

Stock Island tree snail
(*Orthalicus reses* (not including *nesodryas*))

5-Year Review:
Summary and Evaluation



U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
South Atlantic-Gulf Region
Florida Ecological Services Field Office
Vero Beach, Florida

5-YEAR REVIEW
Stock Island tree snail/*Orthalicus reses* (not including *nesodryas*)

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Methodology used to complete the review:

This update to the 2008 Stock Island tree snail (SITS) five-year review is based on new information gathered, compiled, and published since that last five-year review. The review was conducted by the lead recovery biologist with the Florida Ecological Services Field Office (FESFO), Vero Beach. Literature and documents used for this review are on file at the FESFO, Vero Beach. The public notice for this review was published on August 6, 2018, with a 60-day public comment period (83 FR 38320). No comments were received from the public. No part of the review was contracted to an outside party. The Service did not seek additional peer review for this updated 5-year review.

New information, updating the previous review, is provided in italics. Some portions of the previous review may now be outdated, no longer correct, or obsolete. While the older information remains in this version, the added text, in italics, clarifies the most recent published or known information related to the SITS' status and recovery.

*Photo descriptions from cover page: 1. Mature Stock Island tree snail observed in Key Largo, Florida, 2019; 2. Hatchling Stock Island tree snail observed in Key Largo, Florida, 2019; 3. New Guinea flatworm (NGF) found inside *Liguus* sp. tree snail in Castellow Hammock Preserve, Miami, Florida, 2015; 4. NGF; 5. NGF consuming *Eobania vermiculata*, during a lab experiment.*

B. Reviewers

Lead Region: South Atlantic-Gulf Region, Carrie Straight, 404-679-7226,
Carrie_Straight@fws.gov

Lead Field Office: FESFO, Shawn Christopherson, 772-562-3909,
Shawn_Christopherson@fws.gov

C. Background

1. Federal Register Notice citation announcing initiation of this review:

2008: 73 FR 20702 (April 16, 2008)

2018: 83 FR 38320 (August 6, 2018)

2. Listing history

Original Listing

FR notice: 43 FR 28932

Date listed: July 3, 1978

Entity listed: Subspecies

Classification: Threatened

3. Associated rulemakings: N/A

4. Review:

Each year, the Service reviews and updates listed species information to benefit the required Recovery Report to Congress. Through 2013, we performed a yearly recovery data call. The last review conducted in 2008 showed this species' status as uncertain with no change recommended to the species' listing status.

Previous 5-year reviews: 2009

Recovery Plan: 1999

5. Species' Recovery Priority Number at start of review (48 FR 43098): 3. A recovery priority of "3" indicates this is a subspecies with a high degree of threat, a high level of taxonomic distinctiveness, and high recovery potential.

6. Recovery Plan

Name of plan: South Florida Multi-Species Recovery Plan (MSRP) (Service 1999)

Date issued: May 18, 1999

II. REVIEW ANALYSIS

A. Application of the 1996 Distinct Population Segment (DPS) policy

- 1. Is the species under review listed as a DPS?** No.
- 2. Is there relevant new information that would lead you to consider listing this species as a DPS in accordance with the 1996 policy?** No.

B. Recovery Criteria

- 1. Does the species have a final, approved recovery plan containing objective, measurable criteria?** *Yes.*
- 2. Adequacy of recovery criteria.**
 - a. Do the recovery criteria reflect the best available and most up-to-date information on the biology of the species and its habitat?** *No. The criteria do not reflect the best available and most up-to-date information on the biology of the species because they treat the Lower Keys as the only area to conduct reintroductions and otherwise achieve recovery for SITS. Only one Lower Keys site (No Name Key) was known to be occupied by a persistent population at the time of the last review, while more populations and larger numbers of SITS occur at various sites in the Upper Keys. In September 2017, Hurricane Irma made landfall as a Category 4 on Cudjoe Key, approximately 12 miles from the population in the Lower Keys. This large and powerful storm impacted the tropical hardwood hammock through its storm surge and by de-leafing and knocking down trees. The Service is unaware of any*

surveys that have been conducted to determine the impacts to this population since the storm. However, informal observations have been reported and suggest the population is still extant. The populations in the Upper Keys remain extant today.

While the minimal hammock size needed to support a viable population of tree snails is unknown, the hammock that remains in the historical range for SITS (Stock Island and Key West) tends to be small in size and low in quality. Suitable habitat would have to include an area large enough to provide for foraging and nesting requirements, as well as provide for the microclimate (air temperature and humidity) needed by the SITS (Service 1999). Therefore, further assessment is needed to determine if the available hammock in the SITS' historical range, and throughout the rest of the Lower Keys, is suitable to support persistent populations to meet the current recovery criteria.

Accordingly, the criteria do not reflect the best available and most up-to-date information on the biology of the species because they treat the Lower Keys as the only area to conduct reintroductions and otherwise achieve recovery for SITS. Moreover, potential threats in addition to habitat loss have emerged, and these are not adequately addressed in the recovery criteria.

- b. Are all of the 5 listing factors that are relevant to the species addressed in the recovery criteria (and is there no new information to consider regarding existing or new threats)?** *Yes, however additional potential threats have emerged that are not adequately addressed. For example, the New Guinea flatworm (NGF), an invasive, predatory, terrestrial flatworm has been observed throughout the SITS' current range (see C.2.c.) and is a potentially serious concern for the SITS and other native snails of Florida. While we do not have documented predation of SITS by NGF, we do have direct observations of NGF preying on Liguus snails, and perhaps other Orthalicus sp. (both species share the same habitat/locations with SITS). In addition, NGF is not a discriminatory predator, especially among snails. Therefore, NGF may be a potential predator of SITS. Further assessment is needed to understand the potential threat and population-level effects of this new invasive predator on SITS.*
- 3. List the recovery criteria as they appear in the recovery plan and discuss how each criterion has or has not been met, citing information. For threats-related recovery criteria, please note which of the five listing factors are addressed by that criterion. If any of the five listing factors are not relevant to this species, please note that here.** *The recovery criteria, as presented in the 1999 recovery plan (Service 1999), are listed in bold below and address all five listing factors: A) the present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range; B) over-utilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes; C) disease or predation; D)*

inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms; and E) other natural or manmade factors affecting its survival.

The criteria included in the approved recovery plan (Service 1999) to delist SITS are:

[1] Further loss, fragmentation, or degradation of suitable, occupied habitat in the Lower Keys has been prevented;

Although reduced, habitat loss and degradation continue. Progress has been made in managing, restoring, and rehabilitating potential habitat, but this has not been fully accomplished. In the Lower Keys, the No Name Key population is the only one that persists and generally appears to be viable. However, demographic data are lacking.

In February 2013, Florida Keys Electric Cooperative Association, Inc. (FKECA) crewmembers collected 119 SITS from trees being trimmed back during right-of-way maintenance for roads and electric/communication lines in Key Largo. However, only 42 SITS could be relocated to adjacent habitat due to its limited size. Therefore, under the direction of the Service, FKECA relocated 77 SITS to the Key West Tropical Forest and Botanical Garden. While formal surveys need to be conducted to determine the status of these SITS relocations, there were no observations of SITS during recent informal inspections (July 2019) of hardwood hammocks on Key West and Stock Island, further supporting the presumption that SITS has been extirpated from these Keys.

No new data are available to determine the status of the known populations in the Lower Keys, or throughout the SITS' current range, and no additional populations have been discovered or established. Therefore, this criterion, which addresses factors A and E, has not been met.

[2] Occupied habitat on priority acquisition lists for the Lower Keys is protected either through land acquisition or cooperative agreements;

The State's Florida Forever program continues to acquire land for conservation purposes within the range of SITS in both the Lower and Upper Keys. In the Lower Keys, the program includes the Coupon Bight / Key Deer and the Florida Keys Ecosystem projects. Together, considering all habitat types, the Coupon Bight / Key Deer and Florida Keys Ecosystem projects include approximately 6,370 ha (15,743 acres) targeted for acquisition by willing sellers (Florida Department of Environmental Protection (FDEP) 2020). Through 2019, about 3,632 ha (8,974 acres) (57 percent) of this target has been acquired.

In the Upper Keys, areas targeted in the Florida Forever Project's North Key Largo Hammocks accession area encompass the entire remaining privately owned SITS habitat (hardwood hammock) in north Key Largo. In 2012, this area was removed

from the priority list by the council because over 90 percent of the property area had been purchased. No additional lands may be added to the accession area boundary after being removed from the priority list. However, lands located within the boundary area at the time of removal from the priority list may still be acquired as part of the Florida Forever program (Allen, pers. comm. 2019). As of 2012, 1,679 ha (4,148 acres) out of 2,028 ha (5,012 acres) (82.8 percent) had been acquired, leaving about 350 ha (864 acres) to be acquired (Butler, pers. comm. 2019).

Therefore, this criterion, which addresses factor A, D, and E, has not been met.

[3] Potential habitat on these protected lands is managed, restored, or rehabilitated to provide habitat for the SITS;

Restoration and management of what habitat remains will provide the greatest benefit to hardwood hammock species, including SITS. Several habitat restoration projects have occurred within SITS habitat in the Upper Keys. Projects have included the restoration (i.e., filling in of) the Carysfort Marina (22 acres) and the Keystone (quarry) pit (2 acres); the removal of debris piles at the former Nike Missile Site (1 acre); and the removal of old buildings, roads, and infrastructure at the abandoned Port Bougainville site (32 acres). Native vegetation has been planted in these disturbed areas, which speeds the recovery of these areas back into tropical hammock habitat. As of 2018, hardwood hammock vegetation appeared to have taken hold within these restoration areas.

Conservation areas that retain suitable SITS habitat within the subspecies' current range will continually need to be evaluated to make sure each has a management plan that addresses recreation, invasive species control, pesticide use, and public education to achieve this delisting criterion.

While progress has been made in restoring and managing SITS habitat, additional habitat restoration and management is needed. Therefore, this criterion, which addresses all five listing factors, has not been met.

[4] Four stable populations of the SITS are established throughout the Lower Keys. These populations will be considered demographically stable when they exhibit a stable age structure, have a rate of increase (r) equal to or greater than 0.0 as a 3-year running average for 14 years, and have at least a 95 percent probability of persistence for 100 years.

As discussed above in criterion 1, no new data are available to determine the status of the known populations in the Lower Keys, or throughout its current range, and no additional populations have been discovered or established. In September 2017, Hurricane Irma made landfall as a Category 4 on Cudjoe Key, approximately 12 miles from the only known site occupied by a self-sustaining population in the Lower Keys. This large and powerful storm impacted the tropical hardwood hammock through its storm surge and by de-leafing and knocking down trees. However, we are

not aware of any surveys that have been conducted to determine the impacts to this population since the storm. Informal observations have been reported and suggest the population is still extant. Formal, large-scale surveys are needed to determine the status of SITS populations throughout its range. Additionally, there were no observations of SITS during recent inspections of hardwood hammock on Key West and Stock Island further supporting the presumption that SITS has been extirpated from these Keys. Therefore, this criterion, which addresses factors A and E, has not been met.

C. Updated Information and Current Species Status

1. Biology and Habitat

a. Abundance, population trends (e.g., increasing, decreasing, stable), demographic features (e.g., age structure, sex ratio, family size, birth rate, age at mortality, mortality rate), or demographic trends: SITS abundance and range declined throughout the 20th century (Service 1999). Limited information on SITS demographics is available, and little additional data exist since the MSRP was published (Service 1999). Few additional data are available on SITS abundance or population trends since the publication of the MSRP. Rigorous estimates of SITS numbers are not known for any population. SITS status is currently assessed by the numbers of discrete populations that are known. Accordingly, potential trend information only includes observations of whether various populations continue to persist. However, for most populations, even the area occupied is poorly defined. As of 2006, a tabulation of all well-known and poorly documented sites indicated that SITS occupied approximately 25 sites in the Florida Keys (Monroe County) and two sites on the mainland (Miami-Dade County) (Service 2006a). However, for many of those sites, even confirmation as to whether SITS persists in recent years is lacking. Survey and monitoring efforts have been limited and highly variable, and methodologies are usually not reported in detail. Whereas SITS occupies more sites at present than in the recorded past, the total area occupied remains unknown, as are trends in abundance and demographics. Overall, however, the SITS population status appears to be more secure than when it was listed, due to the widespread translocations that occurred subsequently (Service 1999, 2006a).

SITS no longer occupies the Key West Tropical Forest and Botanical Garden (KWTFBG) (discussed below). In contrast, many populations exist on Key Largo, well beyond SITS historic range, as a result of relocations by snail collectors (Service 1999, 2006a). The majority of relocations occurred by the late 1990s. These were largely carried out by private hobbyists who sought to thwart extinction. However, these actions were poorly documented and subsequently poorly monitored. One clear trend is that Key Largo has accumulated more populations than the Lower Keys.

SITS has two congeners (i.e., same genus) in the Florida Keys, the banded tree snail (*O. floridensis*) and the Florida Keys tree snail. Little information is available regarding the status of these taxa. However, Emmel and Perry (2004) believed there to be shifts in the relative abundances of the three *Orthalicus* taxa in the Keys. In the past, the banded tree snail was the most common and widespread of the three, whereas subsequent to 2000, Emmel and Perry (2004) considered the banded tree snail to be the rarest. This situation results partly from the translocations that bolstered SITS distribution and allowed them to avoid extinction, but probably also reflects actual declines in banded tree snail populations over time. SITS now occur in sympatry with their congeners in several locations (Emmel and Perry 2004). The observations of Emmel and Perry (2004) suggested that translocated SITS, all of which are outside the historic range, perform as well or better than congeners in those places where they overlap.

There is no new information since the 2008 status review.

b. Genetics, genetic variation, or trends in genetic variation (e.g., loss of genetic variation, genetic drift, inbreeding): *Orthalicus* is comprised of three recognized taxa in Florida—SITS, Florida Keys tree snail, and banded tree snail—all of which currently overlap in portions of the Keys and Miami-Dade County. Emmel and Perry (2004) sequenced 681, 452, and 683 base pairs in the cytochrome oxidase, 16S ribosomal RNA, and Internal Transcribed Spacer regions, respectively. The 16S ribosomal subunit is typically found to exhibit variation at the species level in a wide variety of organisms. Overall, however, the only marker found to exhibit variation among the *Orthalicus* taxa was the cytochrome oxidase region, which varied at only two positions. Both *Liguus* and *Orthalicus* taxa exhibit substantial morphological differences. Other researchers had found little genetic variation among populations of *Liguus fasciatus* despite the extreme color polymorphisms in this snail, which exhibit partial self-fertilization (Hillis et al. 1987, 1991; Hillis 1989 as cited in Emmel and Perry 2004). However, Emmel and Perry (2004) found a lack of variation more surprising in congeneric *Orthalicus*, which like most pulmonate land snails are hermaphroditic and obligate outcrossing species (reproduce through sexual matings).

Emmel and Perry (2004) considered the findings to be consistent with either of two explanations, neither of which could be confirmed from the available data. One explanation is that there has been recent gene flow among taxa, and the other is that divergence was so recent that sufficient time has not elapsed for the taxa to accumulate mutations. Emmel and Perry (2004) asserted that the taxa “should continue to be considered as independent units for management purposes.”

The results of Emmel and Perry (2004) suggested that the taxa are morphological variants as opposed to subspecies. However, additional studies should be conducted to confirm this. For example, sample sizes were very small. From a total of 47 specimens for all three taxa, cytochrome oxidase, 16S ribosomal RNA, and Internal Transcribed Spacer region sequences for 6, 46, and 4 samples, respectively, were reported (Emmel and Perry 2004). Additionally, Emmel and Perry (2004) noted that an “extremely small percentage of the overall genome of these organisms has been sequenced” and may be a potentially confounding factor (Emmel and Perry 2004). However, the gene fragments used in this analysis are normally capable of delineating differences among species in a wide range of organisms including land snails, and Emmel and Perry (2004) considered it “very likely that these taxa are indeed much more closely related than has previously been suspected.”

At field sites that were occupied by more than one taxon (e.g., Monkey Jungle, Miami-Dade County), observations suggested that the different taxa did not interbreed despite close contact (Emmel and Perry 2004). As noted above, morphological distinctiveness is evident. However, assortive mating has not been confirmed, mating experiments have not been conducted, and genes responsible for color traits and the heritability of polymorphisms have not been identified. Accordingly, relatedness among individuals within an area of sympatry, even individuals presenting color variation, cannot be inferred with certainty based on visual observations at present.

There is no new information since the 2008 status review.

c. Taxonomic classification or changes in nomenclature: *SITS* was originally listed as *Orthalicus reses*. However, *O. reses* is comprised of two recognized taxa, *O. reses reses* (*SITS*) and *O. reses nesodryas* (*Florida Keys tree snail*) (*Integrated Taxonomic Information System 2021*). Accordingly, *Orthalicus reses* (not including *nesodryas*) equates to the recognized taxon, *O. reses reses*. As of 2021, the *Integrated Taxonomic Information System* continues to recognize *SITS* as a valid subspecies, *O. reses reses*. However, Emmel and Perry (2004) recommended that if the two *O. reses* subspecies prove to be as genetically invariant as was observed in their study, the groups should be considered a single taxon or taxonomic unit. In that case, the nominate form, *O. reses reses*, would prevail and *O. reses nesodryas* would become a synonym instead of a valid subspecies.

d. Spatial distribution, trends in spatial distribution (e.g., increasingly fragmented, increased numbers of corridors), or historic range (e.g., corrections to the historical range, change in distribution of the species' within its historic range): *SITS* was originally restricted to the far west end of the Keys, on Stock Island and Key West. It remains unknown whether the Key West Golf Course retains any habitat that is suitable. KWTFBG encompasses and protects a remnant of the original hardwood hammock to

which SITS is endemic. However, SITS currently appear to be extirpated there and elsewhere on Stock Island. Currently, only one Lower Keys site is occupied by a self-sustaining population, whereas more populations and larger numbers of SITS occur in Upper Keys sites. In the Lower Keys, indigenous and introduced SITS have occupied Key West (urban settings), Stock Island (KWTFBG, Key West Golf Course), Big Pine Key (Watson Hammock), No Name Key (Service 1999), and Weapons Hammock (Naval Air Station Key West, Boca Chica Key). In the Lower Keys, the population on No Name Key is the only one that persists in natural surroundings and based on persistence in the absence of direct intervention such as augmentations, generally appears to be viable. The historical SITS introduction sites on Big Pine Key and No Name Key are ensconced within the NKDR, with Watson Hammock designated as an inviolate area (closed to the public year-round). These habitats are protected and managed by the Service. There is no additional information on urban Key West sites, which have historically been tenuous for SITS, or the Weapons Hammock site. Other than sites within urban Key West, previously and currently occupied habitats in the Lower Keys are owned by the City of Key West (KWTFBG), Service (NKDR), and Navy (Naval Air Station Key West). Acquisition of hardwood hammock parcels by Monroe County, the State of Florida, and the Service, both within and adjacent to the administrative boundaries of NKDR, has advanced substantially (see Section 2.a. below).

In September 2017, Hurricane Irma made landfall as a Category 4 on Cudjoe Key, approximately 12 miles from the only known site occupied by a self-sustaining population in the Lower Keys. This large and powerful storm impacted the tropical hardwood hammock through its storm surge and by de-leafing and knocking down trees. However, we are not aware of any surveys that have been conducted to determine the impacts to this population since the storm. Informal observations have been reported and suggest the population is still extant.

e. Habitat or ecosystem conditions (e.g., amount, distribution, and suitability of the habitat or ecosystem): In many portions of the SITS range, habitats that are either suitable or occupied are only loosely delineated on maps, otherwise quantified, or monitored. SITS occupy tropical hardwood hammock communities and ecotones on private and public lands in Monroe and Miami-Dade counties. The extent, distribution, and suitability of the habitat and ecosystem components have not been fully described or monitored. We have no new data on the relationships between tree species composition or forest stand structure and food availability or fitness, nor information on trends in any of these factors. There are no new data that describe particular aspects of hardwood hammock with respect to SITS selection, preference, or fitness. Overall, important habitat components for SITS are not fully identified and understood. Accordingly, the extent of suitable habitat is only loosely delineated (as hardwood hammock in general).

In most areas, the extent of occupied area, and the acreage of hardwood hammock itself, is poorly delineated. However, SITS occupy hardwood hammocks with a range of characteristics, and the status and trends of hardwood hammock in general remains a reasonable proxy for the status and trends of SITS habitat.

As of 2006, there was a total of approximately 3,371 hectares (ha) (8,327 acres) of potential SITS habitat in Monroe County. Of those, approximately 2,419 ha (5,976 acres) were located on conservation lands not subject to development (Service 2006a). The area of potential SITS habitat in Miami-Dade County is unknown. On public conservation lands occupied by SITS, habitat conditions have generally improved due to ongoing acquisitions (i.e., increased habitat continuity) and the various management efforts carried out on such properties (e.g., invasive exotic plant [IEP] control, restoration projects). Regulatory constraints have substantially reduced the occurrence of hammock destruction for development projects. However, in both the Lower and Upper Keys, further fragmentation and loss of privately owned hammock occurs following the issuance of limited building permits by Monroe County.

Several habitat restoration projects have occurred within SITS habitat in the Upper Keys. Projects have included the restoration (filling in of) the Carysfort Marina (22 acres) and the Keystone (quarry) pit (2 acres); the removal of debris piles at the former Nike Missile Site (1 acre); and the removal of old buildings, roads, and infrastructure at the abandoned Port Bougainville site (32 acres). Native vegetation has been planted in these disturbed areas, which speeds the recovery of these areas back into tropical hammock habitat. As of 2018, hardwood hammock vegetation appeared to have taken hold within these restoration areas.

f. Other: None.

2. Five-Factor Analysis

a. Present or threatened destruction, modification or curtailment of its habitat or range:

Development—As a result of natural occurrences and introductions, the previous range of the SITS included natural and developed areas on Stock Island (KWTFBG, Key West Golf Course, Key West), Key Largo DJKLBSP, CLNWR, John Pennekamp Coral Reef State Park, Curry Tract of Florida Keys Wildlife and Environmental Area, Key Largo Subdivisions, Calusa Cove Campground), Lower Matecumbe Key (Klopp Tract of Florida Keys Wildlife and Environmental Area, Lignumvitae Key Botanical State Park), Miami (Monkey Jungle), Weapons Hammock (Naval Air Station Key West), Everglades National Park, and Big Cypress National Preserve. The largest land management units with persistent SITS populations are DJKLBSP and CLNWR, which encompass approximately 2,316 acres (937 ha) and 6,050

acres (2,448 ha), respectively, excluding open water.

The SITS current range consists of disjunct populations, concentrated on No Name Key in the Lower Keys and Key Largo in the Upper Keys. Past habitat destruction and fragmentation eliminated some habitat patches and may have caused others to be too small to support persistent SITS populations (Service 1999, 2006a). In the last 20 years, loss or fragmentation of SITS habitat due to development has been greatly slowed. Extensive land acquisitions and regulations such as Monroe County's Rate of Growth Ordinance (ROGO) have contributed substantially to this outcome. Additionally, the State's Florida Forever program continues to acquire land for conservation purposes within the range of SITS in both the Lower and Upper Keys.

Florida Forever is administered by FDEP on behalf of the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund (Trustees). Fee-simple title for purchased lands resides with the Trustees. In the Lower Keys, the program includes the Coupon Bight / Key Deer and the Florida Keys Ecosystem projects. These projects seek to protect the remaining undeveloped land, including virtually all natural hammock throughout identified project areas. Together, considering all habitat types, the Coupon Bight / Key Deer and Florida Keys Ecosystem projects include approximately 5,942 ha (14,684 acres) targeted for acquisition by willing sellers (FDEP 2006). Of this target, about 2,793 ha (6,901 acres) had been acquired as of 2005. The full complement of acquisitions, if realized, could encompass much of the remaining undeveloped habitat on private and county land. These efforts consolidate habitat and expand potential corridors and allow for management over a larger portion of the landscape. Accordingly, these acquisitions should benefit SITS indirectly by reducing the expansion and overall impact of secondary threats from development.

Together, considering all habitat types, the Coupon Bight / Key Deer and Florida Keys Ecosystem projects include approximately 6,370 ha (15,743 acres) targeted for acquisition by willing sellers (FDEP 2020). Through 2019, about 3,632 ha (8,974 acres) (57 percent) of this target has been acquired.

In the Upper Keys, areas targeted in the Florida Forever Project's North Key Largo Hammocks accession area encompass the entire remaining privately owned SITS habitat (hardwood hammock) in north Key Largo. As of February 2008, 1,604 ha (3,964 acres) out of 1,870 ha (4,621 acres) had been acquired, leaving about 266 ha (657 acres) to be acquired (FDEP 2008). Most of those acquisitions included hardwood hammock. CLNWR and DJKLBSP manage those lands acquired on north Key Largo. In the rest of the Upper Keys (below north Key Largo), potential SITS habitat in private ownership remains at risk of being developed. Miami-Dade County has far less natural areas, except for portions of Everglades National Park that occur in the

county. Remaining habitat fragments in Miami-Dade outside of the Park include public and private parcels (proportions unknown), the latter being susceptible to development. Overall, both the magnitude and imminence of this threat are moderate.

In 2012, the Florida Forever Project's North Key Largo Hammocks accession area, which encompassed the entire remaining privately owned SITS habitat (hardwood hammock) in north Key Largo, was removed from the priority list by the council because over 90 percent of the property area had been purchased. No additional lands may be added to the accession area boundary after being removed from the priority list. However, lands located within the boundary area at the time of removal from the priority list may still be acquired as part of the Florida Forever program (Allen, pers. comm. 2019). As of 2012, 1,679 ha (4,148 acres) out of 2,028 ha (5,012 acres) had been acquired, leaving about 350 ha (864 acres) to be acquired (Butler, pers. comm. 2019).

The amount and variety of potential resource damage is reduced by closures of sensitive areas that occur on KWTFBG and various State and Federal conservation lands and State and Federal law enforcement officer patrol of public lands throughout the range of SITS. The KWTFBG has increasingly pursued and attained active protection, management, and restoration of the original hammock and adjacent areas (Service 1999, Keys Environmental Restoration Fund [KERF] 2006). Accordingly, the site's suitability for SITS reintroductions has increased substantially. SITS sites on Service properties (NKDR and CLNWR) are strictly managed for the protection of SITS and other listed species. However, specific knowledge about how to best manage such protected habitats for SITS is limited and management is essentially passive in that regard. On protected lands on Key Largo, approximately 65 percent of hardwood hammocks and acquired areas that were hardwood hammock prior to historical disturbances have been restored or rehabilitated. Details regarding these rehabilitated areas are provided in KERF (2006) and Service (2006b). Where restoration or rehabilitation occurs, IEP control is a routine component of efforts.

While habitat loss has been reduced, remaining hardwood hammocks for acquisition or substantial range expansion of extant SITS populations are limited. Therefore, restoration and management of what habitat remains will provide the greatest benefit to hardwood hammock species including SITS. As discussed above (section C.1.e.), several habitat restoration projects have occurred or are ongoing within SITS habitat in the Upper Keys designed to enhance the quality, abundance, and connectivity of hardwood hammock vegetation for use by the subspecies.

IEPs—IEPs supplant the native flora on which SITS reside. Significant resources have been applied to IEP control in the Keys. Active management,

restoration, and rehabilitation (including IEP control) occurs on KWTFBG as well as State and Federal conservation lands in the Lower and Upper Keys (KERF 2006, Service 2006b, FDEP 2008). The Service and State, with assistance of the Florida Keys Invasive Exotics Task Force, carry out IEP control programs throughout CLNWR, NKDR, and State lands. Consistent records of control efforts and outcomes have not been produced for each of the IEP species. Accordingly, available data do not allow for quantifying acreages of IEP-infected areas or that of areas that have been treated, and specific risk or cost trajectories cannot be projected. However, undisturbed hardwood hammock has relatively limited susceptibility to current IEP threats. IEPs currently do not appear to be an imminent threat, and the magnitude of this threat to the SITS is low.

As discussed above, habitat restoration projects designed to remove IEPs within CLNWR and DJKLBSP are ongoing. To date, these ongoing efforts have removed 10 acres of IEPs from SITS habitat.

b. Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes: Extensive SITS poaching occurred in the past and remains a potentially significant threat (Service 1999). Some SITS populations occur on protected Federal and State lands, which may help protect it from collectors. However, patrols by law enforcement personnel are limited and variable, and those populations not on public lands are particularly vulnerable in this regard. The potential for unauthorized or illegal collection of SITS exists despite Federal and State provisions for protection. Individual populations are localized, and many lie close to road access points. We do not have evidence of recent collection of SITS, nor of further relocations by enthusiasts. We do not have any information to conclude that the species is currently threatened by overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes at this time.

There is no new information since the 2008 status review.

c. Disease or predation: Disease is not known to be a threat in the wild. Predation is a natural part of the species' life history, but impacts are more devastating when habitat composition and native and non-native predator abundance and composition patterns are altered. Historical studies indicate that substantial predation on SITS may occur and may vary significantly according to location. Deisler (1987) concluded that predation by "vertebrates and invertebrates must be a very important factor in controlling populations of *Orthalicus*" (including SITS). More recent studies focusing on the red imported fire ant (*Solenopsis invicta*), a non-native species, suggest the same patterns (Wojcik et al. 2001, Forsys et al. 2001a, 2002; Forsys and Allen 2005).

Forsys et al. (2001a) used Florida tree snails (*Liguus fasciatus*) as a surrogate for SITS to assess vulnerability to fire ant predation. In laboratory trials, 19

out of 22 tree snails were killed by the fire ants within 3 days, some while foraging and others while aestivating. Forys et al. (2001a) argued that the likely cause of the 1992 SITS extirpation on Stock Island (KWTFBG and vicinity) was fire ant predation. Fire ants were first recorded in Monroe County and Stock Island in the 1970s and 1980s, respectively. Forys et al. (2001a) summarized the SITS decline on Stock Island and concluded that the fastest and terminal phase of the decline occurred after the advent of fire ants.

Forys et al. (2001b) concluded that “habitat restoration that decreases red imported fire ant abundance may be the most cost effective and long-term method of decreasing impacts from red imported fire ants.” They suggested that “the removal and restoration of abandoned roads and access paths, and limiting disturbance of road shoulders, will probably lower fire ant populations in the area.” Fire ants were found to be abundant in the protected hammocks on north Key Largo where translocated SITS occur (Forys et al. 2001b).

Forys and Allen (2005) reported on the entire assemblage of ants detected on bait transects. They found “the native ant fauna of the Florida Keys does not appear to be dramatically influenced by sprawl, however, if development increases, the number of non-native ants may increase, and many of these species have been documented as decreasing native ant diversity. If development plateaus, there is evidence that the native ant fauna could persist and could decrease non-native species richness through competition or predation” (Forys and Allen 2005). Accordingly, precluding or reversing the effects of disturbance may not only help to protect SITS from fire ants, but may also preclude the advent of additional non-native species and help to restore ant community composition.

At CLNWR, the Service acquires in-holdings, restores and protects habitat from disturbances that may facilitate fire ants, and treats 9 miles of County Road 905 twice per year using long-lasting broadcast baits (Service 2006b). The Service plans to expand effectiveness monitoring and control efforts to the Port Bougainville, Keystone/Whiskey Bottle area, county auto salvage, and Nike missile sites, as appropriate.

Overall, the magnitude and imminence of predation threats due to fire ants appear to remain moderate.

Other known invertebrate predators of *Orthalicus* in Florida include the rosy wolf snail (*Euglandina rosea*) and click beetle (*Aleus* sp.) larva (Voss 1976, Deisler 1987, Forys et al. 2001a). Forys et al. (2001a) asserted that, unlike fire ants, these other invertebrate predators are not known to increase in fragmented or disturbed habitats. Voss (1976) indicated that certain crabs may prey on Florida tree snails. Deisler (1987) outlined a variety of additional, potential invertebrate predators and parasites of *Orthalicus*. The

imminence and magnitudes of threats from these predators remains unknown. None of these predators are known to be a substantial threat to SITS at present.

The NGF is an invasive, predatory, terrestrial flatworm and a potentially serious concern for the SITS and other native snails of Florida. It is the only flatworm listed in the “100 world’s worst invasive alien species” (Lowe et al. 2000) and researchers consider it to be the cause for rapid decline or extinction of endemic snail species wherever it has been introduced (Hopper and Smith 1992, Ohbayashi et al. 2005, Ohbayashi et al. 2007, Sugiura and Okochi 2006, Régnier et al. 2009, Sugira and Yamaura 2009, Chiba 2010, Iwai et al. 2010, Justine et al. 2014, Justine et al. 2015, Sugiura 2016).

Generally, the NGF can be found in potted plants, under rocks, and in leaf litter and other substrates in moist, dark areas in both undisturbed forest and disturbed habitats in tropical and sub-tropical climates (Okochi et al. 2004, Sugiura 2009, Winsor et al. 2004). The NGF prefers moist, humid conditions and is unable to survive in completely dry habitats (Kaneda et al. 1990, Sugiura 2009, Justine et al. 2014). NGF are mostly nocturnal and may be observed climbing up trees and walls after a heavy rainfall (Hopper and Smith 1992, Sugiura and Yamaura 2009).

The NGF is a predator of various soil invertebrates, such as earthworms, land snails, slugs, and arthropods (Ogren 1995, Winsor et al. 2004, Ohbayashi et al. 2005, Sugiura 2009) with a preference for live snails (Sugiura 2010). The NGF locates its prey by following chemical cues in mucus trails (Ogren 1995, Sugiura 2009, Sugiura and Yamaura 2009, Iwai, et al. 2010, Iwai, et al. 2010b, Gerlach 2019). The ability of NGF’s to track prey by following mucus trails is limited by temperature, humidity, and age (up to 15 hours in a moisture-saturated environment) of mucus trail (Gerlach 2019). SITS are entirely arboreal except when they move to the forest floor for nesting or traveling. While this would potentially limit the times SITS and other tree snails are exposed to the threat from NGF, NGFs have the ability to climb trees to pursue prey (Hopper and Smith 1992, Sugiura and Yamaura 2009). Additionally, SITS mate and nest in late summer and early fall during the wettest part of the rainy season, and the eggs hatch during the onset of the rains the following spring, both events are times when NGF’s would also be most active. Those species of arboreal snails, such as SITS, that descend from and move among trees may leave trails (i.e., chemical cues) for NGF to follow up tree trunks. Sugiura and Yamaura (2009) examined the effects of NGF on arboreal snails and found that the NGF is highly effective at locating its prey using chemical cues and was frequently observed feeding on tree snails as high as 2 meters up a tree, providing further evidence that it is an effective predator and potentially a serious threat to both terrestrial and arboreal snails.

*The NGF has been introduced into several countries for use as a biological control agent for giant African land snail (*Achatina fulica*; Muniappan 1987, Muniappan 1989, Hopper and Smith 1992, Eldredge & Smith 1995, Ohbayashi et al. 2005, Winsor et al. 2004, Sugiura et al. 2006). However, the introduction of NGF has had a negative impact on endemic land snail fauna and should be considered a serious concern in the conservation of native endemic snails everywhere the NGF has been introduced outside of its natural range (Hopper and Smith 1992, Okochi et al. 2004, Ohbayashi et al. 2005, Sugiura and Okochi 2006, Ohbayashi et al. 2007, Sugiura 2009, Sugira and Yamaura 2009, Régnier et al. 2009, Chiba 2010, Iwai et al. 2010, Justine et al. 2014, Justine et al. 2015, Sugiura 2016). In addition to natural spread, commercial trade can also unintentionally introduce foreign soil animals, such as the NGF (Sugiura 2009). Translocation via contaminated equipment, the movement of ornamental plants, potted plants, and other materials with soil can transfer NGF to new areas (Okochi et al. 2004, Sugiura and Okochi 2006, Sugiura 2009, Justine et al. 2014, Justine et al. 2015).*

Since first being reported by members of the Giant African Snail Eradication Program in Miami, Florida on August 2012 (Justine et al. 2015), there has been an increase in observations of the invasive NGF throughout the SITS' current range. As of December 2020, there have been more than 1,500 verified observations of the predatory flatworm in 44 Florida counties (EDDMapS 2021). Of these reported observations, 119 have been in Miami-Dade County and 20 have been in Monroe County, the two counties in which SITS is found. While it is unknown how this flatworm made its way into Florida, its tolerance for warmer temperate zones increases their ability to spread throughout the southern continental USA, thus raising additional concerns (Justine et al. 2015). Observations in Alabama and Puerto Rico have been reported in August 2017 and December 2014, respectively (Justine et al. 2015, EDDMapS 2021). In October 2018, the Texas Invasive Species Institute (TISI) confirmed specimens collected at Lamar State College campus to be NGF (TISI 2019). TISI is actively collecting and testing for NGF, as additional observations have been reported in other locations within Texas (TISI 2019).

*NGF is known to be a paratenic (intermediate) host of the rat lungworm (*Angiostrongylus cantonensis*; Asato et al. 2004). NGF feed on snails, which are often the intermediate hosts of the rat lungworm, thereby aiding in the spread of the nematode parasite, increasing an animal's or human's ability to encounter the *Angiostrongylus* parasite. There have been 12 confirmed cases of angiostrongyliasis in the continental United States between January 2011 and January 2017 (Liu et al. 2018). Of these, five cases (four in Texas and one in Alabama – where NGF has been confirmed) had no history of travel outside the continental United States and therefore were likely a result of autochthonous (originating in the place where found) transmission (Liu et al. 2018). The *Angiostrongylus* parasite has been observed in exotic and native*

snail species in Florida; however, no cases of rat lungworm infection in SITS have been documented.

We do not have documented predation of SITS by NGF, but we do have direct observations of NGF preying on Liguus snails, and perhaps other Orthalicus sp. (both species share the same habitat/locations with SITS). In addition, NGF is not a discriminatory predator, especially among snails. Therefore, it seems likely that NGF is a potential predator of SITS. Further assessment is needed to understand the potential threat and population-level effects of this new invasive predator on SITS.

Green iguanas (*Iguana iguana*) are among the most popular reptiles in the pet trade and comprise a major portion of imports. By the 1960s, they became established as part of the non-native fauna of southern Florida (Townsend et al. 2003). Green iguanas may occur at high densities; greater than 242 individuals per square mile (627 per square km) were found at a Bill Baggs Cape Florida State Park on Key Biscayne in 2003 (Smith et al. 2007). The extent to which SITS may have capacities to resist predation by green iguanas is unknown. At Bill Baggs Cape Florida State Park, the stomachs of two green iguana (out of 18 assessed) were found to contain lined tree snails (*Drymaeus multilineatus*) (Townsend et al. 2005). Like *Orthalicus* and *Liguus*, *Drymaeus* snails are members of the Family Bulimulidae. The stomach of one iguana (a juvenile) contained 12 individual snails, indicating that predation occurred as opposed to incidental consumption (Townsend et al. 2005). Townsend et al. (2005) stated that “The large and rapidly growing *I. iguana* populations in southern Florida may have the potential to devastate some highly localized native species of tree snails” (*Orthalicus* and *Liguus*). Iguana populations throughout the range of SITS and other *Orthalicus* constitute a new threat, and the magnitude is moderate. The imminence of this threat is unknown.

Opossums (*Didelphis virginiana*) and raccoons (*Procyon lotor*) prey upon both *Orthalicus* and *Liguus* snails (Voss 1976, Deisler 1987). Deisler (1987) noted that the opossum “is more numerous in the mainland range of *Orthalicus* than in the Keys,” but added that they have been reported from Key Largo, Key Vaca, Big Pine Key, and Key West. Throughout 2008, opossum presence has been observed and reported with increasing prevalence on Big Pine Key (P. Hughes, Service, personal observation, 2008). They now appear to be widespread and relatively abundant on Big Pine Key. Opossums frequently exhibit opportunistic foraging and diverse, omnivorous diets (McManus 1974), which include terrestrial snails in various portions of North America (Sandidge 1953, Hopkins and Forbes 1980). Opossums may constitute a predation threat to SITS on No Name Key and elsewhere within the range, depending on the distribution of habitats and interacting species. Raccoons, particularly where overabundant due to anthropogenic and/or natural influences, similarly constitute a potential threat.

Black rats (*Rattus rattus*), Norwegian rats (*R. norvegicus*), grey squirrels (*Sciurus carolinensis*), and birds are reported predators of *Orthalicus* and *Liguus* tree snails in portions of the respective ranges (Deisler 1987). We have no additional information on these potential threats to SITS.

d. Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms: On August 25, 1994, the United States District Court for the Southern District of Florida directed the Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) to consult with the Service to determine whether implementation of the National Flood Insurance Program in Monroe County was likely to jeopardize the continued existence of federally listed species (Case No. 90-10037-CIV-MOORE). In 2003, the Service issued a jeopardy biological opinion with reasonable and prudent alternatives that required Monroe County to consult with the Service before issuing building permits in suitable habitat for listed species. Thus, in recent years, the Service provided technical assistance on pertinent projects (virtually all building applications on private parcels throughout the range of SITS, excluding Coastal Barrier Resource Act zones). On September 9, 2005, the Court ordered an injunction against FEMA issuing flood insurance on any new developments in suitable habitat of federally listed species, and required the Service to submit a revised biological opinion within nine months (deadline later extended to August 9, 2006). Because the Court ruled that the 2003 reasonable and prudent alternatives were invalid, Monroe County was no longer required to consult with the Service before issuing building permits in suitable habitat, and the Service suspended technical assistance on building permit applications.

The Service finalized its reanalysis of the National Flood Insurance Program in Monroe County and provided a biological opinion to the Court on August 8, 2006 (Service 2006a). The biological opinion provides a revised strategy for implementing regulatory actions pertaining to threatened and endangered species. This strategy includes clarification of FEMA's oversight role and a more comprehensive strategy of evaluating potential impacts. The latter incorporates a lot-by-lot assessment of potential impacts that takes into account the limitations on development imposed by Monroe County's ROGO. In the biological opinion, the Service concluded that continued administration of the National Flood Insurance Program in Monroe County was not likely to jeopardize the continued existence of the SITS.

The Service's (2006a) assessment of FEMA's proposed action indicated there were approximately 3,321 ha (8,327 acres) of hardwood hammock (potential SITS habitat) throughout the Keys. Approximately 72 percent were in public ownership, significantly more than was the case in 1996 (Service 2006a). The remainder occurs on 3,825 parcels in private ownership that are susceptible to development and may be affected by the action. A portion of the lots may not accurately represent suitable habitat due to isolation, disturbance, location in

well-developed subdivisions, lack of suitable plant species, and/or infestation by IEPs.

The SITS is listed by the Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) as endangered (Chapter 68A-27, Florida Administrative Code). This legislation prohibits take, except under permit, but does not provide any direct habitat protection. Wildlife habitat is protected on FWC wildlife management and wildlife environmental areas according to Florida Administrative Code 68A-15.004.

The State of Florida has compelled the Monroe County Board of Commissioners to strengthen controls on land use since at least 1975 when the Keys were designated an Area of Critical State Concern. A critical regulatory factor is the level of service on U.S. Highway 1 as it relates to hurricane evacuation time. The County developed a ROGO that, as of March 2006, incorporated a land tier system that specifically designates areas of native habitat for listed species, including the SITS. The process made it more costly to destroy habitat and now discourages development in unfragmented habitat, steers available permit allocations to disturbed areas that are poor habitat for native fauna, and implements a land acquisition program for areas with native vegetation, including SITS habitat.

Throughout the Keys, development is subject to regulatory oversight by Monroe County (e.g., the ROGO), the State (e.g., designated an Area of Critical State Concern), and the Service (e.g., ESA consultation, presumably including continued consultation with Monroe County regarding administration of the FEMA National Flood Insurance Program). Regulatory mechanisms have significantly reduced habitat loss in the Keys, including SITS habitat. However, pressure to develop remaining residential and commercial land within the range of the SITS continues.

For scientific research on SITS, a permit is required from the Service and FWC. Although most of the range occupied by SITS occurs on State and Federal lands, which offers protection, these areas are large and open to the public. Signage prohibiting collection is largely lacking, and efforts to patrol or monitor activities are variable. Therefore, illegal collection could occur without being detected, as discussed under Factor B above.

The City of Key West Code of Ordinances (Chapter 108, Article VI), which generally deals with landscaping, provide very strict and detailed provisions regarding trees and other aspects of landscaping, including the preservation and promotion of native trees.

Currently, regulatory mechanisms provide significant protections to SITS. However, some of the potential and suitable habitat remains vulnerable to development pressure. SITS may be vulnerable to fire ants in any area where

management on adjacent lands does not include fire ant control. Additionally, regulatory mechanisms have not eliminated potential threats from mosquito control (e.g., spray drift) (Factor E below). Therefore, we conclude that existing regulatory mechanisms are inadequate to fully protect SITS and its habitat.

There is no new information since the 2008 status review.

e. Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence:

Mosquito control (pesticides)—As human activity and population size increased in south Florida, so has the control of mosquitoes such as the salt marsh mosquitoes, *Aedes sollicitans* (Walker) and *A. taeniorhynchus* (Wiedemann). To suppress mosquitoes, second-generation organophosphate (naled) and pyrethroid (permethrin) adulticides may be used year-round (particularly May to November in the Keys) by Mosquito Control Districts (Hennessey et al. 1992, Salvato 2001, Zhong 2008). Despite improved mosquito control practices, the use of adulticides applied using both aerial and ground-based methods may result in collateral effects on a variety of non-target invertebrates (Service 1999, Walker 2001), although much of the evidence is strictly correlative. Florida Keys Mosquito Control District and the Mosquito Control Division of Miami-Dade Public Works Department conduct aerial and / or ground spraying of mosquito adulticides over most of Miami-Dade and Monroe Counties. Additionally, the Ocean Reef Club (a residential and golf resort) may conduct or contract ground-based adulticide spraying within their borders. The Service currently does not have specific insecticide application records from those entities for the majority of the SITS range.

Occupied habitat on NKDR, DJKLBSP, and CLNWR are excluded from direct applications of pesticides to control mosquitoes. However, on NKDR (Big Pine Key and No Name Key) as well as DJKLBSP and CLNWR (northern Key Largo), adjacent or interspersed subdivisions are treated with both ground and aerial pesticide spraying to control mosquitoes. On northern Key Largo, residues of these adulticide applications were shown to drift onto DJKLBSP and CLNWR (Hennessey et al. 1992, Zhong 2008). We have no new information that directly assesses impacts or a lack of impacts to SITS.

Although pesticide applications are restricted within CLNWR, the Service and Florida Keys Mosquito Control District have coordinated to allow limited treatments during emergency situations (e.g., post-Hurricane Irma) to avoid or minimize any impacts to occupied hardwood hammocks.

Climate change—The Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change (IPCC) reports that the warming of the world's climate system is unequivocal, based on documented increases in global average air and ocean temperatures, unprecedented melting of snow and ice, and rising average sea level (IPCC

2007). IPCC (2008) found that rising sea level is consistent with warming. They emphasized that it is very likely that anthropogenic forces contributed to sea-level rise during the latter half of the 20th century, but indicate that “the observational uncertainties, combined with a lack of suitable studies, mean that it is difficult to quantify the anthropogenic contribution.”

The long-term record at Key West shows that sea level rose on average 0.224 centimeters (cm) (0.088 inches) annually between 1913 and 2006. This equates to approximately 22.4 cm (8.76 inches) over the last 100 years (National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration 2008). Sea-level rise in the 20th century has been shown to affect conversions of upland communities (i.e., hardwood hammock, pine rockland) with low soil and moisture salinities to communities comprised of more salt tolerant plant species and higher soil and groundwater salinities in the Keys (Ross et al. 1994). This phenomenon may result in loss of suitable SITS habitat. Over time, the ultimate effect of sea-level rise may be total inundation in some areas. The general effects of sea-level rise within the range of the SITS will depend upon the rate of rise and landform topography. However, the specific effects across the landscape will be affected by complex interactions among geomorphology, tides, and fluctuations in energy and matter. These effects have yet to be simulated and projected for the range of the SITS. Sea-level rise enhances the potential impacts of salt-water storm surges associated with hurricanes. Storm surges may directly flood SITS eggs and neonates that are at or near ground level, as well as alter salinity levels and plant composition over longer time-frames. Storm surges associated with Hurricane Andrew influenced the distribution of leaf litter and storm debris on Elliott Key and other areas within the SITS range (Loope et al. 1994). Data on the long-term effects of storm surges are not available. The magnitude of this threat is potentially very high, but imminence is low.

SITS distribution may be undergoing constriction due to expanding mangrove areas and inland human infrastructure (Benedict et al. 2018). Recent climate change modeling suggests that the tropical hardwood hammock in Key Largo is less vulnerable to sea level rise (SLR) than other areas in the Florida Keys (Benedict et al. 2018). However, at three to four feet of SLR, water levels can fragment habitat and several habitat bottlenecks could materialize; effects further exacerbated by the highway (CR 905) running through SITS habitat on northern Key Largo. Additionally, a portion of hammock areas affected by SLR will likely transition into mangrove forest, causing further reduction of SITS habitat (Saha et al. 2011). These types of SLR-related impacts are forecasted to occur in 41 to 80+ years (2060-2100; National Oceanic and Atmospheric Association [NOAA] 2017).

Hurricane winds—Hurricanes may impact SITS populations and habitat due to high wind velocities. Detachment of tree branches and tree falls due to wind may result in SITS mortalities (Forys et al. 2001a). In August 1992,

Hurricane Andrew impacted extreme south Florida. Winds associated with Hurricane Andrew downed approximately 20 to 30 percent of large trees, and sheared large branches off almost all large trees in hardwood hammocks on Elliott Key (Loope et al. 1994). The woody structure of smaller trees was impacted less radically. However, for trees of all sizes, "... defoliation was virtually complete, even near ground level" (Loope et al. 1994). Hurricane Andrew provided some of the impetus to conduct a SITS captive propagation that was unsuccessful (Service 1999). In contrast, post-hurricane responses by SITS populations were not studied *in situ*. According to the National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration, Miami-Dade County, the Keys, and western Cuba are the most storm-prone areas in the Caribbean so this threat is expected to continue. Depending on the location and intensity of catastrophic winds, it is possible that SITS populations could be extirpated. Accordingly, we consider the magnitude and imminence of this threat to be moderate.

The magnitude of threats from stochastic events such as hurricanes is exacerbated by small population sizes and the limited range of SITS. Given these factors, catastrophic loss of adults (arboreal) or eggs and neonates (terrestrial) is a potential threat of high magnitude. Because catastrophic events affect further reductions in abundance over time, they increase the probability that detrimental impacts may subsequently arise due to demographic or genetic stochasticity, or from additional, adverse environmental conditions. For example, Emmel and Daniels (2005) reported that drought conditions prevailed from 1998 through 2002. Natural fluctuations in rainfall, forage volume, or predation may weaken a population to such an extent that recovery to a viable level would be impossible.

In September 2017, Hurricane Irma made landfall as a Category 4 on Cudjoe Key, approximately 12 miles from the only known site occupied by a self-sustaining population of SITS in the Lower Keys. This large and powerful storm impacted the tropical hardwood hammock through its storm surge and by de-leafing and knocking down trees. We are not aware of any surveys that have been conducted to determine the impacts to this population since the storm. However, informal observations have been reported and suggest the population is still extant.

Right-of-way maintenance—The Florida Keys Electric Cooperative Association, Inc. (FKECA) and Monroe County regularly conduct vegetation maintenance activities along power line and road rights-of-way in SITS-occupied habitat along Card Sound Road and elsewhere in Key Largo. This results in habitat loss and injury and death to individual SITS. FKECA has routinely searched for affected SITS and placed them into adjacent unimpacted portions of the occupied hammocks. FKECA (2004) reported that other crews failed to take similar measures in 2004. The magnitude of this threat appears to be low, and the imminence is high.

All tree snails continue to be vulnerable to any roadside or utility corridor tree trimming maintenance activities (e.g., electric utility line clearance; telephone/cable utility line clearance; city, county or state roadside tree trimming). ROW maintenance methods that use side-mounted mowers and saws to trim tree branches that overhang roads can indiscriminately kill tree snails and other invertebrates that are caught in the branches.

FKECA, however, conducts some of the right-of-way (ROW) maintenance clearing within its service area, which extends from the Ocean Reef development on North Key Largo to the Seven-mile Bridge south of the City of Marathon, using different methods that minimize impacts to SITS and other tree snails. FKECA crews utilize bucket trucks and pole saws for a majority of their tree trimming work. Crewmembers, both contract and in house, are trained to look for SITS and other tree snails so they can be collected and relocated during the tree trimming. The branch(es) to be cut are first observed by the person in the bucket truck. If any snails are present, that twig will be cut off first and passed down to ground crew to be placed into a bucket on the back of the truck. The ground crew will examine a trimmed branch for snails as the branches are stacked for chipping. The stacks of branches are checked again by the chipper crew before being fed through the chipper. Annual reports associated with this maintenance are submitted to the Service (FKECA 2010 - 2019). These reports indicate the number of each snail species, including SITS, that are collected and relocated back into the hammock. From 1994 through 2019, FKECA ROW maintenance crews have moved 80,250 tree snails, of which 236 were SITS, into the adjacent unimpacted portions of the occupied hammocks (FKECA, pers. comm. 2019). We recommend this method for ROW maintenance be adopted in areas where SITS has been documented, and recognize it as a best practice when any snails are present.

*Key deer (*Odocoileus virginianus clavium*) browsing—Plant community alteration associated with excessive browsing by locally abundant Key deer is a concern on No Name Key. Barrett et al. (2006) compared baseline vegetation data from the 1990s (Folk 1992) to data collected in 2002 within NKDR and found pronounced browsing impacts in mangrove, buttonwood, and hardwood hammock communities on keys where deer densities have been relatively high (Big Pine Key, No Name Key, Big Munson Key). Because deer are selective browsers, densities of preferred plant species decreased and non-preferred plant species increased on islands with high deer density. Many highly preferred species present in the hardwood hammock understory in the 1990s were virtually absent in 2002. These results indicate that, within a 12-year period, heavy deer herbivory in the understory can influence mid-story composition (Barrett et al. 2006). More generally, available information (Wilmers 1995, Barrett et al. 2006) suggests that, within areas of high deer density, browsing has already driven some plant communities to alternate (i.e.,*

overbrowsed) states (Hobbs 1996, Côté et al. 2004, Wisdom et al. 2006).

Without intervention, such conditions can result in altered species richness in canopy trees (Hobbs 1996, Côté et al. 2004). Replacement of canopy trees by seedlings will be precluded by continued browsing, at least for preferred browse species, which will result in long-term alterations to canopy composition and structure. Specific long-term effects on community dynamics in affected areas are difficult to predict. However, the relative abundance of preferred and non-preferred browse species will continue to change (Barrett et al. 2006). How these phenomena relate to SITS habitat relationships and trends in stand structure and composition important to SITS have not been assessed. However, they will likely alter SITS habitat conditions over the medium- and long-term. Overbrowsing by deer is currently a threat of low magnitude and imminence.

D. Synthesis

The predominant threat described at the time SITS was listed was habitat destruction. Additional threats include: non-native predators, inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms, climate change, hurricane winds, right-of-way maintenance, Key deer browsing, and IEPs. None of these threats has been eliminated, although many have been reduced. Threats relating to climate change and predation have increased. Associated with climate change is sea-level rise and enhanced impacts due to storm surges. These factors not only serve to alter plant communities over different time-frames but may increase the probability that entire cohorts of young SITS are eliminated due to catastrophic storm surges. The threat of sea-level rise is potentially very high, but effects have yet to be simulated and projected for the range of the SITS. Hurricane winds pose additional risks. Relatively recent or expanded predatory threats potentially include green iguanas and opossums. Threats from fire ants persist. IEPs are largely controlled and do not appear to be an imminent threat. Poaching and mosquito control practices remain as potential threats.

Due to translocations, SITS are now roughly as widespread as any time in the past. Additionally, a substantial portion of SITS populations occur on public lands managed for conservation purposes. Threats of habitat destruction due to human population growth and associated development have been significantly reduced. In addition to acquisition efforts, regulatory mechanisms have provided for substantial reductions in the rate of habitat loss. However, detrimental habitat impacts associated with earlier development, including fragmentation and proliferation of fire ants (and likely other predators), persists over much of the historic range. Significant areas of suitable and occupied habitat remain vulnerable to development pressure. Vegetation clearing along utility corridors results in localized threats but requires further investigation to determine the full extent of impact on SITS. SITS continues to meet the definition of threatened.

Large-scale surveys have not been conducted since 2008, however, the information gathered from ROGO surveys and FKECA work indicate SITS distribution is unchanged

in the Northern Keys. There were no observations of SITS during recent inspections of hardwood hammock on Key West and Stock Island, further supporting the presumption that SITS has been extirpated from these Keys. No additional populations have been discovered or established. Formal, large-scale surveys are needed to determine the status of SITS populations throughout its range. Additional work to identify and implement a viable means of obtaining a representative, annual survey of SITS distribution and abundance throughout the range is also needed.

Several projects restoring hardwood hammock have been initiated and currently are underway, but further habitat loss and degradation has occurred (including some due to Hurricane Irma). Recent climate change modeling suggests that the tropical hardwood hammock in Key Largo is less vulnerable to SLR than other areas in the Florida Keys. Therefore, the threat of SLR in Key Largo towards SITS is currently low. Hurricanes and tropical storms, depending on location, intensity and habitat conditions (time-since-disturbance), could result in SITS population extirpations or overall extinction. Additional assessments of Hurricane Irma impacts are needed.

All tree snails continue to be vulnerable to any roadside or utility corridor tree trimming maintenance activities (e.g., electric utility line clearance; telephone/cable utility line clearance; city, county or state roadside tree trimming). Continuing to work with all right-of-way maintenance entities to ensure that best practices are implemented throughout the Florida Keys will largely reduce this threat to SITS.

Pesticides, nonnative predators, and reduction in quality of habitat remain threats. Currently, regulatory mechanisms provide some protections to SITS. However, some of the suitable habitat outside or adjacent to Biscayne National Park, CLNWR, and DJKL BSP remain vulnerable to development pressure, and regulatory mechanisms do not provide protection from nonnative ants, NGF, or mosquito control practices at some locations.

The establishment of NGF throughout SITS range poses a potential significant threat that could impact the recovery of SITS. This is especially important on public lands within Key Largo where the habitat is less vulnerable to SLR and the main populations of SITS occurs. Further studies are needed to assess the potential threat from NGF and other nonnative species.

While progress has been made, SITS remain vulnerable to the same threats identified in the previous 5-year review and continues to be likely to become endangered within the foreseeable future without continued management actions. Therefore, no change is recommended to its listing classification as threatened.

III. RESULTS

A. Recommended Classification:

X **No change is needed**

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTIONS

- Assess the current distribution and abundance of SITS and its congeners.
- *Investigate the distribution of NGF, assess the impacts on SITS, and respond accordingly. This is especially important on public lands within Key Largo where the habitat is less vulnerable to SLR and the main population of SITS occurs.*
- Assess and conduct translocations of SITS within the Lower Keys. [*Note: Current recovery criteria indicate that reintroductions should be undertaken in the Lower Keys and assume that the Lower Keys are the only place to achieve recovery for SITS. This assumption should be re-evaluated.*]
- Continue to work with all right-of-way maintenance entities to ensure that best practices are implemented.
- Identify and implement a viable means to obtain a representative, annual sample of SITS distribution and abundance throughout the range.
- Expand analyses of genetic relationships between populations of *O. reses*, presumably using microsatellite markers, and confirm whether the two subspecies should be lumped taxonomically.
- Assess the status of *O. reses nesodryus*, and whether it should be listed, either due to similarity of appearance or level of imperilment.
- Further assess the habitat values and importance of particular tree species to SITS, and the land use and ecological characteristics that affect the abundance and distribution of the various trees.
- Continue to work with partners and take measures to limit or prohibit mosquito control pesticide drift on protected State and Federal lands, avoid the use of broad spectrum mosquito control pesticides in other conservation areas, and seek cooperative ways to reduce application levels throughout the remainder of the SITS range.
- Routinely obtain, monitor, and assess temporally and spatially explicit data regarding mosquito control applications throughout the SITS range.
- *Develop potential adaptation strategies to moderate or delay the effects of sea level rise on SITS. For example, increase connectivity where sea level rise is likely to cause fragmentation.*
- Assess the current distribution of fire ants and their impacts and respond accordingly.
- Continue to establish appropriate hardwood hammock species in disturbed areas to increase habitat area and continuity and thwart advances by fire ants.
- Determine whether green iguana or opossum predation occurs and poses a threat to SITS.

V. REFERENCES (**denotes new citations since previous 5-year review*)

- *Asato, R., Taira, K., Nakamura, M., Kudaka, J., Itokazu, K., and Kawanaka, M. 2004. Changing epidemiology of *Angiostrongyliasis cantonensis* in Okinawa prefecture, Japan. Japanese Journal of Infectious Disease 57:184-186.

- *Allen, P. 2019. Personal communication. Email to Service. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida. July 31, 2019.
- Barrett, M.A., Stiling, P., and Lopez, R.R.. 2006. Long-term changes in plant communities influenced by Key deer herbivory. *Natural Areas Journal* 26:235-243.
- *Benedict, L., Glazer, B., Traxler, S., Bergh, C. Stys, B., Evans, J. 2018. Florida Keys Case Study on Incorporating Climate Change Considerations into Conservation Planning and Actions for Threatened and Endangered Species. A Project Report for USFWS Cooperative Agreement F16AC01213. 152 p.
- *Butler, T. 2019. Personal communication. Email to Service. Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Tallahassee, Florida. July 31, 2019.
- *Chiba, S. 2010. Species diversity and conservation of *Mandarina*, an endemic land snail of the Ogasawara Islands. *Global Environmental Research*, 17:29-37
- *Civeyrel, L., and Simberloff, D. 1996. A tale of two snails: Is the cure worse than the disease? *Biodiversity and Conservation* 5:12.
- Côté, S.D., Rooney, T.P., Tremblay, J., Dussault, C., and Waller, D.M. 2004. Ecological impacts of deer overabundance. *Annual Review of Ecology, Evolution and Systematics* 35:113-147.
- *Cowie, R. H. 2001. Can snails ever be effective and safe biocontrol agents? *Integrated Journal of Pest Management* 47:23
- Deisler, J.E. 1987. The ecology of the Stock Island tree snail, *Orthalicus reses reses* (Say). *Bulletin Florida State Museum Biological Science* 31(3):107-145.
- *EDDMapS. 2021. Early Detection & Distribution Mapping System. The University of Georgia - Center for Invasive Species and Ecosystem Health. <http://www.eddmaps.org/> [Accessed January 25, 2021].
- *Eldredge L.G., and Smith, B.D., 1994. Introductions and transfers of the triclad flatworm *Platydemus manokwari*. *Tentacle* 4:8 (also reprinted as 'Triclad flatworm tours the Pacific' in *Alien*, 2:11, 1995).
- Emmel, T.C., and Daniels, J.C. 2005. Status monitoring of the endangered Schaus swallowtail butterfly (*Papilio aristodemus ponceanus*) in South Florida. Final report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, South Florida Ecological Services Office, for Grant Agreement 401812M502. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

- Emmel, T.C., and Perry, M.W. 2004. Evaluation of the genetic and systematic distinction of the Stock Island tree snail and its relatives. Final report to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, South Florida Ecological Services Office, for Grant Agreement 1448-40181-00-G-133. University of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 2006. The 2006 annual report of the Florida Forever Program. Prepared for the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida. Division of State Lands, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 2008. Florida Forever five-year plan, February 2008. Prepared for the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida. Division of State Lands, Tallahassee, Florida.
- *Florida Department of Environmental Protection. 2020. Florida Forever five-year plan, February 2020. Prepared for the Board of Trustees of the Internal Improvement Trust Fund of the State of Florida. Division of State Lands, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Florida Keys Electric Cooperative Association, Inc. 2004. C905 electric utility right-of-way maintenance 2004 annual report. Tavernier, Florida.
- *Florida Keys Electric Cooperative Association, Inc. 2014. C905 electric utility right-of-way maintenance 2014 annual report. Tavernier, Florida.
- Folk, M.L. 1992. Habitat of the Key deer. Ph.D. Dissertation, Southern Illinois University, Carbondale, Illinois.
- Forys, E.A., and Allen, C.R. 2005. The impacts of sprawl on biodiversity: the ant fauna of the Lower Florida Keys. *Ecology and Society* 10: 25.
<http://www.ecologyandsociety.org/vol10/iss1/art25/>.
- Forys, E.A., Allen, C.R., and Wojcik, D.P. 2001a. The likely cause of extinction of the tree snail *Orthalicus reses reses* (Say). *Journal of Molluscan Studies* 67:369-376.
- Forys, E.A., Quistorff, A., and Allen, C.R. 2001b. Potential fire ant (Hymenoptera: Formicidae) impact on the endangered Schaus swallowtail butterfly (Lepidoptera: Papilionidae). *Florida Entomologist* 84:254-258.
- Forys, E.A., Allen, C.R., and Wojcik, D.P. 2002. Distribution of the red imported fire ant in the Lower Florida Keys: effects of human development and roads and spatial overlap with vulnerable rare species. *Biological Conservation* 108:27-33.
- *Gerlach, J. 2019. Predation by invasive *Platydemus manokwari* flatworms: a laboratory study. *Biological Letters* 54. 47-60. 10.2478/biolet-2019-0005.
- *Global Invasive Species Database. 2019. Species profile: *Platydemus manokwari*.
<http://iucngisd.org/gisd/speciesname/Platydemus+manokwari> [Accessed June 17, 2019].

Hennessey, M.K., Nigg, H.N., and Habeck, D.H. 1992. Mosquito (Diptera: Culicidae) adulticide drift into wildlife refuges of the Florida Keys. *Environmental Entomology* 21(4):714-721.

Hobbs, N.T. 1996. Modification of ecosystems by ungulates. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 60:695-713.

Hopkins, D.D., and Forbes, R.B. 1980. Dietary patterns of the Virginia opossum in an urban environment. *The Murrelet* 61:20-30.

*Hopper, D.R. and Smith, B.D. 1992 Status of tree snails (*Gastropoda: Partulidae*) on Guam, with a resurvey of sites studied by H.E. Crampton in 1920. *Pacific Science* 46(1): 77-85.

Hughes, P. 2008. Memorandum to the file. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. South Florida Ecological Services Office. Big Pine Key, Florida. December 27, 2008.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2007. Summary for policymakers, In: *Climate Change 2007: the Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fourth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change*, [Solomon, S., D. Qin, M. Manning, Z. Chen, M. Marquis, K.B. Averyt, M. Tignor, and H.L. Miller, Editors]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, New York, USA.

Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. 2008. *Climate Change and Water* [B.C. Bates, Z.W. Kundzewicz, S. Wu, and J.P. Palutikof, Editors]. Technical Paper of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change. Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change Secretariat, Geneva, Switzerland.

*Integrated Taxonomic Information System. 2021. *Orthalicus reses reses*; Taxonomic Serial Number: 77022. <http://www.itis.gov> [Accessed January 25, 2021].

*Iwai N., Sugiura, S., and Chiba, S. 2010a. Prey-tracking behavior in the invasive terrestrial planarian *Platydemus manokwari* (Platyhelminthes, Tricladida) *Naturwissenschaften*. 97:997–1002. doi: 10.1007/s00114-010-0717-4.

*Iwai N., Sugiura, S., and Chiba, S. 2010b. Predation impacts of the invasive flatworm *Platydemus manokwari* on eggs and hatchlings of land snails, *Journal of Molluscan Studies*, 76(3):275-278. <https://doi.org/10.1093/mollus/eyq007>

*Justine J., Winsor, L., Gey, D., Gros, P., and Thévenot, J. 2014. The invasive New Guinea flatworm *Platydemus manokwari* in France, the first record for Europe: time for action is now. *PeerJ* 2:e297. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.297>

*Justine et al. 2015. The invasive land planarian *Platydemus manokwari* (Platyhelminthes, Geoplanidae): records from six new localities, including the first in the USA. *PeerJ* 3:e1037. <https://doi.org/10.7717/peerj.1037>

- *Kaneda M., Kitagawa, K., and Ichinose, F. 1990. Laboratory rearing method and biology of *Platydemus manokwari* De Beauchamp (Tricladida: Terricola: Rhynchodemidae). *Applied Entomology and Zoology (Japan)* 25:524-528.
- *Kaneda, M., Kitagawa, K., Nagai, H., and Ichinohe, F. 1992. The effects of temperature and prey species on the development and fecundity of *Platydemus manokwari* De Beauchamp (Tricladida: Terricola: Rhynchodemidae). *Research Bulletin of the Plant Protection Service, Japan.* 28:7-11.
- Keys Environmental Restoration Fund. 2006. Pieces of the real Florida Keys: twenty-five years of habitat restoration, 1981-2006. Audubon of Florida, Keys Environmental Restoration Fund, Marathon, Florida.
- *Liu E.W., Schwartz, B.S., and Hysmith, N.D., et al. 2018. Rat Lungworm Infection Associated with Central Nervous System Disease - Eight U.S. States, January 2011-January 2017. *Morbidity and Mortality Weekly Report.* 67:825-828. DOI: <http://dx.doi.org/10.15585/mmwr.mm6730a4>
- Loope, L., Duever, M., Herndon, A., Snyder, J., and Jansen, D. 1994. Hurricane impact on uplands and freshwater swamp forest. *BioScience* 44:238-246.
- *Lowe S., Browne, M., Boudjelas, S., and De Poorter, M. 2000. *100 of the World's Worst Invasive Alien Species. A selection from the Global Invasive Species Database.* Invasive Species Specialist Group (ISSG) a specialist group of the Species Survival Commission (SSC) of the World Conservation Union (IUCN), 12pp First published as special lift-out in *Aliens* 12, December 2000 Updated and reprinted version: November 2004.
- McManus, J.J. 1974. *Didelphis virginiana.* *Mammalian Species* 40:1-6.
- *Muniappan, R. 1987. Biological control of the giant African snail, *Achatina fulica* Bowdich, in the Maldives. *FAO Plant Protection Bulletin* 35(4):127-33.
- *Muniappan, R. 1989. Use of the planarian, *Platydemus manokwari*, and other natural enemies for controlling the giant African snail. FFTC-NARC International Seminar on 'The use of parasitoids and predators to control agricultural pests', Tukuha Science City, Ibaraki-ken, Japan, October 2-7, 1989
- *Muniappan, R., Duhamel, G., Santiago, R. M., and Acay, D. R. 1986. Giant African snail control in Bugsuk Island, Philippines, by *Platydemus manokwari*. *Oléagineux* 41(4):183-188.
- National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration. 2008. Sea Levels Online (Mean sea level trend 8724580 Key West, Florida). National Ocean Service, Center for Operational Oceanographic Products and Services. <http://tidesandcurrents.noaa.gov>. [Accessed October 17, 2008].

- * National Oceanographic and Atmospheric Administration (NOAA). 2017. Global and Regional Sea Level Rise Scenarios for the United States. NOAA Technical Report NOS CO-OPS 083. Silver Spring, MD.
- *Ogren, R. 1995. Predation Behavior of Land Planarians. *Hydrobiologia* 305:105-111
- *Ohbayashi T., Okochi, I., Sato, H., and Ono, T. 2005. Food habit of *Platydemus manokwari* De Beauchamp, 1962 (Tricladida: Terricola: Rhynchodemidae), known as a predatory flatworm of land snails in the Ogasawara (Bonin) Islands, Japan. *Applied Entomology and Zoology (Japan)* 40:609-614. <https://doi.org/10.1303/aez.2005.609>.
- *Ohbayashi T., Okochi, I., Sato, H., Ono, T., and Chiba, S. 2007. Rapid decline of endemic snails in the Ogasawara Islands, Western Pacific Ocean. *Applied Entomology and Zoology (Japan)* 42:479-485. <https://doi.org/10.1303/aez.2007.479>
- *Okochi, I., Sato, H., and Ohbayashi, T. 2004. The cause of mollusk decline in the Ogasawara Islands. *Biodiversity Conservation* 13:1465-1475.
- *Régnier, C., Fontaine, B., and Bouchet, P. 2009. Not Knowing, Not Recording, Not Listing: Numerous Unnoticed Mollusk Extinctions. *Conservation Biology: the Journal of the Society for Conservation Biology*. 23:1214-21. [10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01245.x](https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1523-1739.2009.01245.x).
- Ross, M.S., O'Brien, J.J., and Sternberg, L. 1994. Sea-level rise and the reduction in pine forests in the Florida Keys. *Ecological Applications* 4(1):144-156.
- *Saha, A.K., Saha, S., Sadle, J., Jiang, J., Ross, M.S., Price, R.M., Sternberg, L.S.L.O., Wendelberger, K.S. 2011. Sea level rise and South Florida coastal forests. *Climate Change* 107: 81-108.
- Salvato, M.H. 2001. Influence of mosquito control chemicals on butterflies (Nymphalidae, Lycaenidae, Hesperidae) of the lower Florida Keys. *Journal of the Lepidopterists' Society* 55:8-14.
- Sandidge, L.L. 1953. Food and dens of the opossum (*Didelphis virginiana*) in northeastern Kansas. *Transactions of the Kansas Academy of Science* 56(1):97-106.
- Smith, H.T., Golden, E., and Meshaka, W.E. Jr. 2007. Population density estimates for a green iguana (*Iguana iguana*) colony in a Florida state park. *Journal of Kansas Herpetology* 21:19-20.
- *Sugiura, S. 2009. Seasonal fluctuation of invasive flatworm predation pressure on land snails: Implications for the range expansion and impacts of invasive species. *Biological Conservation* 142:3013-3019. doi: [0.1016/j.biocon.2009.07.032](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.biocon.2009.07.032).
- *Sugiura, S. 2010. Prey preference and gregarious attacks by the invasive flatworm *Platydemus manokwari*. *Biological Invasions* 12:1499-1507. doi: [10.1007/s10530-009-9562-9](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10530-009-9562-9).

- *Sugiura, S., Okochi, I., and Tamada, H. 2006. High predation pressure by an introduced flatworm on land snails on the oceanic Ogasawara Islands. *Biotropica* 38(5): 700-703.
- *Sugiura, S., and Yamaura, Y. 2009. Potential impacts of the invasive flatworm *Platydemus manokwari* on arboreal snails. *Biological Invasions* 11:737-742.
- *Texas Invasive Species Institute. 2019. The Texas State University System - New Guinea Flatworm. <http://www.tsusinvasives.org/home/database/platydemus-manokwari> [Accessed August 2, 2019].
- Townsend, J.H., Krysko, K.L., and Enge, K.M. 2003. Introduced iguanas in southern Florida: a history of more than 35 years. *Iguana* 10(4):111-118.
- Townsend, J.H., Slapcinsky, J., Krysko, K.L., Donlan, E.M., and Golden, E.A. 2005. Predation of a tree snail *Drymaeus multilineatus* (Gastropoda: Bulimulidae) by *Iguana iguana* (Reptilia: Iguanidae) on Key Biscayne, Florida. *Southeastern Naturalist* 4(2):361-364.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1983. Stock Island tree snail recovery plan. Southeast Region, Atlanta, Georgia.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 1999. South Florida multi-species recovery plan. Southeast Region, Atlanta, Georgia.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2006a. Biological opinion on the Federal Emergency Management Agency's National Flood Insurance Program's actions in the Florida Keys. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2006b. Crocodile Lake National Wildlife Refuge Comprehensive Conservation Plan. Southeast Region, Atlanta, Georgia.
- Voss, R.S. 1976. Observations on the ecology of the Florida tree snail *Liguus fasciatus* (Muller). *Nautilus* 90:65-69.
- Walker, T.J. 2001. *Gryllus caynsis* n. sp. (Orthoptera: Gryllidae), a taciturn wood cricket extirpated from the Florida Keys: songs, ecology, and hybrids. *Florida Entomologist* 84:700-705.
- Wilmers, T.J. 1995. Key deer survey and habitat evaluation on Big Munson Island, 11 October 1995: implications and perspectives. Unpublished report. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, National Key Deer Refuge, Big Pine Key, Florida.
- *Winsor, L., Johns, P.M., and Barker, G.M. 2004. Terrestrial planarians (Platyhelminthes: Tricladida:Terricola) predaceous on terrestrial gastropods. In: Barker, G.M., ed. *Natural enemies of terrestrial molluscs*. Oxfordshire: CAB International, 227-278.

Wisdom, M.J., Vavra, M., Boyd, J.M., Hemstrom, M.A., Ager, A.A., and Johnson, B.K. 2006. Understanding ungulate herbivory—episodic disturbance effects on vegetation dynamics: knowledge gaps and management needs. *Wildlife Society Bulletin* 34:283–292.

Wojcik, D.P., Allen, C.R., Brenner, R.J., Forys, E.A., Jouvenaz, D.P., and Lutz, R.S. 2001. Red imported fire ants: impact on biodiversity. *American Entomologist* 47:16-23.

Zhong, H. 2008. Impact of mosquito aerial ULV spray on Miami blue butterflies. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services Contract Number 010978. Progress report from Florida A & M University, College of Engineering Sciences, Technology and Agriculture to Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Tallahassee, Florida.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
5-YEAR REVIEW OF THE STOCK ISLAND TREE SNAIL (*Orthalicus reses* (not including *nesodryas*))

Current Classification: Threatened

Recommendation resulting from the 5-Year Review:

- Downlist to Threatened**
- Uplist to Endangered**
- Delist**
- No change is needed**

Review Conducted By: Shawn Christopherson, Florida Ecological Services Field Office

FIELD OFFICE APPROVAL:

Lead Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service

Approve _____ Date _____

In 2014, South Atlantic-Gulf Region Field Supervisors were delegated authority to approve 5-year reviews that do not recommend a status change.