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Peer review #1 from Tylan Dean

From: Tylan_Dean@fws.gov
To: Imperiled
Cc: Delany, Michael
Subject: Re: FW: Marian's marsh wren BSR report
Date: Thursday, January 27, 2011 10:38:25 PM
Attachments: 20110126 Dean Peer Review of Draft Worthington's Marsh Wren Biological Status Review.docx
20110126 Dean Peer Review of Draft Marian's Marsh Wren Biological Status Review.docx

Here are both of my brief reviews. Please contact me with any questions.

Tylan Dean
Assistant Supervisor
Endangered Species & Conservation Planning Assistance
U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Virginia Field Office
6669 Short Lane
Gloucester, Virginia 23061

Peer Review of Draft FWC Biological Status Review for the Marian’s Marsh Wren (Cistothorus palustris mariana)
Reviewer: Tylan Dean

Thank you for the opportunity to review this document.

It appears to consider the appropriate (though limited) information, and the information considered appears to support the need for protection. I recommend explicitly identifying that it is proposed as a regional population, and describing why immigration into the population is not expected. The number of sites where the species occurs was also not clearly expressed. In the table, it is stated that < 10 populations occur, based on the 2003 Breeding Bird Survey, but the information on number of sites is not clear. Recent presence on 5 transects in two counties was also noted in the text, but these weren’t cited in the text. I recommend clearly summarizing the available information on delineation of populations/sites.

Editorial note: in the section titled: “Geographic Distribution and Range,” the range is referenced as both Florida and AL, and as extending westward through Texas. This aspect of the range should be clarified.
Peer review #2 from Paul Sykes

From: Paul Sykes
To: Imperiled
Subject: Re: Worthington's marsh wren Draft BSR Report
Date: Thursday, December 02, 2010 3:25:20 PM

Dear Elsa:

Thank you for the opportunity to review the two marsh wren BSR drafts. I found them to be interesting and informative. The BSRs for the Worthington's and Marian's Marsh Wrens are perfectly adequate for their intended purpose despite the fact relatively little is known of these taxons. I find the accounts "clean", well written and organized, and are accurate to the best of my knowledge. The literate for each taxon is well covered. In my opinion, the three authors did a very good job in drafting these accounts and I have nothing further to offer to improve what is presented.

Paul W. Sykes, Jr.
Peer review #3 from Sally Jue

To: Mike Delany  
From: Sally S. Jue  
Date: 9 January 2011  
Re: Peer review of the Biological Status Review for the Marian’s Marsh Wren (*Cistothorus palustris marianae*)

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the peer review process for the State’s Biological Status Review (BSR) for the two marsh wren subspecies. I have carefully reviewed the BSR for Marian’s marsh wren and concur with the findings and recommendation of the Biological Review Group (BRG) to list this taxon as Threatened.

All available biological information and data, although limited in quantity, have been accurately assessed. The BRG members did a systematic review and step-wise analysis of the available information relative to each of the listing criteria. Their assumptions and interpretations are backed up with references from the literature, and their resulting conclusions are valid. Its restricted geographic range, coupled with declining quality and multiple threats to the salt marsh habitat on which it depends, make monitoring studies of the Marian’s marsh wren essential to understanding this taxon’s population status and trends.

**Biological Status Review for the Marian’s Marsh Wren (*Cistothorus palustris marianae*)**

**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 Marian’s marsh wren was sought from September 17 to November 1, 2010. The three-member Biological Review Group met on November 3 – 4, 2010. Group members were Michael F. Delany (FWC lead), Katy NeSmith (Zoologist with the Florida Natural Areas Inventory), and Bill Pranty (Avian Ecologist Contractor). In accordance with rule 68A-27.0012 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), the Biological Review Group (BRG) was charged with evaluating the biological status of the Marian’s marsh wren using criteria included in definitions in 68A-27.001(3) and following the 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/WILDLIFEHABITATS/imperiledSpp_listingprocess.htm to view the listing process rule and the criteria found in the definitions.

The Biological Review Group concluded from the biological assessment that the Marian’s marsh wren met criteria for listing and recommends listing the species as state threatened.

Supplemental Information for the Marian’s Marsh Wren
This work was supported by a Conserve Wildlife Tag grant from the Wildlife Foundation of Florida.

**BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION**


*Taxonomic Classification* – Marsh wrens (*Cistothorus palustris*) are in the Order Passeriformes assigned to the Family Troglodytidae (Wrens). About 14 subspecies are recognized. Subspecies designation is complex, being based on plumage, wing length, and geographic lines. Two distinct evolutionary groups, eastern and western, may warrant species status (Kroodsma and Verner 1997). Two subspecies, the Marian’s marsh wren (*C. p. marianae*) and the Worthington’s marsh wren (*C. p. griseus*), breed in Florida. The Marian’s marsh wren was first described in 1888 (Scott 1888) as being darker with more olive color than brown, and having more barring on its plumage than other marsh wrens. Wheeler (1931) describes the taxonomic history and early distribution of marsh wrens in the Southeast.

*Population Status and Trend* – Difficulty in conducting surveys in relatively inaccessible salt marsh has limited monitoring, and historic information on abundance is sparse. Kale (1996) estimated 2,000-3,000 breeding pairs of Marian’s marsh wrens between Port Richey and Apalachee Bay. Distribution is sparse and little is known about the abundance of wrens west of Apalachee Bay. More recently, Marian’s marsh wrens (5-18, range of averages from 3 repeated measures) were detected at each of 5 transects between Dixie County (29.71365 - 83.49502) and Franklin County (29.68065, -85.08717) in 2010 (FWC, unpublished data). The FWC list of species of greatest conservation need (FWC 2005) ranks the abundance status of the Marian’s marsh wren as “low” with an “unknown” population trend. Although results are based on only 7 routes and may be imprecise for trend estimates, information from the North American Breeding Bird Survey (BBS 2010) indicate a -9.5 percent annual decline in the abundance of marsh wrens in the Southeastern coastal plain from 1966-2006. Marian’s marsh wrens are “abundant” in the coastal marshes of Alabama (Stevenson 1978). The Florida Natural Areas Inventory ranks the Marian’s marsh wren as rare and restricted in distribution globally and in Florida (G5T3/S3). The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN 2009) ranks the global status of marsh wrens as a species of Least Concern. An array of point count stations (see Ralph et al. 1995) should be established within the range of the Marian’s marsh wren and surveys conducted at 5-year intervals to monitor trends in abundance.

*Geographic Range and Distribution* – Marsh wrens breed in brackish and freshwater marshes of North America from the western and northern continental United States and southern Canada; along the Atlantic coast from Delaware to northern Florida; and along the Gulf coast from mid-peninsula Florida to southern Texas and into Mexico (Kroodsma and Verner 1997). The Marian’s marsh wren breeds along the Gulf coast of Florida from Port Richey (Pasco County) to Escambia Bay (Santa Rosa County), and west into southwest Alabama (Stevenson and Anderson 1994, Kale 1996). Distribution is sparse along the Florida panhandle west of Apalachee Bay (Wakulla County). Kroodsma and Verner (1997) considered *C. p. thryophilus* synonymous with *C. p. marianae*, extending the range of the Marian’s marsh wren to southeastern Texas. Several northern subspecies (*C. p. palustris, C. p. dissaepatus, C. p. waynei*, and *C. p. iliacus*) winter in Florida (Kale 1965, Stevenson and Anderson 1994, but see Phillips 1986). Marian’s marsh wrens inhabit tidal marshes dominated by cordgrass (*Spartina*...
alterniflora) and black needle rush (Juncus roemerianus) and nest in taller vegetation along tidal creeks. Florida land cover information (Water Management Districts, photography dates 1999-2008) indicates 566.0-701.0 km$^2$ of salt marsh habitat within the range of the Marian’s marsh wren. Cox and Kautz (2000) estimated 372.7 km$^2$ of existing potential habitat for the subspecies in Florida. The Florida Breeding Bird Atlas (FWC 2003, 1986-1991) documented confirmed breeding in 25 atlas blocks within the wren’s current range. The subspecies is resident at breeding locations and is considered non-migratory. The range of the Marian’s marsh wren extends into Alabama, with Florida constituting >80 percent of the subspecies’ range.

**Quantitative Analyses** – A population viability analysis has not been conducted on the Florida population of the Marian’s marsh wren.

**BIOLOGICAL STATUS ASSESSMENT**

**Threats** – The narrow coastal range of the Marian’s marsh wren makes it vulnerable to habitat loss and fragmentation due to dredging and filling in conjunction with coastal development, impoundments for mosquito control and waterfowl, flooding from severe storms and hydrological changes, sea level rise, chemical and oil spills, and disposal of dredged material (Montague and Wiegert 1990, FWC 2005). Development of adjacent uplands also may contribute to habitat degredation. The vulnerability of coastal song birds is exemplified by the rapid decline and extinction of the dusky seaside sparrow (Ammodramus maritimus nigrescens) Delany et al. (1981). Climate change is a potential threat at the southern extent of its range where salt marsh habitat may be lost to the invasion of mangroves as the climate warms. However, compared to C. p. griseus, this subspecies appears to be more tolerant of the invasion of woody vegetation as long as a critical amount of grass and rush vegetation remains (Stevenson and Anderson 1994). Sea level rise also may lead to habitat loss for the Marian’s marsh wren in Florida (Walton 2007). However, responses of most species, especially short-lived species, to future climate change are not understood well enough to predict impacts (Akcakaya et al. 2006). The current condition of salt marsh habitats in Florida is considered “poor and declining” (FWC 2005), but strict regulatory mechanisms and public ownership provide some protection. High tides destroyed up to 21 percent of marsh wren nests during a four-year study in Georgia (Kale 1965), where rice rats (Oryzomys palustris), raccoons (Procyon lotor), and mink (Mustela vison) depredated up to 81 percent of nests. Nests sites also may be usurped by rice rats (Stevenson and Anderson 1994).

**Statewide Population Assessment** – The IUCN developed criteria for the evaluation of extinction risk for any taxon, with the exception of micro-organisms (IUCN 2010). Each taxon must be assessed against all criteria, but if the taxon meets any of the criteria under a particular category it qualifies as threatened. IUCN criteria use the terms observed, estimated, projected, inferred, and suspected to refer to the quality of information used to assess the status of a species. The assessment criteria can be applied at a regional (Florida) level with a consideration of the status and impact of extra-regional populations (IUCN 2003). Findings from the BRG are included in the Biological Status Review Information table below.

In our review of the status of the Marian’s marsh wren, the BRG made the following assumptions and conclusions:
1. Because the time estimated for 3 generations was <10 years, the IUCN criteria (2010) stipulation of 10 years was used in assessments.

2. The estimated number of mature individuals ranged from 2,000-3,000 pairs (Kale 1996).

3. The extent of occurrence was 566.0-701.0 km² based on the availability of salt marsh habitat within the range of the wren in Florida. Cox and Kautz (2000) estimated 372.7 km² of existing potential habitat for the subspecies in Florida.

4. Adult marsh wrens will disperse to locate suitable habitat (Kroodsma and Verner 1997). However, given the sparse distribution of Marian’s marsh wrens in the Florida panhandle a rescue effect from extra-regional populations in Alabama seems unlikely.

5. The condition of salt marsh habitat in Florida is considered to be “poor and declining” (FWC 2005).

LISTING RECOMMENDATION
Staff recommends that the Marian’s marsh wren be listed as a Threatened species because the subspecies meets criteria for listing as described in 68A-27.001(3) F.A.C.

SUMMARY OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW
To be added later.
Peer review #4 from Don Kroodsman

From: Don Kroodsma  
To: Imperiled  
Cc: Delany, Michael  
Subject: RE: Worthington"s marsh wren Draft BSR Report  
Date: Saturday, January 15, 2011 7:42:09 AM

Hi Caly, Mike:

Ah, that is the source of my confusion. Given my inattention to subspecies, I just read "marsh wren," and felt some redundancy in what was being sent to me, like, "why are they sending me this stuff twice?"

I just read the Marian's report that was, in fact, sent to me on the date you said. I don't have anything to add to the report, or any recommendation. These birds are hard to count, and their habitat isn't abundant, and declining if anything, so your best guess about these things is better than mine, to be sure.

best . . .Don
Peer review #5 from Craig Parenteau

From: Parenteau, Craig
To: Imperiled
Subject: Biological Status Reviews for Worthington's and Marian's Marsh Wrens
Date: Monday, January 10, 2011 6:27:51 PM

Dr. Haubold: I thank you for providing me with the opportunity to act as an independent peer reviewer of Biological Status Reviews developed by FWC for marsh wrens. I offer the following comments.

Marian's Marsh Wren
I strongly support the conclusion of the Biological Review Group and FWC staff that the Marian's marsh wren also meets established criteria for listing and merits retention on the FWC list of threatened species. The limited extent of available habitat remaining, the vulnerability of that habitat to stochastic events such as the “No Name Storm” of the 1990s, and the generally declining quality of Big Bend tidal marshes due to recent population influx are all causes for concern. Unfortunately, ecologists have not yet studied this wren sufficiently to predict how resilient its populations might be to relatively rapid changes in its preferred environment. Additional research into Marian’s marsh wren ecology is needed, with point count surveys every five years representing the minimum effort recommended.

Thanks again for the opportunity to comment.

Craig Parenteau
Environmental Specialist III
FDEP, Division of Recreation and Parks
Bureau of Parks District 2
4801 Camp Ranch Road
Gainesville, FL 32641-9299
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 Marian’s marsh wren was sought from September 17 to November 1, 2010. The three-member Biological Review Group met on November 3 – 4, 2010. Group members were Michael F. Delany (FWC lead), Katy NeSmith (Zoologist with the Florida Natural Areas Inventory), and Bill Pranty (Avian Ecologist Contractor). In accordance with rule 68A-27.0012 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), the Biological Review Group (BRG) was charged with evaluating the biological status of the Marian’s marsh wren using criteria included in definitions of 68A-27.001(3) and following the 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/WILDLIFEHABITATS/imperiledSpp_listingprocess.htm to view the listing process rule and the criteria found in the definitions.

The Biological Review Group concluded from the biological assessment that the Marian’s marsh wren met criteria for listing and recommend listing the species as state threatened.

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

BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION


Taxonomic Classification – Marsh wrens (Cistothorus palustris) are in the Order Passeriformes assigned to the Family Trogloidyidae (Wrens). About 14 subspecies are recognized. Subspecies designation is complex, being based on plumage, wing length, and geographic lines. Two distinct evolutionary groups, eastern and western, may warrant species status (Kroodsma and Verner 1997). Two subspecies, the Marian’s marsh wren (C. p. marianae) and the Worthington’s marsh wren (C. p. griseus), breed in Florida. The Marian’s marsh wren was first described in 1888 (Scott 1888) as being darker with more olive color than brown, and having more barring on its plumage than other marsh wrens. Wheeler (1931) describes the taxonomic history and early distribution of marsh wrens in the Southeast.
**Population Status and Trend** – Difficulty in conducting surveys in relatively inaccessible salt marsh has limited monitoring, and historic information on abundance is sparse. Kale (1996) estimated 2,000-3,000 breeding pairs of Marian’s marsh wrens between Port Richey and Apalachee Bay. Distribution is sparse and little is known about the abundance of wrens west of Apalachee Bay. More recently, Marian’s marsh wrens (5-18, range of averages from 3 repeated measures) were detected at each of 5 transects between Dixie County (29.71365 - 83.49502) and Franklin County (29.68065, -85.08717) in 2010 (FWC, unpublished data). The FWC list of species of greatest conservation need (FWC 2005) ranks the abundance status of the Marian’s marsh wren as “low” with an “unknown” population trend. Although results are based on only 7 routes and may be imprecise for trend estimates, information from the North American Breeding Bird Survey (BBS 2010) indicate a -9.5 percent annual decline in the abundance of marsh wrens in the Southeastern coastal plain from 1966-2006. Marian’s marsh wrens are “abundant” in the coastal marshes of Alabama (Stevenson 1978). The Florida Natural Areas Inventory ranks the Marian’s marsh wren as rare and restricted in distribution globally and in Florida (G5T3/S3). The International Union for the Conservation of Nature (IUCN 2009) ranks the global status of marsh wrens as a species of Least Concern. An array of point count stations (see Ralph et al. 1995) should be established within the range of the Marian’s marsh wren and surveys conducted at 5-year intervals to monitor trends in abundance.

**Geographic Range and Distribution** – Marsh wrens breed in brackish and freshwater marshes of North America from the western and northern continental United States and southern Canada; along the Atlantic coast from Delaware to northern Florida; and along the Gulf coast from mid-peninsula Florida to southern Texas and into Mexico (Kroodsma and Verner 1997). The Marian’s marsh wren breeds along the Gulf coast of Florida from Port Richey (Pasco County) to Escambia Bay (Santa Rosa County), and west into southwest Alabama (Stevenson and Anderson 1994, Kale 1996). Distribution is sparse along the Florida panhandle west of Apalachee Bay (Wakulla County). Kroodsma and Verner (1997) considered *C. p. thryophilus* synonymous with *C. p. mariana*, extending the range of the Marian’s marsh wren to southeastern Texas. Several northern subspecies (*C. p. palustris, C. p. dissaeptus, C. p. waynei*, and *C. p. iliacus*) winter in Florida (Kale 1965, Stevenson and Anderson 1994, but see Phillips 1986). Marian’s marsh wrens inhabit tidal marshes dominated by cordgrass (*Spartina alterniflora*) and black needle rush (*Juncus roemerianus*) and nest in taller vegetation along tidal creeks. Florida land cover information (Water Management Districts, photography dates 1999-2008) indicates 566.0-701.0 km² of salt marsh habitat within the range of the Marian’s marsh wren. Cox and Kautz (2000) estimated 372.7 km² of existing potential habitat for the subspecies in Florida. The Florida Breeding Bird Atlas (FWC 2003, 1986-1991) documented confirmed breeding in 25 atlas blocks within the wren’s current range. The subspecies is resident at breeding locations and is considered non-migratory. The range of the Marian’s marsh wren extends into Alabama, with Florida constituting >80 percent of the subspecies’ range.

**Quantitative Analyses** – A population viability analysis has not been conducted on the Florida population of the Marian’s marsh wren.

**BIOLOGICAL STATUS ASSESSMENT**
**Threats** – The narrow coastal range of the Marian’s marsh wren makes it vulnerable to habitat loss and fragmentation due to dredging and filling in conjunction with coastal development, impoundments for mosquito control and waterfowl, flooding from severe storms and hydrological changes, sea level rise, chemical and oil spills, and disposal of dredged material (Montague and Wiegert 1990, FWC 2005). Development of adjacent uplands also may contribute to habitat degradation. The vulnerability of coastal song birds is exemplified by the rapid decline and extinction of the dusky seaside sparrow (*Ammodramus maritimus nigrescens*) Delany et al. (1981). Climate change is a potential threat at the southern extent of its range where salt marsh habitat may be lost to the invasion of mangroves as the climate warms. However, compared to *C. p. griseus* this subspecies appears to be more tolerant of the invasion of woody vegetation as long as a critical amount of grass and rush vegetation remains (Stevenson and Anderson 1994). Sea level rise also may lead to habitat loss for the Marian’s marsh wren in Florida (Walton 2007). However, responses of most species, especially short-lived species, to future climate change are not understood well enough to predict impacts (Akcakaya et al. 2006). The current condition of salt marsh habitats in Florida is considered “poor and declining” (FWC 2005), but strict regulatory mechanisms and public ownership provide some protection. High tides destroyed up to 21 percent of marsh wren nests during a four-year study in Georgia (Kale 1965), where rice rats (*Oryzomys palustris*), raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), and mink (*Mustela vison*) depredated up to 81 percent of nests. Nests sites also may be usurped by rice rats (Stevenson and Anderson 1994).

**Statewide Population Assessment** – The IUCN developed criteria for the evaluation of extinction risk for any taxon, with the exception of micro-organisms (IUCN 2010). Each taxon must be assessed against all criteria, but if the taxon meets any of the criteria under a particular category it qualifies as threatened. IUCN criteria use the terms observed, estimated, projected, inferred, and suspected to refer to the quality of information used to assess the status of a species. The assessment criteria can be applied at a regional (Florida) level with a consideration of the status and impact of extra-regional populations (IUCN 2003). Findings from the BRG are included in the Biological Status Review Information table below.

In our review of the status of the Marian’s marsh wren, the BRG made the following assumptions and conclusions:

1. Because the time estimated for 3 generations was <10 years, the IUCN criteria (2010) stipulation of 10 years was used in assessments.

2. The estimated number of mature individuals ranged from 2,000-3,000 pairs (Kale 1996).

3. The extent of occurrence was 566.0-701.0 km² based on the availability of salt marsh habitat within the range of the wren in Florida. Cox and Kautz (2000) estimated 372.7 km² of existing potential habitat for the subspecies in Florida.

4. Adult marsh wrens will disperse to locate suitable habitat (Kroodsma and Verner 1997). However, given the sparse distribution of Marian’s marsh wrens in the Florida panhandle a rescue effect from extra-regional populations in Alabama seems unlikely.
5. The condition of salt marsh habitat in Florida is considered to be “poor and declining” (FWC 2005).

LISTING RECOMMENDATION

Staff recommends that the Marian’s marsh wren be listed as a Threatened species because the subspecies meets criteria for listing as described in 68A-27.001(3) F.A.C.

SUMMARY OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW

To be added later.
LITERATURE CITED


**Biological Status Review Information**

**Findings**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Species/taxon:</th>
<th>Marian's Marsh Wren</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date:</td>
<td>11/04/10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor:</td>
<td>Michael Delany, Katy NeSmith, and Bill Pranty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Generation length:</td>
<td>Estimated &lt;3 years; IUCN 10-year period was used</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Criterion/Listing Measure**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<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, ANY of</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)1. 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 ceased¹</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)2. 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 reversible¹</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)3. 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)¹</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(a)4. 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 reversible¹</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ 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**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Data/Information</th>
<th>Data Type*</th>
<th>Criterion Met?</th>
<th>References</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(b)1. Extent of occurrence &lt; 20,000 km² (7,722 mi²) OR 566.0-701.0 km² of salt marsh within range.</td>
<td>E</td>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Northwest, Suwanee, and Southwest Florida Water Management Districts, photography dates 1999-2008</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(b)2. Area of occupancy $< 2,000 \text{ km}^2$ (772 \text{ mi}^2) AND at least 2 of the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td>Severely fragmented or exist in $\leq 10$ locations</td>
<td>Exists in $&lt;10$ locations that are threatened by single events such as a hurricane or oil/chemical spill.</td>
<td>I Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>(iii) Current condition of salt marsh in Florida is poor and declining</td>
<td>I Y</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td>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</td>
<td>unknown</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(C) Population Size and Trend

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(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</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)2. A continuing decline, observed, projected, or inferred in numbers of mature individuals AND at least one of the following:</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a. Population structure in the form of EITHER</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i) No subpopulation estimated to contain more than 1000 mature individuals; OR</td>
<td>&quot;Marsh wrens at Cedar Key probably number more than 1000 individuals&quot;</td>
<td>E N</td>
<td>M. V. McDonald pers. comm., 3 Nov 2010</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(ii) All mature individuals are in one subpopulation</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b. Extreme fluctuations in number of mature individuals</td>
<td>not available</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(D) Population Very Small or Restricted, EITHER

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Event</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Status</th>
<th>Notes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(d)1. Population estimated to number fewer than 1,000 mature individuals; OR</td>
<td>Marsh wrens in the Cedar Key area probably number more than 1000 individuals</td>
<td>E N</td>
<td>M. V. McDonald pers. comm., 3 Nov 2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
(d)2. Population with a very restricted area of occupancy (typically less than 20 km$^2$ [8 mi$^2$]) 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

| Exists in <10 locations that are prone to the effects of human activities or stochastic events within a short time period in an uncertain future | I | Y | FWC (2003) |

(E) Quantitative Analyses

e1. Showing the probability of extinction in the wild is at least 10% within 100 years

| not available | | | |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Initial 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>Meets at least one of the criteria</td>
<td>B1ab(iii); D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Is species/taxon endemic to Florida? (Y/N)</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>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.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<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>No change from initial finding</td>
<td>B1ab(iii); D2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Biological Status Review Information</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Regional Assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Assessors:</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Initial finding</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>10</td>
<td>2a. Is the species/taxon a non-breeding visitor? (Y/N/DK). If 2a is YES, go to line 18. If 2a is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 11.</td>
<td>N</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>2b. Does the Florida population experience any significant immigration of propagules capable of reproducing in Florida? (Y/N/DK). If 2b is YES, go to line 12. If 2b is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 17.</td>
<td>DK</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>2c. Is the immigration expected to decrease? (Y/N/DK). If 2c is YES or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 13. If 2c is NO go to line 16.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>2d. Is the regional population a sink? (Y/N/DK). If 2d is YES, go to line 14. If 2d is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 15.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>If 2d is YES - Upgrade from initial finding (more imperiled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>If 2d is NO or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>If 2c is NO or DO NOT KNOW - Downgrade from initial finding (less imperiled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>If 2b is NO or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>2e. Are the conditions outside Florida deteriorating? (Y/N/DK). If 2e is YES or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 24. If 2e is NO go to line 19.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>2f. Are the conditions within Florida deteriorating? (Y/N/DK). If 2f is YES or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 23. If 2f is NO, go to line 20.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>2g. Can the breeding population rescue the Florida population should it decline? (Y/N/DK). If 2g is YES, go to line 21. If 2g is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 22.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>If 2g is YES - Downgrade from initial finding (less imperiled)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>If 2g is NO or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>If 2f is YES or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>If 2e is YES or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>Final finding</td>
<td>No change from initial finding</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Appendix 1. Brief biographies of the members of the Marian’s Marsh Wren Biological Review Group.

**Michael F. Delany** (M.S., Wildlife Ecology, University of Maryland Appalachian Laboratory) is an Associate Research Scientist with the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC). He started work with the FWC in 1979 and is the Florida coordinator for the U.S. Geological Survey’s Breeding Bird Survey and the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service’s eastern painted bunting monitoring program. Mike is principal investigator for field studies of the endangered Florida grasshopper sparrow. Studies addressing management needs for grasshopper sparrows, dusky seaside sparrows, American alligators, and Northern bobwhite resulted in over 40 publications. He is a Certified Wildlife Biologist with the Wildlife Society.

**Katy NeSmith** (M.S., Biological Science, Florida State University) is a zoologist with the Florida Natural Areas Inventory (FNAI). Katy is responsible for collecting and processing rare animal occurrence data, concentrating on birds; conducting field surveys for rare animals (past surveys include seaside sparrow, marsh wren, limpkin, Florida scrub-jay, red-cockaded woodpecker, and gopher tortoise); and identifying, evaluating, and describing high priority natural areas in Florida. She has worked on county inventories and has been involved in several current and historic natural community mapping projects.

Appendix 2. Summary of letters and emails received during the solicitation of information from the public period of September 17, 2010 through November 1, 2010.

No information about this species was received during the public information request period.
Appendix 3. Information and Comments Received from Independent Reviewers.