Florida Salt Marsh Vole
(*Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli*)

5-Year Review:
Summary and Evaluation

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service
Southeast Region
Jacksonville Ecological Services Field Office
Jacksonville, Florida

5-YEAR REVIEW

Florida Salt Marsh Vole/*Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli*

I. GENERAL INFORMATION

A. Methodology used to complete the review: The U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service's Jacksonville Field Office completed this review. All literature and documents used for this review are on file at the Jacksonville Field Office and are cited in the References section. We used published literature; technical reports; data and information on the internet; unpublished data; and personal communications with land managers, biologists and researchers. Public notice of this review was given in the Federal Register on April 26, 2007, with a 60-day public comment period. No public comments were received for this review. None of this review was contracted to outside parties. The draft of this document was distributed for peer review (see Appendix A) and comments received were addressed.

B. Reviewers

Lead Region - Southeast Region: Kelly Bibb, 404-679-7132

Lead Field Office - Jacksonville, FL, Ecological Services: Bill Brooks, 904-232-2580

Cooperating Refuges - Lower Suwannee NWR: John Kasbohm, 352-493-0238

C. Background

1. **FR Notice citation announcing initiation of this review:** 72 FR 20866, April 26, 2007

2. **Species status:** Unknown (2007 Recovery Data Call). The two primary threats for listing the Florida salt marsh vole (FSMV) were an extremely limited range with only one known population and the threat of losing this population to a storm or other catastrophic event. Since the time of listing, the situation has slightly improved as a second population of the FSMV has been discovered (MacKenzie 2004), approximately 5 miles from the original location. The original type locality is east of Cedar Key on private land and the second location is north of Cedar Key on the Lower Suwannee National Wildlife Refuge (LSNWR). However, the threat of a catastrophic high water event from a storm is still high since both population locations are in close proximity. There has not been a comprehensive population survey of this subspecies since 1996. Limited surveys have been conducted in potential habitat north and south of the type locality to determine presence or absence, but have not been successful in locating other populations of the FSMV. Additional threats to the FSMV may include habitat management or the lack of management in the salt marsh habitat. Climate change and sea level rise may well be the biggest long term threat depending on response of the salt marsh. The conclusion is that the overall population status is unknown and that recovery efforts

should be focused on preventing extinction by protecting the existing populations and their habitat.

3. **Recovery achieved: 1** (0-25% recovery objectives achieved) (2007 Recovery Data Call)

4. **Listing history:**
   Original listing:
   FR notice: 56 FR 1457
   Date listed: January 14, 1991
   Entity listed: subspecies
   Classification: Endangered

5. **Associated rulemakings:** None

6. **Review history:**

   Final Recovery Plan – September 30, 1997.

   Recovery Data Call – 2007, 2006, 2005, 2004, 2003, 2002, 2001, 2000, 1999, and 1998.

7. **Species' Recovery Priority Number at start of review (48 FR 43098):** 6 (a subspecies with high degree of threat and low recovery potential).

8. **Recovery Plan**
   Name of plan: Recovery Plan for the Florida Salt Marsh Vole
   Date issued: September 30, 1997

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?** No. The FSMV has an approved final recovery plan (September 30, 1997) with the immediate recovery objective for this subspecies to prevent extinction by maintaining the existing population. Because of the limited information available when the recovery plan was written, recovery criteria for the FSMV were not developed. See Section IV, Recommendations for Future actions.

C. Updated Information and Current Species Status

1. Biology and Habitat

A subspecies of the meadow vole or meadow mouse (*Microtus pennsylvanicus*), the FSMV (*Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli*) is endemic to the central Gulf coast area of Florida and is only known from the salt marshes of Waccasassa Bay and Suwannee Sound to the east and north of Cedar Key, Levy County, Florida. The current distribution of the FSMV appears to be a relict from a formerly large range along the Gulf coast during the past 10,000 years when sea levels were lower and suitable habitat extended west of the current coastline of Florida. The range was restricted by rising sea levels and associated changes in vegetation. This population now represents a small remnant of this formerly wide-ranging vole population (Woods et al. 1982). Information concerning the FSMV biology and habitat can be found in the recovery plan (USFWS 1997) and Woods (1992), and is summarized below.

a. Abundance, population trends, demographic features, or demographic trends: First documented during a small mammal study in 1980-1981, 31 individuals were documented at the type locality of Island Field Marsh along the Waccasassa Bay east of Cedar Key, Florida. During two subsequent surveys at this location in 1987 and 1988, only one individual was documented. During a survey in 1996, five individuals were captured. This location has not been surveyed since. Trapping surveys in 1988, 1989, and 1996 at other potential FSMV habitat areas to the north and south of the type locality were not successful in documenting the presence of the FSMV.

In 2004, staff from LSNWR surveyed the Suwannee Sound area salt marshes of the refuge for potential FSMV habitat. This southern section of the refuge is north of Cedar Key. Refuge staff identified a comparable habitat approximately 5 miles northwest of the type locality and trapped this area in April 2004. They captured three FSMVs at this location. This was the first and only time FSMVs were documented at a location other than the type locality on Waccasassa Bay. LSNWR staff trapped a second potential FSMV habitat location in the fall of 2004, but they were not successful in documenting the presence of FSMVs. In 2005, the LSNWR contracted with the U.S. Geological Survey to map potential FSMV habitat within the refuge (Raabe and Gauron 2005). In March 2006, LSNWR staff trapped several of the identified locations, but they were not successful in documenting the presence of FSMVs.

The FSMV has not been well studied due to its rarity, life history and because the salt marsh is a difficult habitat to survey for small mammals. The FSMV has also proven to be difficult to trap. Like other subspecies of the widespread

meadow vole, the FSMV is likely cyclical in population size (Woods 1992). The small mammal community within the FSMV habitat is characterized by shifting densities of species that use different microhabitats at different times (Woods et al. 1982, Woods 1992). The FSMV is one of four small mammals, including the cotton rat (*Sigmodon hispidus*), marsh rice rat (*Oryzomys palustris*) and cotton mouse (*Peromyscus gossypinus*), that occupy this salt marsh community and the ecotones between the salt marsh and uplands. They compete with each other for limited resources and space in this salt marsh community (Woods et al. 1982, Woods 1992). The FSMV directly competes with cotton rats as they are both herbivores, and to a lesser extent with marsh rice rats which are omnivorous (will eat bird eggs, insects, fiddler crabs, in addition to some vegetation) and cotton mice which are primarily granivorous (feed on grain or seeds).

The meadow vole as a species has a very high reproductive potential (Woods 1992). The limited known demographic characteristics of the FSMV and the reproductive potential of voles suggest that the FSMV has a great reproductive potential and should be able to recover from population declines that may occur after extreme high water events (Woods 1992).

Root and Barnes (2006) estimated that a 40-mile section of coastal marshes from Horseshoe Beach in Dixie County, Florida to the Waccasassa River in Levy County could support 33 populations of the FSMV. They developed a Population Viability Analysis (PVA) model based upon potential habitat. The baseline growth rate for these populations was 1.0656. The model predicted a zero chance of extinction and little chance of decline within 100 years assuming no changes in the baseline demographic parameters, habitat changes or catastrophes. They also found that the larger populations (at least 22 females) were likely to persist throughout the 100 years while smaller populations were not likely to persist. The sensitivity analysis determined that adult survival was the most influential parameter on population growth. The PVA model was based on potential habitat. However, it should be noted that PVA models that incorporate realistic changes in demographic parameters with environmental stochasticity might produce very different results and possibly predict a higher risk of extinction (L. Branch, University of Florida, personal communication February 27, 2008).

b. **Genetics, genetic variation, or trends in genetic variation:** Chromosomal, electrophoretic, and morphometric evidence has confirmed that the FSMV is a subspecies (*Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli*) (Woods et al. 1982). Further, Woods et al. (1982) found very little genetic variation within the FSMV, which, is consistent with the reduction of genetic variability observed in insular populations (Fivush et al. 1975, Kilpatrick 1981).

c. **Taxonomic classification or changes in nomenclature:** The Integrated Taxonomic Information System (2007) was checked while conducting this

review. There are no proposed changes in the taxonomic classification or in nomenclature.

d. **Spatial distribution, trends in spatial distribution or historic range:** The current distribution of the FSMV appears to be a relict from a formerly large range along the Gulf coast during the past 10,000 years when sea levels were lower and suitable habitat extended west of the current coastline of Florida. The range was restricted by rising sea levels and associated changes in vegetation. The FSVM now represents a small remnant of this formerly wide-ranging vole population (Woods et al. 1982). The FSMV is an endemic to the coastal salt marsh of the central Gulf coast of Florida. Until 2004, the FSMV was known to occur only from the type locality: Island Field Marsh along the shore of Waccasassa Bay, east of Cedar Key, Levy County, Florida. Additional surveys in 1988, 1989 and 1996 in salt marsh habitats north and south of the type locality did not document the presence of other populations. In 2004, LSNWR staff documented the presence of the FSMV 5 miles northwest of the type locality on the southern section of the refuge. This marks the first and only time FSMVs have been documented at a location other than the type locality. In March 2006, LSNWR staff trapped several locations within the refuge identified as potential FSMV habitat by Raabe and Gauron (2005), but was not successful in documenting the presence of FSMVs.

e. **Habitat ecosystem conditions:** The FSMV is known to occur in the coastal salt marsh near Cedar Key, Levy County, Florida. The type locality is on privately owned land near the Waccasassa Bay Preserve State Park and continues to be a target for acquisition and protection. The second location, approximately 5 miles to the northwest of the type locality, is located within the southern reach of the LSNWR.

FSMV habitat is generally characterized as salt marsh where the vegetation is dominated by saltgrass (*Distichlis spicata*) with smooth cordgrass (*Spartina alterniflora*), and glasswort (*Salicornia* spp.) and may be near or adjacent to black needle rush (*Juncus roemerianus*) (Woods et al. 1982, Woods 1992, USFWS 1997). The small mammal community in the type habitat of the FSMV is characterized by shifting densities of species that use different microhabitats at different times and compete with each other.

Root and Barnes (2006) estimated that 92 percent of the potential FSMV habitat between Horseshoe Beach and the Waccasassa River (40 miles of coastline) is located on publicly managed conservation lands. Beyond this 40-mile stretch indentified as potential FSMV habitat, saltgrass marshes also occur north through St. Marks NWR and south through Chassahowitzka NWR. Approximately 125 of 180 miles of this coastline (or 70 percent) is in public ownership and managed for conservation.

2. Five-Factor Analysis

a. **Present or threatened destruction, modification, or curtailment of its habitat or range:** The type locality is located on privately owned lands which is a current target for acquisition and protection. There will be continuing pressure to develop this and other privately owned coastal areas near Cedar Key and along Florida's Gulf coast.

The present or threatened destruction, modification or curtailment of its habitat or range is not a significant threat as 92 percent of the coastal marshes within 20 miles of the type location are publicly owned and managed for conservation (Root and Barnes 2006); and 70 percent of potential habitat in the coastal marshes within 125 miles of the known range are publicly owned and managed for conservation. However, effective habitat management options are not understood. We do not know how the extent of existing management or lack of management in the salt marsh is affecting the FSMV.

Although a large amount of potential habitat has been identified, to date voles have only been documented in two small areas in close proximity. Consequently, this subspecies is at risk from extinction from catastrophic storm events, and may not maintain densities necessary to persist through storm events and seasonal fluctuations of resources.

b. **Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes:** Not known as a threat to recovery at the time of listing or at present.

c. **Disease or predation:** Not known as a threat to recovery at the time of listing or at present.

d. **Inadequacy of existing regulatory mechanisms:** The Clean Water Act regulates dredge and fill activities that would adversely affect wetlands. Such activities are commonly associated with projects to create dry land for development sites, water-control projects, and land clearing and for water dependent projects such as docks/marinas and maintenance of navigational channels. The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and the Environmental Protection Agency share the responsibility for implementing the permitting program under Section 404 of the Clean Water Act. Permit review and issuance follows a process that encourages avoidance, minimizing and requiring mitigation for unavoidable impacts to the aquatic environment and habitats. This includes protecting the salt marsh habitat and wildlife like the FSMV that depends upon salt marsh for survival.

The National Wildlife Refuge System Administration Act (NWRAA) represents organic legislation that set up the administration of a national network of lands and water for the conservation, management, and restoration of fish, wildlife, and plant resources and their habitats for the benefit of the American people. Amendment of the NWRAA in 1997 required the refuge

system to ensure that the biological integrity, diversity, and environmental health of refuges be maintained. The FSMV occurs on LSNWR (MacKenzie 2004) and is protected under this Act.

The FSMV is listed by the State of Florida as a species of concern. Florida State Law (Chapter 68A-27.004, Florida Administrative Code) prohibits taking of individuals of state-listed threatened species, or parts thereof, except as authorized; however, the statute does not prohibit destruction or modification of habitat occupied by threatened species. On State wildlife management areas, regulations (Chapter 68A-15.004, Florida Administrative Code) protect individual FSMVs. Wildlife management area regulations prohibit destruction or modification of habitat, except for management and restoration activities. Because the FSMV is listed by the State of Florida, these protective regulations apply to this subspecies on the above mentioned State Properties and private properties. Florida Administrative Code, Chapter 62D-2.013 prohibits the destruction of habitat or wildlife from Florida Department of Environmental Protection, Division of Recreation and Park's properties except as authorized under this regulation.

e. **Other natural or manmade factors affecting its continued existence:** One of the primary threats to the FSMV is a catastrophic weather event, hurricanes or other strong storm systems that cause extreme high water events. Storm surges can partially or completely inundate the salt marsh habitats. Florida's Gulf coast salt marshes are very vulnerable to flooding because they are low lying and the adjacent Gulf waters are very shallow. Westerly winds from tropical storms and severe frontal boundaries increase the amplitude of the normal high tides, which can elevate water levels above the normal mean high water levels. Based upon the limited information available, the FSMV has been able to survive in its natural habitat and apparently maintain adult populations within the tidal marshes near Cedar Key under the extreme conditions from many tropical and other storm systems that have impacted this area in recent history. However, this subspecies continues to be at risk of extinction due to the natural cyclic nature of vole populations and its limited distribution.

Global climate change is what led to the remnant FSMV population (Woods et al. 1982). Long-term climate change will continue to affect the extent of salt marsh available to the FSMV along the central Gulf coast of Florida. Meehl et al. (2005) predicted a future sea level rise of 13-30 cm due to global climate change by the end of the century, which would significantly change the coastal marshes and adjacent uplands of Florida.

D. Synthesis

The degree of threat to the FSMV's persistence remains high. It is a subspecies with a high level of taxonomic distinctness, and its potential for recovery is low due to its very

limited range in the coastal marshes near Cedar Key, Florida, and due to the risk of catastrophic loss from hurricanes and other storm events that can completely inundate the coastal marsh habitat.

A significant portion (92 percent) of the coastal marshes where the FSMV likely occurs is publicly owned. However, we do not know how the extent of existing management or lack of management in the salt marsh is affecting the FSMV.

Overutilization for commercial, recreational, scientific, or educational purposes is not known as a threat to recovery. Disease and predation are not known to be a threat to recovery.

Regulatory mechanisms are in place to aid in minimizing impacts from development on both privately owned lands and publicly managed lands.

Hurricanes and other severe storm events are a natural factor affecting the FSMV's continued existence. Given a very limited range of only two known populations within 5 miles of each other, a hurricane or strong storm event could cause a catastrophic decline or the extinction of this subspecies.

In summary, the FSMV continues to be in danger of extinction throughout all or a significant portion of its range due to its very small range and the threat from hurricanes and other storm events. Therefore, the Service recommends that the FSMV remain classified as endangered.

III. RESULTS

A. **Recommended Classification:** No change.

B. **New Recovery Priority Number:** No change.

IV. RECOMMENDATIONS FOR FUTURE ACTIONS

Acquire and protect the FSMV habitat at the original type locality and adjacent salt marsh habitats.

Establish an ongoing monitoring program at the two known locations of occurrence.

Conduct presence/absence surveys in potential FSMV habitat identified on LSNWR and other areas (Raabe and Gauron 2005).

Map potential FSMV habitat on Chassahowitzka NWR, St. Marks NWR, and other public lands between these refuges. Conduct presence/absence surveys in potential FSMV habitat identified.

Update recovery plan and develop objective, measurable recovery criteria.

Develop management techniques to manage for, optimize existing and create FSMV habitat (i.e., saltgrass marsh).

Evaluate establishing a captive breeding program for augmentation of existing populations and reintroductions as a recovery tool. Partner with land managers of publicly owned lands with potential FSMV habitat as potential reintroduction sites.

V. REFERENCES

Fivush, B., R. Parker, and R.H. Tamarin. 1975. Karyotype of the beach vole, *Microtus breweri*, and endemic island Species. Journal of Mammology 56:272-273.

Integrated Taxonomic Information System. 2007. http://www.itis.gov/servlet/SingleRpt/SingleRpt?search_topic=TSN&search_value =180297.

Kilpatrick, C.W. 1981. Genetic structure of insular populations. In M.H.Smith and J. Joule. Mammalian population genetics. University of Georgia Press, Athens. Pp. 28-59.

MacKenzie, T. 2004. Rare Voles Love Suwannee. Fish and Wildlife News. Summer 2004. p. 6.

Meehl, G.A., W.M. Washington, W.D. Collins, J.M. Arblaster, A. Hu, L.E. Buja, W.G. Strand, and H. Teng. 2005. How much more global warming and sea level rise? Science 307:1769-1772.

Raabe, E.A. and L.C. Gauron. 2005. Florida salt marsh vole habitat: Lower Suwannee NationalWildlife Refuge. St. Petersburg, FL, U.S. Geological Survey, Open-File Report 2005-1417.

Root, K.V. and J. Barnes. 2006. Risk assessment for a focal set of rare and imperiled wildlife in Florida. Draft Final Report fo FWC Contract No. 03111, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida. 248 pp.

Woods, C.A., W. Post, and C.W. Kilpatrick. 1982. *Microtus pennsylvanicus* (Rodentia: Muridae) in Florida: a Pleistocene relict in a coastal salt marsh. Bulletin of the Florida State Museum, Biological Science 28(2):25-52.

Woods, C.A. 1992. Florida Saltmarsh Vole, *Microtis pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli*. In S.R. Humphrey. Rare and Endangered Biota of Florida, Volume 1. Mammals. University Presses of Florida, Tallahassee. Pp. 131-139.

U.S. Fish and Widlife Service. 1997. Recovery plan for the Florida salt marsh vole. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Atlanta, Georgia. 9 pp.

U.S. FISH AND WILDLIFE SERVICE
5-YEAR REVIEW of Florida Salt Marsh Vole (*Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli*)

Current Classification: Endangered

Recommendation resulting from the 5-Year Review: No change

Review Conducted By: Bill Brooks

FIELD OFFICE APPROVAL:

Lead Field Supervisor, Fish and Wildlife Service

Approve _____ Date 6/5/08

REGIONAL OFFICE APPROVAL:

for Lead Regional Director, Fish and Wildlife Service

Approve _____ Date 6/4/08

APPENDIX A

Summary of peer review for the 5-year review of Florida Salt Marsh Vole (*Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli*)

A. Peer Review Method: See B. below.

B. Peer Review Charge: On January 18, 2008, the following letter and Guidance for Peer Reviewers of Five-Year Status Reviews were sent via e-mail to potential reviewers requesting comments on the 5-year review. Requests were sent to: Dr. Terry Doonan (Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission), Jeff Gore (Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission), Jeff Dimaggio (Florida Park Service, Florida Department of Environmental Protection), Melissa Charbonneau (Florida Park Service, Florida Department of Environmental Protection), Dr. Stephen Humphries (University of Florida), Dr. Lyn Branch (University of Florida), Dr. David Reed (Florida Natural History Museum), Dr. Charles A. Woods (retired Florida Natural History Museum) and Dr. W. David Webster, (University of North Carolina at Wilmington).

We request your assistance in serving as a peer reviewer of the U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service) 5-year status review of the endangered Florida salt marsh vole (Microtus pennsylvanicus dukecampbelli). The 5-year review is required by section 4(c)(2) of the Endangered Species Act of 1973, as amended (Act) (87 Stat. 884; 16 U.S.C. 1531 et seq.). A 5-year review is a periodic process conducted to ensure the listing classification of a species as threatened or endangered on the Federal List of Endangered and Threatened Wildlife and Plants is accurate. The initiation of the 5-year review for the Florida salt marsh vole was announced in the Federal Register on April 26, 2007, and the public comment period closed on June 25, 2007. No public comments were received for this status review.

The enclosed draft of the status review has been prepared by the Service pursuant to the Act. In keeping with Service directives for maintaining a high level of scientific integrity in the official documents our agency produces, we are seeking your assistance as a peer reviewer for this draft. Guidance for peer reviewers is enclosed with this letter. If you are able to assist us, we request your comments be received in this office on or before February 19, 2008. Please send your comments to Bill Brooks at the address on this letter. You may fax your comments to (904)232-2404 or send comments by e-mail to Billy_Brooks@fws.gov.

We appreciate your assistance in helping to ensure our decisions continue to be based on the best available science. If you have any questions or need additional information, please contact Bill Brooks at (904) 232-2580 extension 120. Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely yours,

David L. Hankla
Field Supervisor

Enclosures

Guidance for Peer Reviewers of Five-Year Status Reviews

U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, North Florida Ecological Services Office

January 6, 2008

As a peer reviewer, you are asked to adhere to the following guidance to ensure your review complies with Service policy.

Peer reviewers should:

1. *Review all materials provided by the Service.*

2. *Identify, review, and provide other relevant data apparently not used by the Service.*

3. *Not provide recommendations on the Endangered Species Act (ESA) classification (e.g., endangered, threatened) of the species.*

4. *Provide written comments on:*
   - *Validity of any models, data, or analyses used or relied on in the review.*
   - *Adequacy of the data (e.g., are the data sufficient to support the biological conclusions reached). If data are inadequate, identify additional data or studies that are needed to adequately justify biological conclusions.*
   - *Oversights, omissions, and inconsistencies.*
   - *Reasonableness of judgments made from the scientific evidence.*
   - *Scientific uncertainties by ensuring that they are clearly identified and characterized, and that potential implications of uncertainties for the technical conclusions drawn are clear.*
   - *Strengths and limitation of the overall product.*

5. *Keep in mind the requirement that we must use the best available scientific data in determining the species' status. This does not mean we must have statistically significant data on population trends or data from all known populations.*

All peer reviews and comments will be public documents, and portions may be incorporated verbatim into our final decision document with appropriate credit given to the author of the review.

Questions regarding this guidance, the peer review process, or other aspects of the Service's recovery planning process should be referred to Bill Brooks, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, at 904-232-2580 extension 120, email: billy_brooks@fws.gov.

C. Summary of Peer Review Comments/Report

A summary of peer review comments from four respondents is provided below. The complete set of comments is available at the Jacksonville Ecological Services Field Office, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, 6620 Southpoint Drive South, Suite 310 Jacksonville, Florida, 32216.

The Service accepted all minor edits from peer reviewers. Overall, the reviewers agreed the draft document adequately characterized the known information on the status and threats of the listed species. The following discussion is limited to the use of additional information that was provided.

Jeff Dimaggio, Florida Park Service, Florida Department of Environmental Protection: Mr. Dimaggio indicates that the review looks complete and clearly states the current status of the FSMV. He confirmed that the type locality habitat is still in private ownership, is for sale, and there is a proposal to develop a residential community on the site. He indicated that preservation and research are critical to maintaining the FSMV. We concur with Mr. Dimaggio and continue to recommend that the type locality habitat of the FSMV be targeted for conservation acquisition.

Dr. Lyn Branch, University of Florida: Dr. Branch noted that the PVA analysis cited in the review was based only upon potential habitat. She suggests that a PVA with realistic changes in demographic parameters with environmental stochasticity might produce very different results. We added language to the section and noted that adding stochasticity to a PVA could provide very different results. Dr. Branch recommends maintaining habitat connectivity. As significant portions of the FSMV habitat and potential habitat (close to 90%) within 20 miles of the type locality are in public lands being managed for conservation, we will ensure those land managers are aware of the needs of the FSMV. Dr. Branch also made several recommendations about the Future Actions section and provided specifics on improving these recommendations. The Future Actions section outlined several priority recovery actions and more detail can be found in the recovery plan. Dr. Branch's specific recommendations on improving these recovery actions will be considered and incorporated into the next revision of the recovery plan.

Dr. David Reed, Florida Natural History Museum: Dr. Reed made several editorial suggestions that were incorporated into the review. Dr. Reed also recommended adding information on the genetic variation description in section C.1.b. Genetics, genetic variation, or trends in genetic variation section. We added additional language and citations to this to further clarify this section.

Dr. W. David Webster, University of North Carolina at Wilmington: Dr. Webster recommended that under section C.1.a., language be incorporated indicating the FSMV competes directly with the marsh rice rat and to a lesser extent competes with cotton rats and cotton mice to better capture the nuances in diet and habitat requirements. We concurred with this recommendation and added additional information. Under section C.2.d., Dr. Webster finds the federal and state listing status ambiguous, as the FSMV is federally listed

as Endangered and state listed as a "Species of Concern." This is confusing, but it should be noted that the listing nomenclature between the federal and state listing processes are not synonymous as the listing processes are quite different. In addition, Dr. Webster made several editorial comments that were incorporated into the review.

D. Response to Peer Review – The Service agreed with all comments and suggestions provided by the peer reviewers. The draft five-year review was modified in accordance with the reviewers' suggestions.