obtained UTM coordinates for the center of each surveyed wetland using a handheld global positioning system (Garmin GPS 76). These units had WAAS (Wide Area Augmentation System) correction and typically provided estimated accuracies of ~3 m. We will use these spatial coordinates in preliminary analyses of wetland connectivity.

A complete analysis of landscape extent and connectivity will incorporate information on plant communities and land use from GIS layers for the APAFE. Because the current GIS map layer for plant communities (and wetlands) is not geo-corrected, and the project for updating the plant layer is substantially behind schedule, it is necessary that we piece together the spatial data layers required for our analysis of landscape context effects. We plan to use the new landscape association map based on Bridges (2000) as a base vegetation map. To this layer, we will add our surveyed marshes and other wetland types (e.g., cypress stands, sawgrass, hardwood stands). We created a spatially accurate map layer of these wetlands by using low-altitude aerial photographs from 1999 to move wetlands from the current GIS plant community map to their correct positions. In addition, we identified a number of marshes that were not on the current GIS plant community map. We added these to our map layer by digitizing in ArcView (using the aerial photographs) or by delineating the marsh boundaries in the field with a GPS unit. We will add additional map features in the future, including pine plantations that are currently being digitized by Peg Mingione, and any spatially referenced data available on cattle grazing, fire history, and military activities.

Preliminary analyses

Spatial autocorrelation in ecological data can lead to false conclusions about relationships (Legendre et al. 2002). We calculated correlograms based on Moran’s I to evaluate potential autocorrelation in the occupancy patterns of Neobatrachus oxyops. Correlograms display the
degree of correlation in variables is sparse across a range of scales. We used indicator correlograms, which are simply correlograms based on binary data (presence and absence).

We examined the relationship between wetland area and the probability of occupancy by small-tailed muskrats, rice rats, and American bitterns using logistic regression. We logit transformed wetland area prior to analysis. We present incidence estimates that include the predicted probabilities of occupancy and 95% confidence envelopes on these estimates.

We used multiple logistic regression models to evaluate the ability of several wetland-level traits to predict occupancy of wetlands by Neogolfer and Oyamaya. In the models, we included wetland area, wetland perimeter, substrate type, and some measure of habitat quality as explanatory variables. For Neogolfer, we used a single variable for quality that was a ranking based on the coverage of plant species with sedges (Fusarium oxysporum). For Oyamaya, we used a variable for wetland quality as a measure of wetland occupancy by erudates because it is a preferred species for food and shelter (Bockenholt 1963, Franz et al. 1993). Oyamaya seems to prefer several plant species for lodge building, including puccinellia (Puccinellia stricta), small willow (Salix humata), and small rush (Juncus effusus). We included these three variables in models as binary variables (presence or absence of one dominant species).


determination of analysis and rice rats

We initiated lotterspring efforts aimed at Neogolfer to determine whether future work on movement behavior would be feasible. Neogolfer is considered a difficult species to capture. For instance, Bergstrom et al. (2000) reported only one capture in >100 trap nights.

We designed a small platform (36.5 x 61 cm) made of plywood with three adjustable legs made of PVC pipes to be used to the shallow waters where the muskrats occur. The adjustable legs allowed us to quickly change the height of the platforms when water levels changed. We attempted to keep the platforms level with the water surface. On each platform, we placed one Tomahawk live trap (15 x 15 x 40 cm) baited with apple slices. The trap was placed near the back of the platform so that there was a small platform area in front of the trap opening where a muskrat could sit and feed on additional apple bits. We placed platforms and traps near active
lodge or natural platforms when possible. Our trap design was also suitable for capturing rice
run.

For all captured animals, we recorded their age, sex, and reproductive status. Beginning in
June, we marked mudskippers with PIT tags (Schooley et al. 1995) and rice rats with ear tags.

Results and Discussion

Wading birds

Aerial Survey

We counted a total of 440 wading bird individuals during our survey on 28 February 2003
and 220 on 31 May 2003 (Table 1). Hence, we expect there will be substantial seasonal
variation in the number of wading birds foraging at APAFR. For comparison, Crouze and
Garlich (2002) counted an average of 223 individuals in a wet year, and 894 in a dry year, on a
similar-sized study area (WCA-2A in the northern Everglades, 45,200 ha).

During both of our surveys, white ibis were the most numerous species (Table 1). This
result is not surprising because white ibis typically congregate in relatively large groups
(15–40 individuals). We counted more wading birds in May compared to February, even though fewer
wading birds were observed overall (Table 1). The wood storks might have been attracted to
wetlands that still had water, but in which some drying had occurred, because foraging wood
storks require sensing water levels that concentrate prey (Bacon et al. 1982).

The total number of individuals varied considerably among transects (Fig. 1). In both
surveys, there was a peak between transects 8 and 11. There was a striking absence of wading
birds on the four most southern transects during the May survey (Fig. 1). Overall, there was
much spatial variation in the counts (Appendix I), which we will be able to correlate to
landscape characteristics.

Ground survey:

We observed wading birds in 121 of 459 (26%) months. The number of species in any one
month ranged from 0–6 (Fig. 2). The 12 species detected in decreasing incidence were the
American bitterns (n = 70 marshes), great egret (n = 39), great blue heron (n = 29), sandhill crane (n = 12), cattle egret (n = 12), white ibis (n = 8), wood stork (n = 5), little blue herons (Egretta caerulea, n = 5), green heron (Butorides virescens, n = 2), treefowl heron (Egretta tricolor, n = 2), snowy egret (n = 1), and rail (Aquilina sp., n = 1). The species richness of wading birds was positively related to wetland size ($X^2 = 29.31, P = 0.000$, $R^2 = 0.19$) but not to wetland perimeter ($X^2 = 0.02, P = 0.000$).

Other water birds that we observed included the ruddy duck (Oxyura jamaicensis), hooded merganser (Lophodytes cucullatus), double-crested cormorant (Phalacrocorax auritus), ibis (Threskiornis aethiopicus), pied-billed grebe (Podilymbus podiceps), and greater yellowlegs (Tringa melanoleuca).

American bitterns are difficult to survey due to their preference for dense zones and ability to stay well hidden. Surveys of bitterns during the breeding season rely on broadcasting recorded vocalizations to elicit responses (Riffell et al. 2001). Our sightings of flushed birds during walking surveys also should provide useful data on incidence because we typically reached all of the dense plant zones. American bitterns are migratory and we first observed an individual during surveys on 7 October 2002. Hence, we calculated an estimate of patch occupancy restricted to the 194 marshes surveyed after the "arrival date". American bitterns occurred in 70 (0.18 marshes), had a patchy distribution (Fig. 3), and their probability of occupancy was related to wetland area (Fig. 4). Wetland area and vegetation density were the most important explanatory variables for bitterns on their breeding range (Riffell et al. 2001).

**Wetland mammals**

**Wetland traits**

Many of the shallow depression marshes at AAFB are small (median = 0.92 ha), but there is a large amount of variation in wetland size (Table 2). The distribution of wetland area was skewed with a long right tail. Most of the wetlands were flooded with water (Table 2) during our ground surveys, although many of these dried out completely in late March to May 2003. Water depths are typically only 0-4 cm in most plant zones (Table 2), but water levels fluctuate widely on short time scales in response to rain events. Wetland organisms must be adapted to
Sampling effort and search time

For round-tailed muskrats, we surveyed 106 marshes from 7 August to 12 November 2002 in which we recorded the amount of time required to find positive signs in occupied marshes (n = 27). Two observers were present for most (87%) of these surveys; 3-5 observers were present for the remainder. In most of the marshes (96%), the first sign was unambiguously <15 min (Fig. 5). The one marsh that required 32 min was 3.2 ha and had a thick coverage of marsh grass and pickerelweed. For marsh rice rats, we surveyed 95 marshes from 4 September to 17 November 2002 in which we recorded the amount of time required to find positive signs in occupied marshes (n = 42). Again, two observers were present for most (86%) of the surveys, and 3-5 observers were present for the rest. In most of the marshes (94%), the first sign was encountered in <30 min (Fig. 5). The two marshes that required >30 min were >1 ha and had thick plant cover. We concluded that a 30-min search was adequate to determine whether these two mammal species were present in most marshes. Hence, we restricted most additional surveys to 30 min, but extended the search time up to 60 min for large marshes with exceptionally dense plant cover.

From 1 July 2002 to 15 February 2003, we conducted surveys of 459 marshes for the presence of muskrats and rice rats. This sampling effort not only exceeds our proposed effort for this project (275 patches), it also greatly surpasses the sample sizes for most previous studies of patch occupancy by muskrats (e.g., Pratt et al. 1998, Furts and Humphrey 1999, Hauki 1999, Fedriani et al. 2002). Overall, at least two observers searched most wetlands (97.6%), and often there were 3-4 observers (34.1%). We generally used 3-4 observers for large marshes (>2.5 ha).

Wetland occupancy: round-tailed muskrat and marsh rice rat

As expected, the occupancy rate of marshes (n = 459) was substantially lower for round-tailed muskrats (0.33) than for marsh rice rats (0.55). Muskrats not only occurred in fewer wetlands, they also had a more patchy distribution on a broad scale (Appendixes 2 and 3).
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Particular, muskrats were nearly absent from the southwestern portion of the study area south of Ashsville Marsh and west of Van Buren Road.

The area south of the study area contained only a few, isolated marshes. Round-tailed muskrats occupied some of these wetlands (Appendix 2). Hence, the scrub ridge might separate our study area into two relatively independent patch networks for Neophryne. In contrast, much larger introduced in several of the wetlands bordered in the scrubby area (Appendix 3).

The distribution of both muskrats and rice rats exhibited positive spatial autocorrelation at fine scales (1.5 km), but the pattern was stronger for the muskrats (Fig. 6): Such results can be due to autocorrelation of environmental variables related to occupancy, or to spatial dynamics of the species independent of measured variables. In either case, our logistic regression results must be considered preliminary. Our final analysis will include an evaluation of whether we need to statistically control for broad-scale spatial trend (with trend-surface analysis) and for fine-scale autocorrelation (with autoregressive models).

The occupancy of wetlands was positively related to wetland size for round-tailed muskrats and for muskrat rice rats (Fig. 7). Because of differences in overall occupancy rates and the shapes of the incidence curves, the points where the probability of occupancy was ≥50% differed substantially for the two species (muskrats = 0.9 ha, rice rats = 0.7 ha). Interestingly, wetland area did not explain a large amount of the variance for either mammal species (Fig. 7).

Of the four wetland-level variables that we evaluated for predicting occupancy of Neophryne, habitat quality was the most important (Table 4, Figure 8b). In fact, the importance of wetland area was marginal when included in the model with habitat quality. The model with only quality explained 35% of the overall variation, whereas a model with area and quality explained 32%. This outcome is at odds with current ideas on spatially structured metapopulations, in which patch area is assumed to be a key determinant of occupancy (Hanski 1999).

For Otnesmy, wetland area was an important predictor variable (Table 5). Habitat quality, as indicated by the presence of Juniper, Sparrman, and Penstemon, was also related to occupancy (Table 5). The logistic regression model that included wetland area and the three intensity species explained 20% of the overall variation in occupancy.

For both mammal species, there was a fair amount of unexplained variance that may be related to variables not used in our preliminary models, including other wetland traits, isolation,
land use, and landscape context. Moreover, we should be able to refine our measures of habitat quality for future analyses.

**Lawsuits of mudcrabs and rice rats.**

In March 2003, the capture success of *Neophytes* was 69% (15 captures/276 trapnights), and the capture success of *Oryzomys* was 58% (16/276). In June 2003, the capture success of *Neophytes* was only 13% (8 captures/513 trapnights), and all of the captures were of the same individual. The seasonal decline in capture success for *Neophytes* coincided to a general lack of activity in the shallow depression marshes; we found no fresh mudcrab lodges during May or June. *Neophytes* must burrow in other areas during the periods when wetlands are dry and when early summer rains refill the wetlands. The capture success of *Oryzomys* in June was 63% (12/513), so we initiated movement experiments with them aimed at determining their ability to locate and colonize toward wetlands while dispersing (Zollner 2000).

**Potential effects of land use.**

We will evaluate the potential influences of military activities and other land uses on wetland quality, landscape connectivity, and vertebrate distribution patterns at APA. Our general analytical approach will be to develop correlative habitat models using environmental variables (e.g., wetland size, wetland quality, isolation, matrix habitat), and time to ask whether additional variation in patterns of distribution and abundance can be explained by land use. The degree that we can incorporate different types of land use as predictor variables into our statistical models for wetland birds and marsh mammals will depend on the availability of spatially referenced data. Ideally, we plan to examine levels of military activity, current and past grazing pressures, fire history, and planting of pine plantations. Moreover, we will evaluate whether roadside ditches might serve as movement corridors for *Neophytes* and *Oryzomys* indirectly by comparing models of landscape connectivity that either include or exclude these linear elements in the calculation of wetland isolation.

The most significant finding of our preliminary analysis is the importance of habitat quality of wetlands in determining distribution patterns of *Neophytes*. Wetland size may matter, but...
quality matters more. Therefore, land use could influence wetland occupancy not only by affecting the nature of matrix habitat and wetland connectivity, but also by directly affecting the habitat quality of the wetlands. For instance, cattle grazing could influence the cover of inundation in marshes via herbivory and trampling, or road building and pine planting could alter hydrological patterns and the vegetation of wetlands. Finally, the round-tailed muskrat currently occurs in marshes throughout most of Echo, Chincote, and OQ meadows at APATR.

Therefore, any substantial changes in activities and land use within these areas could potentially influence the distribution and network-level persistence of this patchily distributed mammal.

Main activities for next year
1) Conduct six additional aerial surveys of habitat use by foraging wading birds at APATR.

2) Resurvey 459 wetlands for habitat characteristics and for the presence of wading birds, round-tailed muskrats, and marsh rice rats.

3) Continue live-trapping of round-tailed muskrats and marsh rice rats and conduct studies to obtain data on movement behavior, space use, and inter-wetland dispersal.

4) Conduct statistical analysis for (a) distribution patterns of wading birds, and (b) predictive models of patch occupancy for muskrats, rice rats, and American bitterns.
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Table 1. Aerial counts of wading birds on 15 transects at AFAFR. We sampled 20% of the
study area during the surveys. "Small white herons" are primarily cattle egrets.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species</th>
<th>28 February 2003</th>
<th>31 May 2003</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood stork</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White ibis</td>
<td>279</td>
<td>67.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great egret</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Great blue heron</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>4.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&quot;Small white heron&quot;</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>13.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhill crane</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>410</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 2. Continuous environmental variables measured at 459 wetlands surveyed from 3 July 2002 – 15 February 2003. The traits are potential explanatory variables for predictive habitat models.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>SD</th>
<th>Median</th>
<th>Minimum - Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Area (ha)</td>
<td>1.92</td>
<td>0.22</td>
<td>0.92</td>
<td>0.04 – 73.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perimeter (m)</td>
<td>313.4</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>376.0</td>
<td>94.0 – 0832.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water cover (%)</td>
<td>88.57</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>6 – 100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean water depth (cm)</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>0.82</td>
<td>22.8</td>
<td>0 – 80.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water depth of deepest hole (cm)</td>
<td>86.8</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>0 – 115</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5. Categorical environmental variables measured at wetlands surveyed from 3 July 2002 to 15 February 2003 at APAPR.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>No. of wetlands</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Substrate</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mucky</td>
<td>287</td>
<td>84.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sediment</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees in wetland</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>133</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trees along wetland edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>317</td>
<td>73.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>26.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shrubs along wetland edge</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>46.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent</td>
<td>241</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4: Logistic regression analysis of occupancy of shallow marsh wetlands (n = 459) by sound-tailed marsh frogs (Eleutherodactylus). The model includes four patch-level variables. Wetland area was log-transformed. Significance was based on a Type II analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.42</td>
<td>0.1194</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland perimeter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.97</td>
<td>0.3253</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Habitat quality</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>82.16</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substrate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.91</td>
<td>0.3375</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5: Logistic regression analysis of occupancy of shallow marsh wetlands (n = 459) by marsh rice rats (Oryzomys palustris). The model includes six patch-level variables. Wetland area was log-transformed. Significance was based on a Type III analysis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source of variation</th>
<th>d.f.</th>
<th>$\chi^2$</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Wetland area</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>19.96</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wetland perimeter</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1.07</td>
<td>0.2994</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Juncus</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.5422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spartina</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.96</td>
<td>0.3289</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pontederia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5.25</td>
<td>0.0220</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substrate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.51</td>
<td>0.4742</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Figure 1. Distribution of wading birds counted along 15 transects during aerial surveys at Avon Park Air Force Range.
Figure 2. Species richness of wading birds in depression marshes (n = 450) at Avon Park Air Force Range, July 2002-February 2003 based on ground surveys of wetlands.

Figure 3. Patterns of patch occupancy for American bitterns (Botaurus lentiginosus) at Avon Park Air Force Range, October 2002-February 2003. Each circle indicates the location of a depression marsh (n = 364).
Figure 4. Relationship between wetland size and the probability of wetland occupancy by American bitterns (*Botaurus lentiginosus*). The incidence curve is based on predicted probabilities from a logistic regression model. Dotted lines indicate a 95% confidence envelope for the predicted values. The X-axis is on a log₁₀ scale.
Figure 5. The amount of time until the first sign of occupancy was encountered for round-tailed muskrats (Neofiber alleni) and marsh rice rats (Oryzomys palustris) during wetland surveys. The sample size refers to the number of depression marshes with signs of occupancy.
Figure 6. Isotropic indicator correlograms for wetland occupancy by round-tailed muskrats and marsh rice rats. The correlograms indicate the degree of spatial autocorrelation in occupancy patterns across a range of spatial scales. Positive values at small lag distances indicate that nearby wetlands have similar values (if a marsh is occupied then the neighboring marshes tend to be occupied).
Figure 7. Relationship between wetland size and the probability of wetland occupancy by round-tailed muskrats (Neofiber alleni) and by marsh rice rats (Oryzomys palustris). The incidence curves are based on predicted probabilities from logistic regression models. Dotted lines indicate 95% confidence envelopes for the predicted values. The y-axes are on a log scale.
Figure 8. Relationship between habitat quality and occupancy of wetlands by round-tailed muskrats. Quality is a rank based on the coverage of plant zones in which reed canary grass is a dominant or codominant species.
Appendix 1. Spatial distribution of wading birds from aerial survey at APAFR on 31 May 2003.
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Biological Status Review
for the
Gopher Frog
(Lithobates capito)

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) directed staff to evaluate all species listed as Threatened or Species of Special Concern as of September 1, 2010. Public information on the status of the gopher frog was sought from September 17 through November 1, 2010. The 5-member biological review group (BRG) met on November 18, 2010. Group members were Kevin Enge (FWC lead), Steve Johnson (University of Florida), Thomas Ostertag (FWC), Rick Owen (Florida Department of Environmental Protection), and David Printiss (The Nature Conservancy) (Appendix 1). In accordance with rule 68A-27.0012 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C), the BRG was charged with evaluating the biological status of the gopher frog using criteria included in definitions in 68A-27.001(3), F.A.C. and following protocols in the Guidelines for Application of the IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Levels (Version 3.0) and Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (Version 8.1). Please visit http://myfwc.com/docs/WildlifeHabitats/Imperiled_EndangeredThreatened_FinalRules.pdf to view the listing process rule and the criteria found in the definitions. The BRG concluded from the biological assessment that the gopher frog did not meet any of the criteria for designation as a Threatened species. FWC staff recommends that the gopher frog not be listed as a threatened species and be removed from the State Species of Special Concern list.

This work was supported by a Conserve Wildlife Tag grant from the Wildlife Foundation of Florida.

BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION

Taxonomic Classification – Two subspecies of gopher frog were formerly recognized in Florida, the Florida gopher frog (Rana capito aesopus) and the dusky gopher frog (R. c. sevosa). The latter subspecies was thought to occur west of the Apalachicola River (Conant and Collins 1991). However, Young and Crother (2001) analyzed allozyme data that showed no genetic divisions among populations of Rana capito, except for the population in southern Mississippi, which they recommended elevating to specific status by resurrecting Rana sevosa (Goin and Netting, 1940), the dusky gopher frog. Frost et al. (2006) removed New World frogs from the genus Rana and placed them in Lithobates, so the current name for the species occurring in Florida is the gopher frog (Lithobates capito).

Life History and Habitat Requirements – Information on the species has been summarized by Jensen and Richter (2005). The gopher frog primarily inhabits areas with well-drained sandy soils that support gopher tortoise (Gopherus polyphemus) populations (Wright 1932, Franz 1986, Blihovde 2006, Roznik 2007). During the non-breeding season, the gopher frog is generally associated with longleaf pine (Pinus palustris)–xeric oak (Quercus spp.) sandhills but also occurs in upland pine forest,
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Gopher frogs will travel up to 2 km to a breeding pond (Franz 1986), typically during heavy winter and spring rains. The breeding season is usually September–April (Palis 1998; Branch and Hokit 2000; Blihovde 2006; S. Morrison, The Nature Conservancy, pers. commun. 2010), but frogs potentially can breed during any month of the year during heavy rains, although summer breeding is probably more common in southern Florida because winter frontal systems are weaker (Godley 1992, Jackson 2004). A female apparently deposits only a single egg mass containing a mean of 1,200–2,200 eggs (see Jensen and Richter 2005). Egg masses are attached to vegetation, and tadpoles transform in 3–7 months (Godley 1992, Palis 1998). Newly metamorphosed frogs leave their natal pond and spend most of their life in the surrounding uplands. Males apparently become reproductively mature at 1.5 years and females at 2 years (see Jensen and Richter 2005).

Population Status and Trend – There is no quantitative information, but the population is assumed to have declined as the human population in Florida has increased and converted suitable habitat to urban, agricultural, and other land uses. Based on the lack of recent activity at many historic breeding sites, Franz and Smith (1999) concluded that gopher frog populations had declined east of the Apalachicola River in the last 20 years (1975–95), particularly in coastal counties and in South Florida where most of the human population is concentrated. However, Franz and Smith (1999) considered the species to still be common on protected lands along the central spine of the Peninsula north of Lake Okeechobee. Franz and Smith (1999) compiled records from 258 localities in 45 counties in the peninsula. During surveys in 1990–95, they found gopher frogs at only 3 of 63 historical sites visited but found 83 new sites in 19 counties, including 4 new county records. Of the 12 counties for which Franz and Smith (1999) found no records, there have been recent records for 2 counties, Gilchrist and Hamilton (Tucker and Handrick 2006; K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). In the past 12 years (since 1998), gopher frogs have been recorded in 26 counties: Alachua, Baker, Citrus, Clay, Columbia, Gilchrist, Glades, Hernando, Highlands, Lake, Leon, Levy, Manatee, Marion, Martin, Orange, Osceola, Pasco, Polk, Putnam, Sarasota, Seminole, St. Lucie, Sumter, Taylor, and Volusia (museum and Florida Natural Areas Inventory [FNAI] records; K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). None of these counties is west of the Apalachicola River, because there have not been recent surveys in those counties; however, records in the 1990s exist for Calhoun, Okaloosa, Santa Rosa, Walton, and Washington counties (museum and FNAI records). Of the 63 ponds where gopher frogs were found from July 2009 through June 2010, 50 represented new ponds (K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). Many public lands were not surveyed, such as Avon Park Air Force Range, where Franz et al. (1998) found 11 gopher frog breeding ponds. Surveys for gopher frogs on public lands typically document multiple breeding ponds, such as 20 ponds on Eglin Air Force Base (Palis and Jensen 1995) and 21 ponds on...
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Camp Blanding Military Reservation (Hipps and Jackson 1996). At the Ordway–Swisher Biological Station, Franz (1986) marked 100 gopher frogs at tortoise burrows over a 16-month period.

**Geographic Range and Distribution** – The gopher frog occurs in the southeastern Coastal Plain from southeastern Alabama to North Carolina, with disjunct populations in central Alabama and the Cumberland Plateau in Tennessee (see Jensen and Richter 2005). The gopher frog historically occurred throughout Florida except for the Everglades region (Fig. 1), and Florida represents the largest portion of the total global range of the species (Jensen and Richter 2005).

**Quantitative Analyses** – We are not aware of a population viability analysis for the gopher frog. However, we believe that it is unlikely that the species will become extinct within the next 100 years based upon the large acreage of suitable habitat contained in conservation lands throughout Florida, its adaptability to some habitat alteration, and the increased security of gopher tortoise populations because of its new Threatened status (see Enge et al. 2006) and concomitant Gopher Tortoise Management Plan (Gopher Tortoise Management Plan Team 2007). The only factor that might change this scenario would be catastrophic die-offs from disease, but the isolated nature of many populations should keep them protected from disease vectors.

**BIOLOGICAL STATUS ASSESSMENT**

**Threats** – The greatest threat to gopher frogs is loss and alteration of xeric upland habitats resulting from commercial and residential development, silviculture, agriculture, and mining (Jensen and Richter 2005). Intact xerophytic upland ecosystems inhabited by gopher frogs have suffered severe losses in Florida, including longleaf pine-dominated sandhill as well as scrub habitat on the ridges of central and coastal Florida (Means and Grow 1985, Myers 1990, Kautz, 1998, Enge et al. 2006). Losses have been especially severe along the highly developed coastal ridges of both southeastern and southwestern Florida, as well as the central ridges that have been mined, converted to

---

Fig. 1. Locality records from museums, FNAI, and the literature for the gopher frog.
agriculture, and more recently developed (Jackson 2004). Because of their vagility, gopher frog populations can persist in fragmented landscapes, even when breeding ponds occur in unsuitable upland habitat. Gopher frogs do not require intact native ground cover, and dense populations can occur in pastures containing gopher tortoise burrows. For example, 97 gopher frogs were observed using 261 tortoise burrows in an abandoned pasture in Green Swamp West, Pasco County (M. Barnwell, Southwest Florida Water Management District, pers. comm. 2010). The most cited management concerns for gopher frogs are altered fire regimes, resulting in the encroachment of hardwoods and shrubs in the upland habitat, and the loss of gopher tortoise or pocket gopher populations that provide the primary source of upland shelters (Godley 1992, Greenberg et al. 2003, Jensen and Richter 2005, Bluhovde 2006, Roznik 2007). Newly metamorphosed gopher frogs emigrating from ponds in Ocala National Forest selected fire-maintained habitat that was associated with an open canopy, few hardwood trees, small amounts of leaf litter, and large amounts of wiregrass (*Aristida stricta*); this habitat contained higher densities of gopher tortoise and small mammal burrows used as refuges (Roznik and Johnson 2009b). Altered fire regimes have resulted in canopy closure and unnatural shading of the grassy ground cover, which provides food for gopher tortoises and the frog’s invertebrate prey base. Silvicultural practices can degrade upland habitat and impact gopher frog populations. Gopher frog larvae were found in <7% of 444 ponds sampled on forest industry lands (Wigley et al. 1999). On commercial forest lands in the Panhandle, dense stands of sand pine (*Pinus clausa*) are often planted in sandhill habitat. Gopher frog larvae were found in only 1 of 85 ponds sampled in a Sand Pine plantation on private land, whereas they were found significantly more often in ponds in an adjacent Longleaf Pine forest on Apalachicola National Forest (Means and Means 2005).

Degradation and destruction of wetlands also affect gopher frogs that rely on these ponds for breeding. Exclusion and suppression of fire from wetlands often leads to degradation of breeding ponds through shrub encroachment, peat buildup, and increased evapotranspiration shortening hydroperiods (LaClaire 2001). Coverage of grassy emergent vegetation decreases, and peat buildup may acidify the water past tolerance levels (Smith and Braswell 1994). Land managers often use fire lines to exclude prescribed fire from dry wetlands to prevent problems with smoke management or muck fires, particularly if the wetlands are associated with wildland urban interface (Bishop and Haas 2005). Erosion from adjacent unpaved roads can lead to siltation and sedimentation of ponds, and runoff from paved roads can pollute ponds with petrochemicals and other toxic substances to frogs (LaClaire 2001). Pond degradation also results from garbage dumping and off-road vehicle (ORV) use (Means and Means 1998, LaClaire 2001). Use of ORVs in pond basins can cause direct mortality of tadpoles and adults, and it can affect habitat quality by altering pond contours, herbaceous vegetation, and hydrology (LaClaire 2001). Loss of herbaceous vegetation decreases cover for tadpoles from predators and can discourage reproduction, because egg masses are attached to stems of herbaceous vegetation (see LaClaire 2001). Large tires of ORVs may break the organic hardpan beneath a pond, causing water to drain out and shortening the hydroperiod (LaClaire and Franz 1990). The hydrology of many of Florida’s depression marsh wetlands may already have been significantly influenced by anthropogenic-caused impacts related to groundwater withdrawals (R. Owen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, pers. commun. 2010). North Florida has already undergone extreme shifts in groundwater potentiometric levels (i.e., “groundwater contours”) (Grubs and Crandall 2007). The hydrologic impact has been documented for the first time across regional hydrologic divides between the Suwannee River and St. Johns River water management districts, and there are numerous examples across the entire state where groundwater withdrawals are significantly shifting the historic directional flow of localized groundwater supplies (R. Owen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, pers. commun. 2010). State regulators and governing water management districts have been forced to plan for future losses of ground water and even develop written recovery strategies, as mandated by
legislative law, because of significant damaging groundwater losses (http://www.swfwmd.state.fl.us/waterman/swuca/). Some ephemeral wetlands are independent of ground water or surface aquifer water, but other wetlands are being impacted by hydrological alterations related to groundwater withdrawal (Guzy et al. 2006). Groundwater withdrawal can shorten hydroperiods or even eliminate ephemeral wetlands, and climate change may be affecting the amount of winter precipitation in peninsular Florida. Long-term droughts may have caused some populations to disappear because of insufficient population recruitment.

The introduction of fish may play a role in population declines of certain anurans breeding in normally fish-free wetlands. Eastern mosquitofish (Gambusia holbrooki) are often introduced into isolated wetlands for mosquito control purposes, and even these small fish may have significant negative effects on gopher frog tadpoles (Gregoire and Gunzburger 2008). A far more serious threat, however, is the stocking of game fish (Lepomis spp. and Micropterus spp.) into ponds used by gopher frogs, or the introduction of predaceous fish into formerly fish-free wetlands during natural flooding events. Invertebrates can significantly impact population recruitment by feeding on eggs and tadpoles (Richter 2000), and a variety of vertebrates, such as wading birds and snakes. Seventy-five percent of 32 metamorphs leaving a natal pond were killed by North American racers (Coluber constrictor), common garter snakes (Thamnophis sirtalis), or mammals (Roznik and Johnson 2009a). The long distances sometimes traveled by gopher frogs to breed can make them susceptible to highway mortality. A metamorph leaving a natal pond moved 691 m before being killed, and 3 of 32 metamorphs were killed by vehicles on lightly traveled dirt roads (Roznik and Johnson 2009a) that they apparently used as migration corridors (Roznik and Johnson 2009b).

A chytridiomycete fungus (Batrachochytrium dendrobatidis), or Bd, has been implicated as a primary or suspected cause of disease epidemics and subsequent population declines of amphibians in many parts of the world, but although chytrid fungus is not known to be responsible for any amphibian die-offs in the Southeast. None of 18 gopher frog tadpoles examined from Florida and Georgia tested positive for Bd (Rothermel et al. 2008). Ranaviruses are likely a greater threat to amphibians, particularly tadpoles, than Bd in North America (Gray et al. 2009a, b). A die-off of hundreds of ranid tadpoles, including gopher frogs, in 2 ponds in Withlacoochee State Forest, Hernando County, was apparently caused by an unnamed Perkinsuslike (or alveolate) microorganism (Davis et al. 2007, Rothermel et al. 2008). A newly identified mesomycetozoan pathogen, Anuraperkinsus emelandra, has been the cause of massive ranid tadpole mortalities in 10 states, including a 2003 die-off of almost all tadpoles at the only known breeding pond of the federally endangered dusky gopher frog (http://www.nwhc.usgs.gov/disease_information/amphibian_malformation_and_decline/index.jsp).

Statewide Population Assessment – Findings from the BRG are included in Biological Status Review Information tables.

LISTING RECOMMENDATION

The BRG found the gopher frog did not meet any of the criteria for listing as a threatened species. Staff recommends that the gopher frog not be listed as a threatened species.

SUMMARY OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW
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### Findings

**Species/taxon:** Gopher Frog  
**Date:** 11/18/10  
**Assessors:** Enge, Johnson, Ostertag, Owen, Printiss  
**Generation length:** 4 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Criterion/Listing Measure</th>
<th>Data/Information</th>
<th>Data Type*</th>
<th>Criterion Met?</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>(A) Population Size Reduction</strong>, ANY of</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a1). An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of at least 50% over the last 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer, where the causes of the reduction are clearly reversible and understood and ceased</td>
<td>Causes of reduction have not ceased (c)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a2). An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of at least 30% over the last 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer, where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased or may not be understood or may not be reversible</td>
<td>&lt;30% population size reduction because only 16.0% increase in human population since 2000 and acquisition of conservation lands. Loss of suitable habitat in the past 12 years is &lt;30%.</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Kautz et al. (2007), U.S. Census Bureau</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a3). A population size reduction of at least 30% projected or suspected to be met within the next 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years)</td>
<td>&lt;30% population size reduction because human population projected to increase by 16.5% in next 10 years, 47.6% of potential habitat is on conservation lands, and species can survive in some altered habitats</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Zwick and Carr (2006), GIS analysis of potential habitat by B. Stys (FWC)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a4). An observed, estimated, inferred, projected or suspected population size reduction of at least 30% over any 10 year or 3 generation period, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future), where the time period must include both the past and the future, and where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased or may not be understood or may not be reversible.</td>
<td>&lt;30% population size reduction (see A2 and A3)</td>
<td>S</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Zwick and Carr (2006)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Data Types - observed (O), estimated (E), inferred (I), suspected (S), or projected (P).  Criterion met - yes (Y) or no (N).  

**Based on (and specifying) any of the following: (a) direct observation; (b) an index of abundance appropriate to the taxon; (c) a decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and/or quality of habitat; (d) actual or potential levels of exploitation; (e) the effects of introduced taxa, hybridization, pathogens, pollutants, competitors or parasites.

| **(B) Geographic Range**, EITHER | | | | |
| (b1). Extent of occurrence < 20,000 km$^2$ (7,722 mi$^2$) OR | ca. 80,440 km$^2$ (37 counties) | E | N |  |
| (b2). Area of occupancy < 2,000 km$^2$ (772 mi$^2$) | 8,992 km$^2$ | E | N | GIS analysis of potential habitat by B. Stys (FWC) |
| AND at least 2 of the following: | | | | |
| a. Severely fragmented or exist in ≤ 10 locations | S | N | | |
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#### b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected in any of the following: (i) extent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) area, extent, and/or quality of habitat; (iv) number of locations or subpopulations; (v) number of mature individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>See Sub-criterion A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### c. Extreme fluctuations in any of the following: (i) extent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) number of locations or subpopulations; (iv) number of mature individuals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### (C) Population Size and Trend

#### Population size estimate to number fewer than 10,000 mature individuals AND EITHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&gt;10,000 mature individuals</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### (c) Population size estimate to number fewer than 10,000 mature individuals AND EITHER

- Uncertain if there will be a 10% decline in the next 12 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

#### (c)1. An estimated continuing decline of at least 10% in 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future) OR

- A continuing decline, observed, projected, or inferred in numbers of mature individuals AND at least one of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>P</th>
<th>Y</th>
<th>See Sub-criterion A3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### (D) Population Very Small or Restricted, EITHER

- Population estimated to number fewer than 1,000 mature individuals; OR

- Population with a very restricted area of occupancy (typically less than 20 km² [8 mi²]) or number of locations (typically 5 or fewer) such that it is prone to the effects of human activities or stochastic events within a short time period in an uncertain future

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>&gt;10,000 mature individuals</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### (E) Quantitative Analyses

- Showing the probability of extinction in the wild is at least 10% within 100 years

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No PVA</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

### Initial Finding (Meets at least one of the criteria OR Does not meet any of the criteria)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason (which criteria are met)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Not Threatened**

- Is species/taxon endemic to Florida? (Y/N)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

If Yes, your initial finding is your final finding. Copy the initial finding and reason to the final finding space below. If No, complete the regional assessment sheet and copy the final finding from that sheet to the space below.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Final Finding (Meets at least one of the criteria OR Does not meet any of the criteria)</th>
<th>Reason (which criteria are met)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not Threatened</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No.</td>
<td>Question</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Initial finding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2a. Is the species/taxon a non-breeding visitor? (Y/N/DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>2b. Does the Florida population experience any significant immigration of propagules capable of reproducing in Florida? (Y/N/DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2c. Is the immigration expected to decrease? (Y/N/DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>2d. Is the regional population a sink? (Y/N/DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2e. Are the conditions outside Florida deteriorating? (Y/N/DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>2f. Are the conditions within Florida deteriorating? (Y/N/DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>2g. Can the breeding population rescue the Florida population should it decline? (Y/N/DK)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Final finding</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional notes – Generation length is defined as the average age of parents of the current cohort (estimated at 5 years), which is greater than the age at first breeding and less than the age of the oldest breeding individual. Franz (1986) estimated that it took gopher frogs 3.8 years to attain the maximum size observed at the Ordway–Swisher Biological Station. In a mark-recapture study of the closely related dusky gopher frog in Mississippi, the minimum age of sexual maturity was 4–6 months for males and 24–36 months for females, and annual population turnover was apparently high (Richter and Seigel 2002). Only 13.6% of 301 marked frogs were captured in more than 1
breeding season; the average number of breeding seasons for a frog was 1.2, although 1 frog bred 5 times (Richter and Seigel 2002). Richter et al. (2003) estimated maximum longevity of the dusky gopher frog to be 6–10 years but thought most adults did not live longer than 4–5 years. Based upon this information, we will infer a mean generation length of 4 years.

Sub-criterion A2. – We assume that the gopher frog population has declined as the human population in Florida has increased and converted suitable habitat to urban, agricultural, and other land uses. Florida’s human population increased by 23.5% from 1990 through 2000 and by 16.0% from 2000 through 2009. Florida loses 182 ha (450 acres) of forest and 166 ha (410 acres) of farmland every day (Bouvier and McClue Stein n.d.). Actual estimates of gopher frog populations do not exist, but we suspect that loss and degradation of habitat would not have resulted in a ≥ 30% population decline within the past 12 years, particularly considering Florida’s programs for purchasing public conservation lands (e.g., Preservation 2000 and Florida Forever). See Population Status and Trend section for past and present occurrence information. On most public lands, suitable upland habitat for the gopher frog is managed by controlled burning, and these public lands probably have extant populations. However, gopher frogs were documented in the Panacea Unit of St. Marks National Wildlife Refuge in 1978 but apparently no longer occur there, despite suitable upland habitat and wetlands (Dodd et al. 2007). Inexplicable population declines or extinctions are a cause for concern and indicate that such events could occur elsewhere. Apparent population declines or extinctions may be related to several years of unsuitable weather for breeding or population recruitment (or to unknown factors), but populations may reappear. For example, calling gopher frogs have been monitored from 1 station (choruses from 2 breeding ponds can be heard) on the Lake Wales Ridge in Polk County since 1993, and the number of nights frogs were heard calling ranged from 4 to 35 annually. However, no gopher frogs were heard calling from 2006 through 2009, but frogs were again heard in 2010 (S. Morrison, The Nature Conservancy, pers. commun. 2010). The gopher frog is currently not hunted for food or pets in Polk County since 1993, and the number of nights frogs were heard calling ranged from 4 to 35 annually. However, no gopher frogs were heard calling from 2006 through 2009, but frogs were again heard in 2010 (S. Morrison, The Nature Conservancy, pers. commun. 2010). The gopher frog is currently not hunted for food or pets (Enge 2005). Massive die-offs of gopher frog adults and tadpoles from pathogens could contribute to future population declines (see Threats section).

Sub-criterion A3. – Three generations from 2010 as the present would be 2022. Florida’s population is projected to increase by 16.5% by 2020 and by 24.4% by 2025 (Zwick and Carr 2006). The exact relationship between human population increase and habitat loss is unknown. Much of the population increase could occur in urban areas, and residential development in suburban and rural areas may not eliminate frog populations. Both public and private lands will continue to experience habitat degradation from altered fire regimes (timing, intensity, fire-return interval, and season) (D. Printiss, The Nature Conservancy, pers. commun. 2010), leading to future population declines. Increased groundwater withdrawal shortening the hydroperiod of ephemeral wetlands used as breeding ponds may also impact frog populations. Of the potential habitat identified using GIS analysis, 47.6% is in conservation lands (B. Stys, FWC, pers. commun. 2010), and presumably gopher frog populations will continue to persist on most of these lands, particularly the larger parcels. However, just because land is protected does not mean that it is properly managed. There are ca. 900,000 ha (2.2 million acres) of fire-dominated natural communities on all publicly managed state lands, and ca. 336,000 ha (830,000) acres were reported to have been prescribe burned in fiscal year 2009–10 within the fire interval necessary to maintain optimal habitat conditions (State of Florida Land Management Uniform Accounting Council 2010). This means that 61% of fire-dominated communities are being fire suppressed. This trend of backlogged, fire-suppressed communities has occurred each year all the way back to the mid-1970's when state agencies in Florida first began using fire as a management tool, and these backlogged acres, on average, are not decreasing (R. Owen, Florida Department of Environmental Protection, pers. commun. 2010). Because of this downward trend, the available optimal habitat for upland species is projected to continue to decrease on the very lands that were meant to conserve them. The ability of gopher frog populations to continue to persist on fire-suppressed public and private lands is unknown. Efforts are being made to restore degraded sandhill habitat. For example, a 3-year multi-state sandhill ecological restoration project will enhance restoration on public and private lands by providing additional resources to meet sandhill restoration goals, significantly increasing the quality and quantity of habitat for wildlife species on 6,740 ha (16,655 acres) of sandhill habitat in Florida by 2012 (http://myfwc.com/wildlifelegacy/fundedprojects/GrantDetails.aspx?ID=215). Another project will completely or partially restore 539 ha (1,333 acres) of sandhill and scrub habitats to benefit wildlife on Apalachicola Wildlife Management Area (WMA), Big Bend WMA, Guana River WMA, and Lake Wales Ridge Wildlife and Environmental Area by 2012 (http://myfwc.com/wildlifelegacy/fundedprojects/GrantDetails.aspx?ID=229).

Sub-criterion B1. – The extent of occurrence was calculated by adding up the land area of the 37 counties in which gopher frogs have been reported since 1990 (museum and FNAI records; K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data). The extent of occurrence is 80,440 km² (31,058 mi²).

Sub-criterion B2. – A GIS analysis of potential habitat for the species identified 8,992 km² (3,462 mi²) of potential habitat (B. Stys, FWC, pers. commun. 2010), which we will assume is equivalent to the area of occupancy. The major FWC 2003 land-cover classes that comprised the potential habitat were pine lands (3,428 km²; 1,323.6 mi²),
sandhill (1,903 km²; 734.6 mi²), dry prairie (1,254 km²; 484.0 mi²), mixed pine-hardwood forest (874 km²; 337.6 mi²), shrub and brushland (627.0 km²; 242.1 mi²), xeric oak scrub (159.8 km²; 61.7 mi²), sand pine scrub (145.8 km²; 56.3 mi²), open water (143.7 km²; 55.5 mi²), and freshwater marsh and wet prairie (140.0 km²; 54.0 mi²), and unimproved pasture (139.6 km²; 53.9 mi²). The amount of potential habitat just on conservation lands, which is 4,280 km² (1,653 mi²) (B. Stys, FWC, pers. commun. 2010), is over twice the threshold for listing. Well-managed sandhill habitat is considered the most favorable natural habitat for both gopher tortoises and commensal gopher frogs. Potential habitat just in the sandhill landcover class (1,903 km²; 734.6 mi²) almost meets the threshold for area of occupancy.

Criterion C – Because females lay only a single egg mass, counts of egg masses are a good index of the number of breeding females in the population. At 2 ponds in Conecuh National Forest, Alabama, a maximum of 160–180 egg masses were counted in each pond during 1 year (Jensen et al. 2003). Gopher frog populations apparently have an equal sex ratio (Palis 1998); thus, over 300 adult frogs used each of these ponds. At a 1.2-ha pond on Eglin Air Force Base, Florida, 301 unmarked adult frogs were captured during 1 breeding season (Palis 1998). We suspect that most ponds are not used by this many frogs, and the number of adult frogs in a population will vary annually depending upon the number of frogs recruited into the population and mortality rates. In some years, there is no population recruitment from some ponds (Greenberg 2001, Richter and Seigel 2002). Since 1990, at least 200 breeding ponds have been found during surveys on 7 public lands: Apalachicola National Forest, Avon Park Air Force Range, Camp Blanding Military Reservation, Chassahowitzka WMA, Eglin Air Force Base, Ocala National Forest, and Rock Springs Run State Reserve. If an average of 50 frogs bred in these ponds, these 7 public lands would contain 10,000 adult gopher frogs. There are far more than 200 breeding ponds in Florida. During a survey in northern Florida in 2006–10, gopher frogs were found using 118 ponds (K. Enge, FWC, unpubl. data).

Sub-criterion C2. – Ocala National Forest has at least 70 gopher frog breeding ponds, and this subpopulation probably contains >1,000 adults. Prolonged droughts could result in extreme population fluctuations of adults, but we think it is unlikely that the fluctuations would be the scale of on an order of magnitude.
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