

1
2

ANNEX F
INVASIVE AND NUISANCE SPECIES MANAGEMENT PLAN

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1			
2	F	INVASIVE AND NUISANCE SPECIES MANAGEMENT PLAN	F-1
3	F.1	Introduction	F-1
4	F.2	Status of Priority Species and Their Impacts	F-3
5	F.2.1	Plants	F-3
6	F.2.2	Widely Established Species	F-7
7	F.2.3	Localized/Potential Early Detection and Rapid Response Species	F-10
8	F.2.4	Animals	F-11
9	F.2.5	Localized/Early Detection Rapid Response Species	F-14
10	F.2.6	Other Species of Concern	F-16
11	F.3	Introduction to Management	F-16
12	F.3.1	Prevention	F-16
13	F.3.2	Monitoring	F-16
14	F.3.3	Early Detection and Rapid Response	F-17
15	F.3.4	Control and Management	F-17
16	F.3.5	Risk and Uncertainties Related to Invasive Species	F-18
17	F.4	Existing Management Programs	F-19
18	F.4.1	South Florida Water Management District	F-19
19	F.4.2	Lake Okeechobee	F-19
20	F.4.3	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers	F-19
21	F.4.4	U.S. Department of Agriculture / University of Florida	F-20
22	F.4.5	Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission	F-20
23	F.4.6	Invasive Animals	F-20
24	F.5	Existing Monitoring Programs	F-21
25	F.6	Management Strategy and Plan	F-21
26	F.6.1	Surveillance – Early Detection and Rapid Response	F-22
27	F.6.2	Control	F-23
28	F.6.3	Monitoring	F-24
29	F.6.4	Pre-construction Phase	F-24
30	F.6.5	Design and Construction Phases	F-24
31	F.6.6	Operational Testing and Monitoring Period	F-26
32	F.6.7	OMRR&R Phase	F-26
33	F.6.8	Specific Control by Project Feature – Construction Phase	F-26
34	F.6.9	Specific Control by Project Feature – OMRR&R Phase	F-27
35	F.7	Education/Outreach	F-28
36	F.7.1	Education / Outreach Opportunities at Recreational Areas	F-28
37	F.8	Costs	F-28
38	F.9	References	F-29
39			

1
2
3
4
5
6

LIST OF TABLES

Table F-1. Summary of Invasive Plant Species Documented in the Project Area..... F-2
Table F-2. Invasive Plant Species Documented in the Project Area. F-4
Table F-3. Invasive Animal Species Documented in the Project Area. F-12
Table F-4. Invasive and Nuisance Species Management Costs. F-29

1 F INVASIVE AND NUISANCE SPECIES MANAGEMENT PLAN

2 In accordance with the Comprehensive Everglades Restoration Plan (CERP) Guidance Memorandum
3 062.00, Invasive Species, Lake Okeechobee Component A Storage Reservoir (LOCAR) will incorporate
4 invasive and nuisance species assessments and management of those species into pertinent planning
5 documents and phases of the project. The Invasive and Nuisance Species Management Plan (INSMP) is a
6 living document and will be updated throughout the Design; Construction; and Operations, Maintenance,
7 Repair, Replacement, and Rehabilitation (OMRR&R) phases.

8 The Project Partnership Agreement (PPA) and the Construction Phasing, Transfer, and Warranty (CPTW)
9 Plan will be developed and agreed upon prior to construction. These documents outline the
10 responsibilities of the federal government and non-federal sponsor during the construction phase, the
11 operational testing and monitoring period, and the OMRR&R phase, and will include the cost estimates
12 associated with this INSMP. This INSMP must be included with the CPTW Plan.

13 F.1 Introduction

14 The Project Area covers a portion of the Lake Okeechobee Watershed in Florida. It includes five sub-basins
15 (totaling approximately 920,000 acres) within the Lake Okeechobee Watershed and includes portions of
16 Glades, Highlands, Okeechobee, St. Lucie, and Martin Counties, along with the Seminole Tribe of Florida
17 (STOF) Brighton Reservation. Most LOCAR features are located in the Indian Prairie sub-basin. The Study
18 Area includes the Project Area, along with Lake Okeechobee and the Caloosahatchee and St. Lucie
19 Estuaries.

20 Nationally, more than 50,000 species of introduced plants, animals, and microbes cause more than \$120
21 billion in economic damages and control costs each year (Pimentel et al. 2005). Not all introduced species
22 become invasive species. According to the U.S. Congress Office of Technology Assessment's Harmful Non-
23 Indigenous Species in the United States Report (1993), approximately 10 to 15 percent of introduced
24 species will become established and 10 percent of the established species may become invasive.

25 Executive Order 13112, entitled *Invasive Species*, signed February 3, 1999, states "an invasive species
26 means an alien species whose introduction does or is likely to cause economic or environmental harm or
27 harm to human health." Alien species means "with respect to a particular ecosystem, any species,
28 including its seeds, eggs, spores or other biological material capable of propagating that species, that is not
29 native to that ecosystem." Invasive species are broadly defined and can be a plant, animal, fungus, plant
30 disease, livestock disease, or other organism. The terms 'alien' and 'exotic' also refer to non-native
31 species. A native species is defined as a species that historically occurred or currently occurs in a particular
32 ecosystem and is not the result of an introduction.

33 Invasive non-native species decrease biodiversity, displace native plant and animal communities, reduce
34 wildlife habitat and forage opportunities, alter the rates of soil erosion and accretion, alter fire regimes,
35 upset predator/prey relationships, alter hydrology, degrade environmental quality, and spread diseases
36 to native plants, animals, and other organisms. Furthermore, invasive species are the second largest
37 threat to biodiversity following only habitat destruction (Wilcove et al. 1998). In the United States,
38 invasive species directly contributed to the decline of 49 percent of threatened and endangered species
39 (Wilcove et al. 1998). In addition to environmental impacts, invasive species can impact human health;

1 reduce agricultural production and property values; degrade aesthetic quality; decrease recreational
 2 opportunities; and threaten the integrity of human infrastructure such as waterways/navigation channel,
 3 locks, levees, dams, and water control structures.

4 Florida is particularly vulnerable to the introduction, invasion, and naturalization of non-native species.
 5 This is due to several factors including its subtropical climate; dense human population centers; major
 6 ports of entry; and the pet, aquarium, and ornamental plant industries. Major disturbance to the
 7 landscape has also increased Florida's vulnerability to invasive species. Alteration of the landscape for
 8 urban development, flood control, and agricultural uses has exacerbated non-native plant and animal
 9 invasions. Florida is listed as one of the states with the largest number of invasive species. This list also
 10 includes Hawaii, California, and Louisiana. On average, 10 new organisms per year are introduced into
 11 Florida that are capable of establishing and becoming invasive and causing environmental harm.
 12 Approximately 90 percent of the plants and animals that enter the continental United States enter through
 13 the port of Miami (Cuda 2009a). Stein et al. (2000) estimated that over 32,000 exotic species (25,000
 14 plants and 7,000 animals) have been introduced into Florida. Approximately 4,000 to 5,000 native species
 15 of plants and animals live in Florida. The number of non-native species that have been introduced is eight
 16 times the total number of native species in the entire state.

17 *The Guide to the Vascular Plants of Florida* (Wunderlin 2008) documented 3,834 plant species in Florida.
 18 Of these, 1,180 were considered non-native and were naturalized (freely reproducing) populations. The
 19 Florida Invasive Species Council (FISC) identifies 81 of the 1,180 species of non-native plants as Category I
 20 species and 87 as Category II species in the 2019 Invasive Plant List (FLEPPC 2011). Invasive exotics are
 21 termed Category I invasives when they are altering native plant communities by displacing native species,
 22 changing community structures or ecological functions, or hybridizing with natives (FLEPPC 2011).
 23 Category II invasive exotics have increased in abundance or frequency but have not yet altered Florida
 24 plant communities to the extent shown by Category I species (FLEPPC 2011). These species may become
 25 Category I if ecological damage is demonstrated (FLEPPC 2011). Searches through existing data and
 26 resources indicate 74 non-native plant species have been documented to occur within the Project Area
 27 (**Table F-1**). Other non-native species are probably present; however, documented citations could not be
 28 located. Of the 74 species of plants documented to occur within the Project Area, there are 44 FLEPPC
 29 Category I species, 12 FLEPPC Category II species, and 15 Florida Noxious Weed species (FLEPPC 2011).

30 **Table F-1. Summary of Invasive Plant Species Documented in the Project Area.¹**

Category	Total Number of Species
Total Non-native Plants	74
Total FLEPPC Category I	44
Total FLEPPC Category II	12
Total Noxious Weeds	15

¹ This list was compiled from the 2019 Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council (FLEPPC) Category I and II species lists. It was cross-checked with species occurrences reported in Early Detection and Distribution Mapping System (EDDMapS) for Broward, Charlotte, Collier, DeSoto, Glades, Hendry, Highlands, Lee, Miami-Dade, Martin, Monroe, Okeechobee, Palm Beach, and St. Lucie counties. Any of the FLEPPC species that had not been recorded in these counties were removed from the list. The list also includes any species that are being actively managed in these areas by the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers or the National Park Service (based on Weed Data and Reports [WEEDAR] data).

1 Significant scientific evidence and research documents invasive non-native plants are degrading and
2 damaging south Florida’s natural ecosystems (Doren and Ferriter 2001). Many species are causing
3 significant ecological impacts by crowding out and displacing native plants, altering soil types and
4 soil/water chemistry, altering ecosystem functions such as carbon sequestration, nutrient cycling and fire
5 regimes, and reducing gene pools and genetic diversity. It has also been documented that 19 species within
6 Florida are among the world’s worst weeds (Holm et al. 1977). It is estimated that federal, state, and
7 county agencies in Florida spend between \$94 million and \$127 million each year in an effort to manage
8 invasive non-native plants (GAO 2000).

9 Non-native invasive animal distribution, extent, and impacts are not well understood; however,
10 implications of invasive animals are apparent in central and south Florida. Searches through existing data
11 and resources indicate 51 non-native animal species have been documented to occur within the Project
12 Area (See **Appendix C**). Other non-native animal species are probably present; however, documented
13 citations could not be located. Information regarding species presence and distribution is largely
14 incomplete for most taxonomic groups of animals. Not all of the 51 non-native animal species identified
15 and documented to occur within the LOCAR area will have a significant impact on the ecosystem.

16 Invasive species are a major threat to the success of CERP. The intent of CERP is to restore, preserve, and
17 protect the south Florida ecosystem while providing for other water-related needs of the region (Corps
18 and SFWMD 2010). CERP focuses on hydrologic restoration to improve degraded natural habitat in the
19 south Florida ecosystem. Hydrologic restoration alone cannot ensure habitat restoration (Corps and
20 SFWMD 2010). To restore the Everglades and ensure south Florida’s natural ecosystems are preserved
21 and remain intact, invasive species must be comprehensively addressed (Doren and Ferriter 2001). Lack
22 of management will allow invasive non-native species to flourish and out-compete native species.

23 **F.2 Status of Priority Species and Their Impacts**

24 **F.2.1 Plants**

25 Searches through existing data and resources indicate 74 non-native plant species have been documented
26 to occur within the Project Area. The species list is presented in **Table F-2**. Other non-native species are
27 probably present; however, documented citations could not be located. Of the 74 species of plants
28 documented to occur within the Project Area, there are 44 FISC Category I species, 12 FISC Category II
29 species, and 15 Florida Noxious Weed species.

30 Some plant species can exhibit traits similar to invasive species and become problematic in their native
31 ecosystem under certain conditions. A primary native nuisance species within the Project Area is cattail
32 (*Typha* spp.). Many areas within the Project Area have been invaded by cattails. This is attributed to water
33 with increased phosphorus being delivered to these areas which began in the late 1950s. Areas where
34 water control structures, conveyance features, and levees exist provide a suitable habitat for invasion and
35 expansion of cattail.

1 **Table F-2. Invasive Plant Species Documented in the Project Area.**

Invasive Plant Species		Region Documented In				FISC Category
Common Name	Scientific Name	LO	NE	EAA	GE	
Rosary pea	<i>Abrus precatorius L.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Mimosa	<i>Albizia julibrissin Durazz.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Woman's tongue	<i>Albizia lebeck (L.) Benth</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Alligator weed	<i>Alternanthera philoxeroides (Mart.) Griseb.</i>	x	x	x	x	II
Coral ardisia	<i>Ardisia crenata Sims</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Shoebuttan ardisia	<i>Ardisia elliptica Thunb</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Sprenger's asparagus fern	<i>Asparagus aethiopicus L.</i>	x	x	x	x	
River she-oak	<i>Casuarina cunninghamiana Miq.</i>	x	x	x	x	
Australian pine	<i>Casuarina equisetifolia L.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Mission grass	<i>Cenchrus pennisetum</i>					
Watersprite	<i>Ceratopteris thalictroides</i>	x				
Camphor tree	<i>Cinnamomum camphora (L.) J. Presl</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Coco yam, Wild taro	<i>Colocasia esculenta (L.) Schott</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Showy rattlebox	<i>Crotalaria spectabilis Roth</i>	x	x	x	x	
Carrotwood	<i>Cupaniopsis anacardioides (A. Rich.) Radlk.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Cuban bulrush	<i>Cyperus blepharoleptos</i>	x	x	x	x	
Umbrella plant	<i>Cyperus involucratus Rottb</i>	x	x	x	x	II
Miniature flatsedge, dwarf papyrus	<i>Cyperus prolifer Lam</i>	x	x	x	x	II
Indian rosewood	<i>Dalbergia sissoo Roxb. ex DC.</i>	x	x	x	x	
Air potato	<i>Dioscorea bulbifera L.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Brazilian waterweed	<i>Egeria densa</i>	x	x	x	x	
Water hyacinth	<i>Eichhornia crassipes (Mart.) Solms</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Surinam cherry	<i>Eugenia uniflora L.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Chinese crown orchid	<i>Eulophia graminea</i>	x	x	x	x	II
Chinese banyan	<i>Ficus microcarpa L. f.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Limpoglass	<i>Hemarthria altissima (Poir.) Stapf & C.E. Hubbard</i>	x	x	x	x	II
Hydrilla	<i>Hydrilla verticillata (L. f.) Royle</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Miramar weed	<i>Hygrophila polysperma (Roxb.) T. Anders.</i>	x	x		x	I
West Indian marsh grass	<i>Hymenachne amplexicaulis (Rudge) Nees</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Cogongrass	<i>Imperata cylindrica (L.) Beauv.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Swamp morning glory	<i>Ipomoea aquatica Forssk.</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Dotted duckmeat, Spotted duckweed	<i>Landoltia punctata</i>	x	x		x	II

Common Name	Scientific Name	LO	NE	EAA	GE	FISC Category
Lantana, Shrub verbena	<i>Lantana camara</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Limnophila	<i>Limnophila sessiliflora</i> (Vahl) Blume	x	x	x	x	II
Primrose willow	<i>Ludwigia peruviana</i> (L.) Hara	x	x	x	x	I
Tropical American watergrass	<i>Luziola subintegra</i>		x		x	I
Japanese climbing fern	<i>Lygodium japonicum</i> (Thunb. ex Murr.) Sw.	x	x	x	x	I
Old World climbing fern	<i>Lygodium microphyllum</i> (Cav.) R. Br.	x	x	x	x	I
Guineagrass	<i>Megathyrsus maximus</i> (Jacq.) R. Webster	x	x	x	x	
Melaleuca	<i>Melaleuca quinquenervia</i> (Cav.) Blake	x	x	x	x	I
Chinaberry	<i>Melia azedarach</i> L.	x	x	x	x	
Natalgrass	<i>Melinis repens</i> (Willd.) Zizka	x	x	x	x	I
Parrot feather	<i>Myriophyllum aquaticum</i>	x	x	x	x	
Asian swordfern	<i>Nephrolepis brownii</i> (Desv.) Hovenkamp & Miyam.	x	x	x	x	I
Narrow swordfern	<i>Nephrolepis cordifolia</i> (L.) C. Presl	x	x	x	x	
Burmareed	<i>Neyraudia reynaudiana</i> (Kunth) Keng ex A.S. Hitchc.	x	x	x	x	I
Cape Blue waterlily	<i>Nymphaea capensis</i> var. <i>zanzibariensis</i>	x	x	x	x	
Crested floating heart	<i>Nymphoides cristata</i> (Roxb.) O. Ktze.	x	x	x	x	I
Torpedograss	<i>Panicum repens</i>				x	I
Elephant grass, Napier grass	<i>Pennisetum purpureum</i> Schumacher	x	x	x	x	I
Water lettuce	<i>Pistia stratiotes</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Strawberry guava	<i>Psidium cattleianum</i> Sabine	x	x	x	x	I
Guava	<i>Psidium guajava</i> L.	x	x	x	x	I
Downy rose myrtle	<i>Rhodomyrtus tomentosa</i> (Ait.) Hassk.	x	x	x	x	I
Castorbean	<i>Ricinus communis</i> L.	x	x	x	x	
Wild sugarcane	<i>Saccharum spontaneum</i>	x			x	
Water fern	<i>Salvinia minima</i> Baker	x	x	x	x	I
Giant salvinia	<i>Salvinia molesta</i>				x	
Iguanatail	<i>Sansevieria hyacinthoides</i> (L.) Druce	x	x	x	x	II
Brazilian peppertree	<i>Schinus terebinthifolius</i> Raddi	x	x	x	x	I
Lakeshore nutrush	<i>Scleria lacustris</i> C. Wright	x	x	x	x	I
Climbing cassia	<i>Senna pendula</i> var. <i>glabrata</i>	x	x	x	x	I
Twoleaf nightshade	<i>Solanum diphyllum</i> L.	x	x	x	x	II
Jamaican nightshade	<i>Solanum jamaicense</i>	x	x			
Wetland nightshade	<i>Solanum tampicense</i> Dunal	x	x	x	x	I
Turkeyberry	<i>Solanum torvum</i> Sw.	x	x	x	x	

Common Name	Scientific Name	LO	NE	EAA	GE	FISC Category
Tropical soda apple	<i>Solanum viarum</i> Dunal	x	x	x	x	I
Bay Biscayne creeping oxeye	<i>Sphagneticola trilobata</i> (L.C. Rich.) Pruski	x	x	x	x	
Java plum	<i>Syzygium cumini</i> (L.) Skeels	x	x	x	x	I
Chinese tallowtree	<i>Triadica sebifera</i> (L.) Small	x	x		x	I
Caesarweed	<i>Urena lobata</i> L.	x	x	x	x	I
Paragrass	<i>Urochloa mutica</i> (Forsk.) T.Q. Nguyen	x	x	x	x	I
Washington fan palm	<i>Washingtonia robusta</i>		x		x	II
Arrowleaf elephant's ear	<i>Xanthosoma sagittifolium</i>	x	x	x	x	II

1

1 **F.2.2 Widely Established Species**

2 Plants that are widely established within the Project Area that are managed for long term suppression
3 include Brazilian pepper (*Schinus terebinthifolius*), cogongrass (*Imperata cylindrica*), torpedograss
4 (*Panicum repens*), creeping water-primrose (*Ludwigia* spp.), water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*), water
5 lettuce (*Pistia stratiotes*), and hydrilla (*Hydrilla verticillata*) (SFER 2022).

6 **F.2.2.1 Brazilian Pepper**

7 Brazilian pepper is an evergreen shrub or tree that can grow up to 40 feet tall. It forms dense thickets and
8 is a prolific seed producer. It produces a small bright red fruit in the form of a spherical drupe. Brazilian
9 pepper is native to Brazil, Argentina, and Paraguay and was imported in the 1840s as an ornamental plant
10 (Langeland and Burks 1998). Brazilian pepper inhabits natural areas such as pinelands, hardwood
11 hammocks, and mangrove forests. It is an aggressive pioneer species that quickly colonizes and thrives in
12 disturbed areas (Francis n.d.) such as fallow farmland, fence lines, rights-of-way, roadsides, canal banks,
13 and levees. Seeds are spread primarily by birds and mammals through consumption and deposition of the
14 fruit. Seeds are also spread by flowing water (Langeland and Burks 1998). Brazilian pepper seedlings will
15 not tolerate inundation and are quickly killed; however, large plants can withstand 6 months of flooding
16 (Francis n.d.) with several feet of inundation. Brazilian pepper forms dense monocultures and completely
17 shades out, crowds, and displaces native vegetation. It also produces allelopathic agents that possibly
18 suppress the growth of other plants. Brazilian pepper is a member of the family Anacardiaceae, which
19 includes plants such as poison ivy, poison oak, and poison sumac. The leaves, flowers, and fruits of
20 Brazilian pepper produce a chemical that can irritate and form a rash on human skin and cause respiratory
21 problems (Langland and Burks 1998).

22 **F.2.2.2 Earleaf Acacia**

23 Earleaf acacia (*Acacia auriculiformis*) is a tree species growing up to 15 meters (50 feet) tall which was
24 introduced in Florida in the 1930's as an ornamental tree (Minteer et al., 2020). It has alternate curved
25 leaves with prominent parallel veins and produces oblong-shaped fruit that twist and become woody at
26 maturity. The leaf litter of earleaf acacia is potentially allelopathic which would reduce competition,
27 promoting a monospecific population of earleaf acacia (Ferreira et al. 2021). This fast-growing tree that
28 can produce up to 47,000 seeds per year readily invades pinelands, scrub, hammocks, and rights-of-ways.
29 If left unmanaged, earleaf acacia will create tall thickets in natural areas and along the banks of canals and
30 lakes.

31 **F.2.2.3 Tropical Soda Apple**

32 Tropical soda apple (*Solanum viarum*) is a Florida and federal noxious weed that is widespread in disturbed
33 soils all over the Southeastern United States while also invading natural habitats in Florida. It is a perennial
34 herbaceous shrub growing between 3 and 6 feet in height. Its most distinctive feature is long yellow thorns
35 growing on the stem and leaves. It produces round fruits that swell and ripen to yellow. Tropical soda
36 apple produces brown seeds, which are poisonous, making this invasive species a priority to control on
37 cattle lands. It can produce hundreds of seeds, facilitating its spread even when few plants are present.

38 **F.2.2.4 Torpedograss**

39 Torpedograss (*Panicum repens*) is a perennial grass that can grow up to 3 feet tall. It has extended
40 rhizomes that can be rooted or floating. It has a panicle-type inflorescence that is 3 to 9 inches long. It

1 flowers nearly year round. Torpedograss reproduces primarily through rhizome extension and
2 fragmentation. It is native to Africa and Asia and was introduced into the Gulf Coast of the United States
3 before 1876. Torpedograss seed was introduced as a forage crop in the south and was planted in almost
4 every southern Florida County by 1950. It is drought tolerant and grows in upland areas but thrives in
5 areas with moist to wet sandy or organic soil. It inhabits scrub, coastal flatwoods, upper tidal marshes,
6 mesic flatwoods, herbaceous wetlands, wet prairies, swales, lake shores, canals, and other disturbed sites.
7 Torpedograss can quickly form a monoculture and displace native vegetation. In 1992, it was present in
8 approximately 70 percent of the public waters in Florida. The largest population of torpedograss was
9 present in Lake Okeechobee. Approximately 14,000 acres of torpedograss displaced native plants in the
10 Lake's marsh (Langeland et al. 2008). Torpedograss is present in agricultural and water conveyance canals
11 throughout the Project Area and has potential to spread into areas with the removal of levees and
12 backfilling canals.

13 **F.2.2.5 Cogongrass**

14 Cogongrass is a perennial grass that grows in compact bunches and produces extensive rhizomes. The leaf
15 blades are erect and narrow with a whitish midvein off center and leaves can be 1 to 4 feet in length. The
16 inflorescence is narrow, white, and plume-like. Cogongrass flowers in the spring, fall, and sometimes year-
17 round. It produces seeds that are spread by wind, animals, and equipment. Cogongrass is native to
18 southeast Asia and was introduced into Florida in the 1930s and 1940s for forage and soil stabilization in
19 Gainesville, Brooksville, and Withlacoochee. More than 1,000 acres of cogongrass was established in
20 central and northwest Florida by 1949. Cogongrass inhabits dry to moist sites and has been documented to
21 occur in xeric hammocks, mesic flatwoods, herbaceous marshes, and floodplain forests (Langeland et al.
22 2008). It has extensively invaded disturbed areas such as fallow pastures (FDEP n.d.) and is commonly
23 found along transportation and utility corridors (Langeland et al. 2008). Cogongrass forms dense stands
24 which results in almost complete displacement of native plants. Dense stands of cogongrass also create a
25 severe fire hazard, especially when mixed with other volatile fuels (FDEP n.d.).

26 **F.2.2.6 Elephant grass**

27 Elephant grass (*Pennisetum purpureum*) is an up to 15-foot-tall invasive grass species intentionally
28 introduced as a forage for bovine that has naturalized in Florida and now infests wetlands, rights-of-ways,
29 ditches, canal banks, and irrigated areas in central and south Florida. Elephant grass can be identified by
30 its long, cylindrical spike inflorescence that emerges at the top of the stem and its wide, finely serrated
31 leaves which can be several feet long. This species is often misidentified as mission grass—an emerging
32 invasive grass species in central and south Florida. Elephant grass creates thick monocultures by
33 outgrowing native grasses and shading out other early successional species. Its tall dense growth can
34 impede use of boat ramps, block rights-of-way access, impede flow in ditches and canals, reduce visibility
35 on roadways, and cause difficulty for mowing.

36 **F.2.2.7 Water Lettuce**

37 Water lettuce is a floating aquatic plant native to South America. The plant reproduces extremely quickly
38 except in the coolest months. It reproduces both vegetatively and from seed, which is found to be up to
39 80 percent viable (Dray and Center 1989). Water lettuce was reported as early as 1765 by William Bartram
40 as forming dense mats on the St. Johns River. It forms large floating mats that block navigation, impact

1 water control structures, degrade water quality, and dramatically alter native plant and animal
2 communities.

3 **F.2.2.8 Water Hyacinth**

4 Water hyacinth is a floating aquatic plant native to tropical South America that was introduced in Florida
5 in 1884. The plant reproduces extremely quickly; it grows at explosive rates that exceed any other tested
6 vascular plant (Wolverton and McDonald 1979). Vegetative reproduction occurs rapidly except in the
7 coolest months. It forms large floating mats that block navigation, impact water control structures,
8 degrade water quality, and dramatically alter native plant and animal communities (Gowanlock 1944;
9 Penfound and Earle 1948). New plants are produced vegetatively and from seed, which germinate
10 abundantly on exposed moist soils (Perez 2011). Water hyacinth has low-nutrient needs and wide
11 tolerance for water conditions that enable it to persist and spread.

12 **F.2.2.9 Hydrilla**

13 Hydrilla (*Hydrilla verticillata*) is a rooted, submerged plant that often forms dense mats throughout the
14 water column, creating a monoculture which displaces native plant communities. It is designated as a
15 Federal Noxious Weed and a Florida Prohibited Aquatic Plant. It is native to the Old World and Indo-Pacific
16 and was likely first introduced to Florida in the 1950s as a consequence of aquarium dumping. Hydrilla
17 also supports the growth of a cyanobacterial epiphyte (*Aetokthonos hydrillicola*) which produces an avian
18 toxin affecting herbivorous waterbirds and their avian predators, like coots (*Fulica americana*) and bald
19 eagles (*Haliaeetus leucocephalus*) (Wilde 2005, Wilde 2014, Martin 2015). It is found in all types of Florida
20 waterbodies, and it has been present in Lake Okeechobee for over 20 years.

21 **F.2.2.10 Hygrophila**

22 West Indian hygrophila (*Hygrophila polysperma*) is a rooted, submerged plant native to the East Indies,
23 India, and Malaysia. It is a Federal Noxious Weed, but continues to be sold by aquarium suppliers. West
24 Indian hygrophila grows in both quiescent and still waters where it can quickly grow to the water's surface
25 and shade out native submerged plants. It spreads both vegetatively and by seed. West Indian hygrophila
26 produces great biomass and in windy conditions it can create a floating mass that is problematic for water
27 control structures.

28 **F.2.2.11 Limnophila**

29 Limnophila (*Limnophila sessiliflora*) is typically submerged aquatic macrophyte that can that root in up to
30 12 feet of water but is polymorphic with emersed growth. Its leaves occur in whorls and are dark green
31 with submersed leaves finely dissected while emersed leaves are lance-shaped with irregular serrations.
32 Its flowers are often small, light purple, and sessile. Limnophila produces seeds and can regrow from
33 fragments. With a rapid growth rate, limnophila can clog canals and pump stations.

34 **F.2.2.12 Creeping Water Primrose**

35 A complex of invasive aquatic *Ludwigia* species (*Ludwigia* spp.) native to South and Central America has
36 become widely established in Florida. Involved species include *L. grandiflora*, *L. hexapetala*, *L.*
37 *uruguayensis*, and *L. peploides*. Young plants of the creeping water primrose grow horizontally across the
38 surface of the water, spreading into other plant communities. When mature, some grow upright to form
39 dense stands up to 6 feet tall, and the dense rhizome mats fill the water column. Allelopathic effects

1 further contribute to the plant’s invasiveness (Dandelot et al. 2008). They are currently found from
2 Kissimmee to Lake Okeechobee and are reported from many other Florida waterbodies.

3 **F.2.2.13 Cattail**

4 Cattail (*Typha* spp.) are native to Florida and occur in wetlands, lakes, rivers, canals, stormwater treatment
5 areas, and other disturbed sites. Cattail grow up to 12 feet tall and have strap-like leaf blades. The
6 inflorescence is spike-like with very tiny flowers. This plant is a primary native nuisance species within the
7 Project Area. Many areas within the Project Area have been invaded by cattail. This is attributed to water
8 with increased phosphorus being delivered to these areas which began in the late 1950s (Holmes et al.
9 2002). Areas where water control structures, conveyance features, and levees exist provide a suitable
10 habitat for invasion and expansion of cattail.

11 **F.2.2.14 Green Iguana**

12 The green iguana (*Iguana iguana*) is a large lizard native to Central and South America and extending to
13 the eastern Caribbean (FWC 2018). Green iguanas can be found on the ground, in shrubs, or in trees in a
14 variety of habitats, from agricultural and natural areas to suburban developments. They are excellent
15 swimmers and are often found near canals and waterways. Male green iguanas can reach lengths of 1.5
16 meters and can feed on a variety of vegetation, fruits, bird eggs, and dead animals. This species is
17 characterized by its green coloration, row of spikes down the center of its neck, back, and upper section
18 of the tail, which is banded with dark rings. Mature male iguanas display heavy jowls and a large throat
19 fan, used both for sexual selection and self-defense.

20 Green iguanas were first reported in Florida in the 1960s in Hialeah, Coral Gables, and Key Biscayne along
21 Miami-Dade’s southeastern coast (FWC 2018). Breeding populations now extend along the Atlantic coast
22 in Collier and Lee counties, as well as in Hendry County at Lake Okeechobee. Reports have been made as
23 far north as Alachua, Highlands, Hillsborough, Indian River, and St. Lucie counties (FWC 2018). Those
24 reported in more northern counties are likely individual pet releases, as green iguanas are not cold
25 resistant and will be unlikely to establish breeding populations in these locations. In cleared habitats such
26 as canal banks and vacant lots, green iguanas reside in burrows, culverts, drainage pipes, and rock or
27 debris piles. Central and south Florida’s extensive man-made canals serve as ideal dispersal corridors to
28 further allow iguanas to colonize new areas (FWC 2018). Green iguanas cause damage to residential and
29 commercial landscape foliage and are often considered a nuisance by landowners. Some iguanas may
30 even cause damage to infrastructure by digging burrows that erode and collapse sidewalks, foundations,
31 seawalls, berms, levees, and canal banks (FWC 2018). It is vital that this species be actively managed
32 throughout central and south Florida to prevent further damage to infrastructure and native vegetation.

33 **F.2.3 Localized/Potential Early Detection and Rapid Response Species**

34 Four Cooperative Invasive Species Management Areas (CISMA) cover portions of the Project Area. These
35 include Heartland, Southwest, Treasure Coast, and Lake Okeechobee CISMAs.

36 The Heartland CISMA includes Polk, Hardee, Desoto, Highlands, and Okeechobee counties. The CISMA’s
37 Early Detection and Rapid Response (EDRR) list includes the following species: sisal (*Agave sisalana*), coral
38 ardisia (*Ardisia crenata*), crested Philippine violet (*Barleria cristata*), basket plant (*Callisia fragrans*), day
39 jessamine (*Cestrum diurum*), carrotwood (*Cupaniopsis anacardioides*), Japanese dodder (*Cuscuta*
40 *japonica*), foxtail flatsedge (*Cyperus alopecuroides*), cerulean flaxsedge (*Dianella ensifolia*), aroma

1 (*Dichrostachys cinera* subsp. *Africana*), lesser roundweed (*Hyptis brevipes*), cowitch (*Mucuna pruriens*),
2 red-root floater (*Phyllanthus fluitans*), Praxlies (*Praxelis clematidea*), kudzu (*Pueraria montana* var.
3 *lobata*), downy rose myrtle (*Rhodomyrtus tomentosa*), Britton's wild petunia (*Ruellia simplex*), tropical
4 nutrush (*Scleria microcarpa*), java plum (*Syzygium cumini*), sea hibiscus (*Talipariti tiliaceum*), portia tree
5 (*Thespesia populnea*), boatlily (*Tradescantia spathacea*), and paragrass (*Urochloa mutica*).

6 The Southwest CISMA includes Charlotte, Glades, Lee, Hendry, and Collier counties. The following species
7 are considered to be EDRR species: sisal (*Agave sisalana*), nightflowering jessamine (*Cestrum nocturnum*),
8 grand eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus grandis*), Torell's eucalyptus (*Eucalyptus torelliana*), swamp morning glory
9 (*Ipomoea aquatica*), and giant salvinia (*Salvinia molesta*).

10 The Lake Okeechobee Aquatic Plant Management CISMA has identified the following EDRR species for
11 Lake Okeechobee: earleaf acacia (*Acacia auriculiformis*), bishopwood (*Bischofia javanica*), carrotwood
12 (*Cupaniopsis anacardioides*), tropical American watergrass (*Luziola subintegra*), and paragrass (*Urochloa*
13 *mutica*).

14 **F.2.3.1 Other Species of Concern**

15 Other species that are present within or are likely to invade the LOCAR project footprint and cause
16 environmental harm include Napier grass (*Pennisetum purpureum*), climbing cassia (*Senna pendula* var.
17 *glabrata*), Wright's nutrush (*Scleria lacustris*), castor bean (*Ricinus communis*), crested floating heart
18 (*Nymphoides cristata*), and West Indian marsh grass (*Hymenachne amplexicaulis*).

19 **F.2.4 Animals**

20 Searches through existing data and resources indicate 51 animal species have been documented to occur
21 within the Project Area (**Table F-3**). Other non-native animal species are probably present; however,
22 documented citations could not be located. Information regarding species presence and distribution is
23 largely incomplete for most taxonomic groups of animals. Not all of the 51 non-native animal species
24 identified and documented to occur in the LOCAR Project Area will have a significant impact on the
25 ecosystem.

26 Key species of carnivorous reptiles, such as the Burmese python (*Python molurus bivittatus*) and Nile
27 monitor (*Varanus niloticus*) have been located within the Project Area. At present time, these occurrences
28 have been isolated, but there is concern regarding further spread of these species from south of the
29 Project Area. These species have potential to cause significant impacts to the ecosystem and are among
30 central and south Florida's most threatening invasive animals. These species are considered top predators
31 and increase additional pressures on native wildlife populations, particularly threatened and endangered
32 species (SFER 2013). Other species of concern include the island apple snail (*Pomacea insularum*), purple
33 swampfen (*Porphyrio porphyrio*), feral pig (*Sus scrofa*), Mexican bromeliad weevil (*Metamasius callizona*),
34 Cuban treefrog (*Osteopilus septentrionalis*), redbay ambrosia beetle (*Xyleborus glabratus*), and associated
35 fungus (*Raffaelea lauricola*). Two additional key carnivorous reptiles have potential to cause significant
36 ecological impacts in the Project Area: the Argentine black and white tegu (*Salvator merianae*) and
37 northern African python (*Python sebae*).

38

1 **Table F-3. Invasive Animal Species Documented in the Project Area.**

Invasive Animal Species		Region Documented In			
Common Name	Scientific Name	LO	NE	EAA	GE
BIRDS					
Common myna	<i>Acridotheres tristis</i>	x	x	x	x
Egyptian geese	<i>Alopochen aegyptiacus</i>	x	x	x	x
Muscovy duck	<i>Cairina moschata</i>	x	x	x	x
House finch	<i>Carpodacus mexicanus</i>	x	x	x	x
Rock dove	<i>Columba livia</i>	x	x	x	x
Budgerigar	<i>Melopsittacus undulatus</i>	x	x		x
Monk parakeet	<i>Myiopsitta monachus</i>	x	x	x	x
House sparrow	<i>Passer domesticus</i>	x	x	x	x
Common pheasant	<i>Phasianus colchicus</i>	x	x	x	x
Purple swampphen	<i>Porphyrio porphyrio</i>	x	x	x	x
Eurasian collared dove	<i>Streptopelia decaocto</i>	x	x	x	x
African collared dove	<i>Streptopelia roseogrisea</i>	x	x	x	x
European starling	<i>Sturnus vulgaris</i>	x	x	x	x
White-winged dove	<i>Zenaida asiatica</i>	x	x	x	x
REPTILES & AMPHIBIANS					
African redhead agama	<i>Agama agama</i>	x	x	x	x
Largehead anole	<i>Anolis cybotes</i>	x	x		
Knight anole	<i>Anolis equestris equestris</i>	x	x	x	x
Brown anole	<i>Anolis sagrei</i>	x	x		
Greenhouse frog	<i>Eleutherodactylus planirostris</i>		x		
Green anaconda	<i>Eunectes murinus</i>				x
African spurred tortoise	<i>Geochelone sulcata</i>	x	x	x	x
Tropical house gecko	<i>Hemidactylus mabouia</i>	x	x	x	x
Green iguana	<i>Iguana iguana</i>	x	x	x	x
Northern curlytail lizard	<i>Leiocephalus carinatus armouri</i>	x	x	x	x
Cuban treefrog	<i>Osteopilus septentrionalis</i>	x	x	x	x
Ball python	<i>Python regius</i>	x	x	x	x
Burmese python	<i>Python molurus bivittatus</i>	x	x	x	x
Brahminy blind snake	<i>Ramphotyphlops braminus</i>	x	x		x
Giant toad	<i>Rhinella marina</i>	x	x	x	x
Black and white tegu	<i>Salvator merianae</i>				x
Red-eared slider	<i>Trachemys scripta elegans</i>				x
FISH					
Oscar	<i>Astronotus ocellatus</i>				x
Black acara	<i>Cichlasoma bimaculatum</i>				x
Mayan cichlid	<i>Cichlasoma urophthalmus</i>				x
Walking catfish	<i>Clarias batrachus</i>				x
Grass carp	<i>Ctenopharyngodon idella</i>	x	x	x	x
Common carp	<i>Cyprinus carpio</i>				x
African jewelfish	<i>Hemichromis letourneuxi</i>	x	x	x	x
Brown hoplo	<i>Hoplosternum littorale</i>				x
Blue tilapia	<i>Oreochromis aureus</i>				x
Nile tilapia	<i>Oreochromis niloticus</i>	x			x
Vermiculated sailfin catfish	<i>Pterygoplichthys disjunctivus</i>				x
Orinoco sailfin catfish	<i>Pterygoplichthys multiradiatus</i>				x
Amazon sailfin catfish	<i>Pterygoplichthys paradalis</i>				x

Common Name	Scientific Name	LO	NE	EAA	GE
Spotted tilapia	<i>Tilapia mariae</i>				x
MAMMALS					
Wild hog, feral pig	<i>Sus scrofa</i>	x	x	x	x
OTHER					
Asian clam	<i>Corbicula fluminea</i>	x	x	x	x
Freshwater jellyfish	<i>Craspedacusta sowerbyi</i>	x	x	x	x
Island apple snail	<i>Pomacea insularum (d'Orbigny, 1839)</i>	x	x	x	x
Giant apple snail	<i>Pomacea maculata</i>	x	x	x	x
Fungus (causes laurel wilt)	<i>Raffaelea lauricola</i>				x

1

2 **F.2.4.1 Widely Established Species**3 **F.2.4.1.1 Cuban Treefrog**

4 The Cuban treefrog (*Osteopilus septentrionalis*) is the largest species of treefrog in Florida and ranges from 1
5 to 4 inches in length. The Cuban treefrog has expanded pads on the ends of its toes which are significantly
6 larger than the toepads of Florida's native treefrogs. Cuban treefrogs have large eyes and usually have
7 rough, somewhat warty skin. Sometimes Cuban treefrogs have a pattern of large wavy marks or blotches
8 on their back and have stripes or bands on their legs. The color of the treefrogs varies from creamy white
9 to light brown but Cuban treefrogs can be green, beige, yellow, dark brown, or a combination thereof.

10 The Cuban treefrog is native to Cuba, the Cayman Islands, and the Bahamas. It was first reported in Florida
11 in the 1920s in the Florida Keys and was likely transported in cargo or ornamental plant shipments. Cuban
12 treefrogs inhabit natural areas such as pine forests, hardwood hammocks, and swamps. They also inhabit
13 disturbed sites such as urban and suburban developments, agricultural areas such as orange groves, and
14 plant nurseries (Johnson 2007). Cuban treefrogs inhabit areas throughout most of the LOCAR footprint.
15 These treefrogs are introduced to new areas as stowaways on cars, trucks, boat trailers, and through
16 shipment of ornamental plants and trees.

17 Cuban treefrogs consume a variety of invertebrates and native treefrog species (Maskell et al. 2003).
18 Native green and squirrel treefrogs (*Hyla cinerea* and *H. squirella*) are less likely to be found when Cuban
19 treefrogs are present (Waddle et al. 2010), and when Cuban treefrogs are removed from an area, the
20 abundance of native treefrogs increases (Rice et al. 2011). In addition, tadpoles of Cuban treefrogs are
21 fierce competitors and can inhibit the growth and development of two species of native treefrogs
22 (Johnson 2007). Effects of LOCAR on the distribution and abundance of Cuban treefrogs should be
23 assessed given the Cuban treefrog's wide distribution and habitat tolerances, mounting evidence of direct
24 impacts to native anuran species, and the lack of regional monitoring and control programs.

25 **F.2.4.1.2 Feral Hog**

26 Feral hogs (*Sus scrofa*), also known as wild pigs, have existed on the Florida landscape since their
27 introduction four centuries ago. They are reported in all 67 Florida counties within a wide variety of
28 habitats, but prefer oak-cabbage palm hammocks, freshwater marshes and sloughs, and pine flatwoods.
29 Although they do not favor marshes with deep water, during the dry season they make extensive use of
30 partially dried out wetlands. Feral hog populations are particularly high in the counties immediately north
31 and west of Lake Okeechobee, and in the Big Cypress and East Coast Regions.

1 Hogs commonly grow 5 to 6 feet long and weigh over 150 pounds. With a keen sense of smell and a
2 powerful snout, they can detect and root up buried food. The diet of feral hogs includes vegetation,
3 earthworms, insects, reptiles, frogs, bird eggs, rodents, small mammals, and carrion (Laycock 1966; Baber
4 and Coblenz 1987). This invasive mammal is also known to prey on sea turtles, gopher tortoises, and
5 other at-risk wildlife (Singer 2005). No animal native to North America creates the kind of disturbance
6 when feeding that hogs do (Baber and Coblenz 1986).

7 Rooting by feral hogs can convert native grassland and other low vegetation to what looks like plowed
8 fields. Hog rooting may facilitate establishment of invasive plant species because invasive exotics typically
9 favor disturbed areas and colonize more quickly than many native plants (Belden and Pelton 1975; Duever
10 et al. 1986). Feral hogs are unusually prolific for large mammals because they reach sexual maturity at an
11 early age (6 to 10 months) (Barrett 1978), can farrow more than once a year (Springer 1977; Taylor et al.
12 1998), have large litters (4 to 8) (Sweeney et al. 2003), and often experience low natural mortality rates
13 (Bieber and Ruf 2005). Recreational hunting is often a major source of mortality (Barrett and Pine 1980).
14 However, in favorable habitat, hog populations are typically not greatly reduced by hunting (Bieber and
15 Ruf 2005). There is no regional, coordinated monitoring program for the ubiquitous feral hog. Monitoring
16 is limited to efforts associated with trapping programs and game management. Numerical monitoring of
17 hogs presents challenges because they are wary and adaptable animals that change their activity patterns
18 and feeding areas in response to changing needs and threats from humans (Hughs 1985; Sweeney et al.
19 2003).

20 **F.2.4.1.3 Island Apple Snail**

21 The island apple snail (*Pomacea maculata*) is a freshwater mollusk. This large snail can grow up to 10
22 centimeters in length. It is native to South America (SFER 2013). Mating and egg-laying begins in March
23 and can continue through October. It is thought the island apple snail was introduced in Florida in the
24 early 1980s through the tropical pet industry (Fasulo 2004). This species has been globally introduced
25 through releases associated with aquariums and intentional releases as a food crop. The island apple snail
26 is considered as one of the 100 World's Worst Invasive Alien Species. Potential impacts to Florida flora
27 and fauna include destruction of native aquatic vegetation by consumption and competition with native
28 aquatic fauna. The island apple snail has a voracious appetite for vegetation and in other countries has
29 converted lush ecosystems into barren areas. It is likely the island apple snail will continue to spread and
30 possibly outcompete the native apple snail (*P. paludosa*). The native apple snail is the primary food source
31 for the Everglade snail kite (*Rostrhamus sociabilis*) which is an endangered species (SFER 2013). The
32 Everglade snail kite is also known to feed on the island apple snail, which has been found in several canals
33 within the LOCAR Project Area. It is thriving in Lake Okeechobee, the Kissimmee Chain of Lakes, and the
34 Kissimmee River.

35 **F.2.5 Localized/Early Detection Rapid Response Species**

36 **F.2.5.1.1 Burmese Python**

37 Burmese pythons (*Python molurus bivittatus*) are large (up to 5.5 meter) constrictors that are native to
38 Southeast Asia (Dorcas et al. 2012) and are top predators (SFER 2013). For 20 years prior to being
39 considered established, python sightings occurred intermittently in south Florida. In 2000, the Burmese
40 python was considered established in south Florida and since that time the population has increased
41 significantly in abundance and geographic range (Dorcas et al. 2012). The Burmese python is found

1 throughout the southern Everglades, particularly in Everglades National Park (ENP) and adjacent lands
2 including the East Coast Buffer lands and the northern ENP boundary along Tamiami Trail. Sightings have
3 also been documented in the Key Largo region (SFER 2013).

4 Pythons consume a wide variety of mammals and birds. More than 100 species have been identified as a
5 food source and these include the endangered Key Largo woodrat (*Neotoma floridana smalli*) and wood
6 stork (*Mycteria americana*). In addition, American alligators (*Alligator mississippiensis*) are infrequently
7 preyed upon by the python. Little is known about the impacts of predation by pythons on native species;
8 however, a recent study by Dorcas et al. (2012) indicates there has been a dramatic decline in mammal
9 populations that coincides with the increase of pythons in ENP. The increase in the population size of
10 pythons has been linked to a regional decline in small and medium mammals (Dorcas et al. 2012) but has
11 not been distinguished from possible effects of changes in habitats and hydrology on mammal populations
12 that also occurred during this time.

13 **F.2.5.2 Argentine Black and White Tegu**

14 The Argentine black and white tegu (*Salvator merianae*) is a large South American lizard that can reach
15 1.5 meters in length in the wild. Tegus seem to prefer savannas and other grassy open areas in their native
16 range (SFER 2013). In Florida, tegus seem to prefer disturbed upland areas adjacent to wetlands or
17 permanent bodies of water. These types of habitats are frequently found adjacent to canals and rock pits
18 and occur throughout the south Florida landscape. Tegus are generalist predators with a diet that includes
19 a variety of fruits, vertebrates, invertebrates, and eggs. Because the tegu is a predator of eggs, it threatens
20 native ground-nesting birds and reptiles, including threatened and endangered species such as the
21 American crocodile (*Crocodylus acutus*) and Cape Sable seaside sparrow (*Ammodramus maritimus*
22 *mirabilis*). Endangered snail species such as *Liguus fasciatus* are also potential prey.

23 There are two known established populations in Florida; one in Hillsborough and Polk counties and one
24 in southern Miami-Dade County. The population in Miami-Dade County seems to be increasing and
25 expanding its range both to the west towards ENP and east toward Turkey Point. Both areas are home to
26 endangered wildlife that may be threatened by tegus. Continued monitoring and removal efforts are
27 needed to prevent the expansion into natural areas and control the population. Recently, there has been
28 an increase in sightings near ENP which suggests the population is expanding. Systematic surveys of the
29 species are needed to validate the population is expanding near ENP (SFER 2011) and to provide early
30 detection of possible range expansion to new areas.

31 **F.2.5.3 Nile Monitor**

32 The Nile monitor (*Varanus niloticus*) is a large, carnivorous lizard from sub-Saharan Africa that is capable
33 of reaching 2.4 meters (FWC bioprofile). It is a generalist feeder and an egg specialist in its native range
34 (SFER 2013) that will feed on a wide variety of invertebrates and vertebrates it acquires by either
35 predation or scavenging (FWC bioprofile). As such, the Nile monitor could impact a variety of native and
36 threatened species in Florida through both competition and predation. The Nile monitor may pose a
37 serious threat to a number of wading birds, marsh birds, gopher tortoises (*Gopherus polyphemus*),
38 burrowing owls (*Athene cunicularia*), Florida gopher frogs (*Lithobates capito*), sea turtles, and other
39 ground nesting species. They may negatively impact populations of American alligators and American
40 crocodiles via egg predation and competition (FWC bioprofile). The Nile monitor has been well established
41 in the Cape Coral area since the 1990s. There is also a small breeding population near Homestead Air

1 Force base in Miami-Dade County (SFER 2011). More recently, a breeding population of Nile monitors has
2 been discovered in Palm Beach County and numerous reports of the species throughout Broward County
3 also suggest a breeding population. Because of their threat to native wildlife, this species has the potential
4 to impact restoration efforts.

5 **F.2.6 Other Species of Concern**

6 Other species that are present within, or are likely to invade, the LOCAR footprint and cause
7 environmental harm include the purple swamphen (*Porphyrio porphyrio*), brown hoplo (*Hoplosternum*
8 *thoracatum*), bullseye snakehead (*Channa marulius*), sailfin catfish (*Pterygoplichthys disjunctivus*), and
9 Gambian pouch rat (*Cricetomys gambianus*).

10 **F.3 Introduction to Management**

11 **F.3.1 Prevention**

12 Prevention is the first line of defense and the most efficient and cost-effective approach to reduce the
13 threat of invasive non-native species. Successful prevention will reduce the rate of introduction and
14 establishment and thereby reduce the impacts of invasive species. One essential element to prevention is
15 identifying the high-risk pathways that facilitate introductions and implementing actions to impede those
16 introductions. Decontamination is another technique employed to control invasive non-native species
17 involving systematic removal or treatment. Common techniques include physical removal, chemical
18 treatment, heat treatment, and sterilization. Other critical elements include using effective
19 management tools to reduce unintentional introductions and using risk assessment for both intentional
20 and accidental introductions of non-native species. Baseline data and monitoring systems are required to
21 evaluate the success of preventative measures.

22 **F.3.2 Monitoring**

23 Natural resource managers need spatial data on invasive species populations to develop management
24 strategies for established populations, direct rapid response efforts for new introductions, and evaluate
25 the success of control efforts (Myers et al. 2000, Dewey and Andersen 2004, Barnett et al. 2007). Several
26 approaches may be taken to document the spatial distribution and population trends of invasive species.
27 Each method has strengths and weaknesses and should be used according to specific management
28 objectives.

29 Monitoring is the collection and analysis of population measurements to determine changes in population
30 status and progress towards meeting a management objective (Elzinga et al. 1998). This type of monitoring
31 is usually intended to detect relatively small changes in populations over time and often uses small scale
32 plots and/or transects. Invasive-species surveys and inventories may be preferred when the objective is to
33 detect populations and describe their spatial distributions over large landscapes, especially when early
34 detection of new populations is desired (see EDRR discussion below).

35 Optimally, invasive-plant mapping methods have high positional accuracy, high species-detection
36 accuracy (particularly for low-density infestations), rapid turnaround time, relatively low cost, and the
37 ability to quantify the degree of infestation (USDA 2012). Ground-based surveys can provide high
38 positional accuracy and species detection but can be time consuming and logistically unrealistic for large
39 landscapes (Rew et al. 2005). Stratified subsampling approaches to ground surveys can mitigate some of

1 these limitations but probabilistic mapping may be ineffective for early detection needs of land managers
2 (Barnett et al. 2007) and may not provide sufficient fine-scale information over large areas.

3 Developments in remote sensing technology have greatly improved opportunities for rapidly obtaining
4 spatially precise data on invasive plant populations, particularly for large areas (Lass et al. 2005). However,
5 the ability to detect target species using remote sensing is still limited to conditions where the species has
6 a unique spectral signature or is a dominant canopy species and is often ineffective at detecting target
7 species at low densities (Shafii et al. 2003). This inability to detect target species at low densities is a
8 significant limitation for land managers focused on containment of expanding populations and detection
9 of new invasions. Visual surveys from aircraft have been effectively used to map invasive plant
10 distributions in the Everglades since 2008 (Rodgers and Pernas, in press). While visual aerial surveys may
11 provide cost-effective information on landscape distributions of targeted plants, they have limited value
12 for long-term change detection or fine-scale assessments of abundance. This method may also lack
13 sufficient detection precision for small plant species or species that occupy understories. Use of
14 unmanned aerial vehicles may also provide relatively inexpensive invasive plant monitoring data and
15 video documentation provides a permanent record of conditions. However, detection accuracy may be
16 less than that of visual surveys, especially at low densities or new species introductions.

17 **F.3.3 Early Detection and Rapid Response**

18 Once a species becomes widespread, the cost to control it will more than likely require significant and
19 sustained funding. Early detection and rapid response (EDRR) may be a cost-effective strategy to locate,
20 contain, and eradicate invasive species early in the invasion process to minimize ecological and economic
21 impacts of non-indigenous species (Rejmanek and Pitcairn 2002).

22 The three components of EDRR are early detection, rapid assessment, and rapid response. Early detection
23 is defined as a comprehensive and integrated system of active or passive surveys to locate, identify, and
24 report new invasive species as quickly as possible to implement procedures when it is feasible and less
25 costly. Rapid assessment includes the actions necessary to determine the appropriate response. This
26 assessment identifies the current and potential range of the infestation, analyzes the risks associated with
27 the invasion, and evaluates the timing and overall strategy for the appropriate actions. Rapid response is
28 defined as a systematic approach to control, contain, or eradicate these species while the infestation is still
29 contained in a particular area. Based on the results of the rapid assessment, a rapid response may be
30 implemented to address new introductions or isolated infestations of a previously established species
31 invading a new site (i.e., containment strategy).

32 Another critical element to rapid response is having the infrastructure in place to quickly implement
33 management actions while new invasions can still be eradicated or contained. Effectively implementing
34 EDRR will require coordination and collaboration among federal, Tribal, state, local governments,
35 nongovernment organizations (NGO) and the private sector (National Invasive Species Council 2008).

36 **F.3.4 Control and Management**

37 Integrated Pest Management (IPM) is an effective approach to manage invasive species. IPM is the
38 coordinated use of the most appropriate strategy to prevent or reduce unacceptable levels of invasive
39 species and their damage by using the most economical means, with the least possible hazard to people,

1 property, and the environment. Physical, mechanical, chemical, and biological control methods are used
2 in IPM.

3 Physical control, sometimes referred to as cultural control, is the physical manipulation of an invasive
4 species or its habitat. A number of techniques are used for physical control. These include manual
5 removal; installing barriers (including barriers to burrowing for species such as green iguanas); and
6 environmental alterations such as water-level manipulation, prescribed fire, and light attenuation.

7 Mechanical control refers to the use of machinery designed to cut, shear, shred, uproot, grind, transport,
8 or remove invasive species. Equipment used to complete mechanical control may include but is not limited
9 to, heavy equipment such as excavators or front-end loaders (with a root rake, grinding heads, or other
10 attachments), cutter boats, dredges, and mechanical harvesters (Haller 2009).

11 Chemical control is the use of a specially formulated pesticide to control an invasive species. The United
12 States Environmental Protection Agency defines a pesticide as “a substance or mixture of substances
13 intended for the prevention, destruction, repulsion, or mitigation of any pest.” The term pesticide
14 encompasses a broad range of substances including herbicides, insecticides, and fungicides. Pesticides are
15 applied through ground and aerial applications.

16 Biological control, also known as biocontrol, is the planned use of one organism to suppress the growth
17 of another. Biological control is primarily the search for and purposeful introduction of species-specific
18 organisms that selectively attack a single target species. Organisms such as insects, animals, or pathogens
19 that cause plant diseases are used as biological controls (Cuda 2009b).

20 Objectives of management can include complete eradication within a given area, population suppression,
21 limiting spread, and reducing effects of invasive species. Once an invasive species becomes widely
22 established, complete eradication is usually not feasible. The most effective action for managing widely
23 spread invasive species is often preventing the spread and reducing the impacts by implementing control
24 measures. This concept is known as maintenance control. Maintenance control is defined as controlling
25 an invasive species to maintain the population at the lowest feasible level.

26 **F.3.5 Risk and Uncertainties Related to Invasive Species**

27 As with most land management activities, there are a number of risks and uncertainties associated with
28 invasive species management. The use of an adaptive management approach will help develop and
29 prioritize invasive species control strategies. As restoration proceeds, invasive species may establish
30 and/or spread as a direct result of or independently of restoration activities. In the context of LOCAR and
31 the long-term management of the natural resources within the Study Area, risks include but are not
32 limited to:

- 33 • Inability to control established invasive species onsite prior to construction activities;
- 34 • Introduction of new invasive species which are difficult or impossible to control;
- 35 • Restoration activities which unintentionally facilitate the spread of invasive species via
36 contaminated earth-moving equipment;
- 37 • Undetected spread of invasive species into new areas, making containment of populations more
38 costly and less likely to succeed;

- 1 • Uncontrolled invasive species which create disturbances or alter ecosystems such that desired
2 restoration outcomes are not achieved;
- 3 • Failure to secure necessary funding to control invasive species;
- 4 • Undesirable impacts on non-target species and ecosystem functions resulting from invasive
5 species control efforts; and
- 6 • Not taking action to manage a species due to inaccurate assessments of the species' impact on
7 restoration activities.

8 In most cases, the necessary information for detailed, specific, pre-project evaluations of the need for
9 management activities to control invasive species is not available. With the exception of a few well-
10 established and well-studied species (e.g., melaleuca), there is an information deficit on the status,
11 potential impact, and effective control techniques for priority species. This is particularly true for non-
12 indigenous animals. Current knowledge on invasion mechanisms suggests that some restoration activities
13 may facilitate the spread of certain priority species. For example, partial removal of canals and levees
14 could encourage spread of or provide sites for colonization by numerous invasive species including
15 Brazilian pepper, Old World climbing fern, Nile monitors, pythons, and Cuban treefrogs. There remains
16 considerable uncertainty regarding the degree to which different species will respond, if at all, to
17 restoration activities and how these responses will impact achievement of restoration goals. Given the high
18 degree of uncertainty, the most effective and lowest cost management option is early detection and rapid
19 removal of invasive species during and post Project construction. Central to this strategy is the
20 implementation of a rigorous monitoring program (discussed below).

21 **F.4 Existing Management Programs**

22 **F.4.1 South Florida Water Management District**

23 The South Florida Water Management District (FWMD) manages invasive exotic aquatic and terrestrial
24 plants in canals and on levees of the Central and Southern Florida Project, Water Conservation Areas 2
25 and 3, stormwater treatment areas (STAs), interim project lands, and public conservation lands. Most
26 vegetation management is outsourced through the Vegetation Management Division and includes
27 herbicide application contractors, mechanical removal contractors, and the use of biological controls
28 such as plant-specific insects and herbivorous fish. The Melaleuca Control Program is a major focus for
29 the FWMD, but other priority plant species are controlled within the LOCAR Project Area as funding
30 resources allow.

31 **F.4.2 Lake Okeechobee**

32 The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers (Corps) and Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC)
33 manage various species of invasive plants on Lake Okeechobee. Vegetation managed includes floating
34 vegetation on Lake Okeechobee, the Okeechobee Waterway, and associated tributaries, as well as
35 torpedograss, tropical American watergrass, and cattail.

36 **F.4.3 U.S. Army Corps of Engineers**

37 The Corps also conducts treatment of priority species on the Herbert Hoover Dike. In addition to the
38 operations and maintenance program on Lake Okeechobee, the Corps conducts treatments of vegetation

1 during the construction and OMRR&R phases for CERP projects. Vegetation treated includes FLEPPC
2 Category I and II species, as well as native nuisance species.

3 **F.4.4 U.S. Department of Agriculture / University of Florida**

4 The SFWMD, FWC, Corps, National Park Service (NPS), U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS), and other
5 agencies provide financial support to the U.S. Department of Agriculture – Agricultural Research Service
6 (USDA-ARS) and the University of Florida (UF) for the development of invasive plant biological controls.
7 Efforts to identify safe and effective biological controls have led to important advancements in the
8 integrative management of several invaders including melaleuca, Old World climbing fern, water hyacinth,
9 and alligator weed.

10 The CERP Melaleuca Eradication and Other Exotic Plants – Implement Biological Controls Project is
11 dedicated to the implementation of biological-control agents once overseas surveys and quarantine
12 testing has developed agents deemed safe for release in Florida. The project included the construction of
13 a mass rearing annex to the existing USDA-ARS biological control facility in Davie, Florida, in support of
14 implementing the mass rearing, field release, establishment, and field monitoring of approved biological
15 control agents for melaleuca and other invasive nonindigenous species.

16 **F.4.5 Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission**

17 The FWC’s Invasive Plant Management Section is the designated lead entity in Florida responsible for
18 coordinating and funding the statewide control of invasive aquatic and upland plants in public waterways
19 and on public conservation land. In addition to funding the SFWMD melaleuca control program, FWC
20 annually awards funding for individual invasive plant management projects in the Everglades region.
21 Allocation of control funding is determined by an interagency regional working group.

22 **F.4.6 Invasive Animals**

23 Efforts to develop control tools and management strategies are underway for a few priority animal species.
24 These include the Burmese python and other giant constrictors, Nile monitor, and Argentine black and
25 white tegu. Control tools are very limited for free-ranging reptiles, and application of developed methods
26 is often impracticable in sensitive environments where impacts to non-target species are unacceptable.
27 Available tools for removing large constrictor snakes and lizards currently include trapping, detection
28 dogs, and visual searching. Potential tools include the use of toxicants, introduced predators, and
29 pheromone attractants, but these have not been fully explored to date.

30 Regional invasive biologists have developed a conceptual response framework for established priority
31 invasive animals in south Florida. Objectives within this framework are classified into three main
32 categories—containment (slow the spread), eradicating incipient populations (remove outliers), and
33 suppression (reduce impact in established areas). The resources to implement this strategic framework
34 remain insufficient, but close collaboration between agencies has allowed for some coordinated efforts.
35 Currently, FWC, NPS, UF, and SFWMD are conducting trapping and visual searching for Burmese pythons,
36 green iguanas, northern African pythons, Argentine black and white tegus, spectacled caimans, and Nile
37 monitors.

1 **F.5 Existing Monitoring Programs**

2 Since 2008, the SFWMD and NPS, along with other partner agencies, have used digital aerial sketch
3 mapping (DASM) for a region-wide mapping program on over 728,000 hectares in the Everglades. DASM is
4 a method for mapping plant infestations “on-the-fly” using GPS-linked computers and trained biologists.
5 Visual surveys allow an observer to learn to recognize targeted species, sometimes at low densities, under
6 a range of environmental and phenological conditions. Visual aerial surveys also may provide data more
7 rapidly than other methods, which is important when rapid responses to newly established threats are
8 expected. The primary objective of the DASM inventory program is to determine the distributions of four
9 priority invasive plant species (Australian pine, Brazilian pepper, melaleuca, and Old World climbing fern)
10 on managed conservation lands in the region. A secondary objective of the program is to detect new plant
11 species invasions in remote areas to facilitate rapid response efforts. Data are currently collected on a 2-
12 year cycle.

13 In 2010, UF, FWC, and SFWMD began collaboration on the Everglades Invasive Reptile, Amphibian, and
14 Mammal Monitoring Program (EIRAMMP). The purpose of the project is to develop a monitoring program
15 for priority invasive reptiles and amphibians and evaluate their impacts to south Florida. Specifically, the
16 program seeks to: (1) determine the status and spread of existing populations and the occurrence of new
17 populations of invasive reptiles and amphibians, (2) provide additional EDRR capability for removal of
18 invasive reptiles and amphibians, and (3) evaluate the status and trends of populations in native reptiles,
19 amphibians, and mammals. The monitoring program involves visual searches for targeted invasive species
20 on fixed routes along levees and roads within Arthur R. Marshall Loxahatchee National Wildlife Refuge,
21 Water Conservation Areas 2 and 3, Big Cypress National Preserve, and ENP. In addition to trapping, visual
22 searches and call surveys are conducted to monitor invasive reptile and amphibian species. Thirteen
23 routes have been established.

24 **F.6 Management Strategy and Plan**

25 Many of the features of the water management system, as well as construction and operations and
26 maintenance activities, have the potential to spread and promote establishment of non-native invasive
27 and native nuisance species. Proposed restoration activities may affect ecosystem drivers that directly or
28 indirectly influence the invasiveness of non-native species. These factors may affect invasive species
29 positively or negatively, depending on the unique characteristics of individual species and the
30 environmental conditions for a given biological invasion (Doren et al. 2009).

31 Many of the areas where LOCAR features are proposed are currently inhabited by non-native invasive and
32 native nuisance species. Construction of the proposed features has the potential to spread the existing
33 non-native invasive and native nuisance species onsite as well as introduce new invasive species via
34 contaminated equipment. Disturbed areas resulting from construction are likely to become established
35 with non-native invasive and native nuisance species. New flows created by operations of the proposed
36 features may serve as vectors to spread invasive and native nuisance species into new areas. Monitoring
37 is a critical component of the management strategy. Information on distribution and restoration
38 responses of invasive species should be used to inform decisions on control strategies. Invasive species
39 surveillance, monitoring, and control should be carried out within the construction footprints, as well as
40 impacted areas. Species of non-native vegetation to be treated include, but are not limited to, species
41 listed in the current version of the FLEPPC invasive plant lists and the Florida Department of Environmental

1 Protection prohibited plant list. The priorities for managing vegetation include FLEPPC Category I and II
2 species, new invasive plant introductions, native nuisance species, and plants that impact project
3 operations. Management of animal species will include surveillance, control, and monitoring.

4 The strategy for managing invasive species will be to use an IPM approach. Objectives of management will
5 include complete eradication, population suppression, limiting spread, and reducing effects of invasive
6 species. Eradication will be the objective for newly established species that are localized. The objective
7 for widespread invasive species will be to implement control measures to suppress and prevent the spread
8 of identified priority invasive species.

9 **F.6.1 Surveillance – Early Detection and Rapid Response**

10 EDRR should be implemented during every phase, for the life of a project. EDRR is an effective
11 management measure to control and contain invasive species that were not previously within the Project
12 Area. EDRR minimizes the negative impacts that invasive species have on the ecosystem and economy
13 and reduces future treatment and management costs. It is very difficult to predict when and where an
14 invasive species may appear. As such, estimating a budget is challenging. However, to assist managers, a
15 priority list of species to immediately respond to under EDRR management strategy has been developed.

16 A framework for establishing an EDRR program in the Everglades was recently drafted by an interagency
17 team of invasive species experts and land managers. As discussed above, EDRR includes three strategy
18 elements: 1) early detection, 2) rapid assessment, and 3) rapid response.

19 1. *Early Detection:* This plan proposes implementation of routine surveillance in the Project
20 Area to minimize the time between initial introduction and detection of a new species.
21 Strategic surveillance by trained biologists in proximity to the LOCAR project features should
22 greatly increase the probability of detection of new species. In many cases, existing
23 programs could be expanded to include focused monitoring in the LOCAR footprint. For
24 example, the EIRAMMP is well suited for enhanced surveillance for numerous invasive
25 animal species (see **Section F.4** Existing Management Programs).

26 2. *Rapid Assessment:* Following the detection of new invasions (or expansion of formerly
27 contained invasions), it is important to gather and process available information to
28 determine the potential risk and control options in the face of high uncertainty. Critical
29 questions must be answered in a relatively short period of time. Example questions include:

- 30 • What is the spatial extent and abundance of the invasive non-native species?
- 31 • What is the likelihood that the species will impact native species, ecosystem function, operations
32 infrastructure, or human health?
- 33 • What are the management options for containment or eradication?

34 Numerous tools are available to assist natural resource managers with the assessment phase of
35 EDRR, though none of them is likely to be completely accurate in assessing the risk of a species.
36 This plan proposes use of UF's Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences (IFAS) Assessment of
37 Non-native Plants in Florida's Natural Areas, Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council's Invasive Species List,
38 FWC's Non-native Animal Bioprofile protocol, and ECISMA's Rapid Response Plan for assessing the

1 risks of non-indigenous species within the LOCAR footprint. These assessments should be
2 conducted with LOCAR biologists, subject matter experts, and stakeholders.

- 3 3. *Rapid Response*: This is the "risk management" component of EDRR. Once a species is
4 determined to have a high probability of ecological impact and control options are available,
5 rapid response strategies aimed at containment and ultimately eradication can be
6 formulated and implemented. To be effective, rapid response programs must have built-in
7 procedural, financial, and logistical capacity to respond quickly to newly established threats.
8 Since it is not possible to accurately predict the number and severity of new invasions during
9 the project, this plan proposes contingency funding for rapid response activities in the event
10 that new, high-priority species establish in the Project Area. During the pre-construction
11 phase, protocols for implementing rapid response should be developed.

12 **F.6.2 Control**

13 A combination of biological, physical, mechanical, and chemical control methods may be used to manage
14 invasive species. Biological control agents may be used to decrease the targeted invasive species'
15 competitive advantages over native species and to weaken the invading population by increasing leaf
16 mortality, decreasing plant size, reducing flower and seed production, and/or limiting population
17 expansion. Biological control agents may be acquired through the Melaleuca Eradication and Other Exotic
18 Plants—Implement Biological Controls project which is a component of CERP. One element of this CERP
19 component includes the implementation of biological control agents which involves the mass rearing, field
20 release, establishment, and monitoring of approved biological controls in south Florida and the
21 Everglades. The four main invasive plant species targeted for control through this component include
22 melaleuca, Australian pine, Brazilian pepper, and Old World climbing fern.

23 It is anticipated that physical control methods will be limited. Prescribed burns may be conducted to
24 promote native plant growth and should be planned, if possible, to target invasive species when they are
25 most susceptible to fire. Hand pulling of melaleuca and other non-native plant species will occur when it is
26 feasible. Weed/debris barriers will be placed at water control structures when required to minimize
27 dispersal of floating vegetation. Physical control measures may be used for invasive animal control.
28 Examples of these measures include trapping of feral hogs, controlled harvest/overfishing (nets, fishing
29 tournaments specific to invasive fish species), and compliance with FWC Fishing Regulation
30 release/movement of fish (no return to water/used as bait).

31 Mechanical control may be implemented to remove non-native plant species when the construction of
32 project features requires such removal. Heavy equipment such as bulldozers, front-end loaders, and
33 excavators (with or without grinding heads) may be used to uproot, grind and/or clear, and grub. It is
34 expected this type of control method may be used during levee degradates, canal backfilling, and during
35 construction of new project features such as water control structures.

36 Chemical control may be used to treat aquatic and terrestrial invasive plants. Methods for treatment may
37 include hack-n-squirt, basal bark, cut-stump, foliar, and/or aerial application. EPA-approved herbicides
38 will be used to control invasive plants when required. Chemical control may be used to treat invasive
39 plants in canals, along levees, and in wetland/natural areas.

1 **F.6.3 Monitoring**

2 Monitoring of invasive species populations may be conducted through DASM, ground or boat-based
3 assessments, Unmanned Aircraft System surveys, and/or electrofishing. Invasive species will also be
4 identified through monitoring for the Adaptive Management Plan. This information will be provided to
5 invasive species managers to ensure appropriate management measures are implemented.

6 **F.6.4 Pre-construction Phase**

7 Baseline conditions need to be established prior to the construction phase. Existing monitoring programs
8 should be used as much as possible to establish baseline conditions prior to the start of construction
9 activities. Although there are no system-wide monitoring programs for invasive species in the region,
10 several individual agencies collect data. Data mining will be the primary resource to obtain baseline data
11 via collaboration with the individual agencies. In areas with data gaps, surveys will need to be completed
12 using the most cost-effective method (e.g., ground survey, Unmanned Aircraft Systems survey, DASM).

13 Existing monitoring and management programs should continue to be implemented. The existing
14 programs help maintain invasive and nuisance species at a controlled level. Taking immediate action upon
15 identifying EDRR species helps prevent their establishment and further colonization of the area. By
16 addressing these species early on, construction activities can be modified or managed to avoid
17 disturbance of their habitats, reducing the risk of unintentional spread and potential ecological impacts.
18 Timely and proactive management during the pre-construction phase plays a crucial role in minimizing
19 the long-term ecological and economic consequences associated with invasive and nuisance species.

20 A significant length of time lapses from the time a project is planned to when it receives congressional
21 authorization and appropriations, and ultimately goes to construction. As property (lands and structures)
22 sit with no activity, vegetation and wildlife changes can occur. Unmanaged areas become inhabited by
23 many species of flora and fauna, native and non-native. Older-growth vegetation is more difficult and
24 more costly to treat and remove than lands that are managed along the way. As these lands become
25 established with invasive species, there is an increased risk of spreading the invasive species to
26 neighboring lands. Therefore, it is ecologically and economically beneficial to manage the lands early on.
27 Managing invasive vegetation throughout the interim phase reduces construction costs since mowing is
28 much less costly than clearing/grubbing and treating, and rapid response to new infestations helps reduce
29 spread into environmentally sensitive areas.

30 **F.6.5 Design and Construction Phases**

31 The best method of controlling invasive and nuisance species is to prevent non-native species from being
32 introduced and established to begin with. Incorporation of invasive species prevention and control into
33 project designs, alternatives analysis, and operational plans has the potential to save significant resources
34 during the long-term. The plans and specifications phase should simply design “with the end in mind.”
35 When the end goal is ecosystem restoration, the designers should periodically obtain input from invasive
36 species experts to identify design features and operational strategies that could potentially favor the
37 establishment and spread of invasive species. An example of design influences on invasive species is
38 levee removal without backfill of canals. Without canal backfilling, deep water refuges for non-native fishes
39 and invertebrates (from both seasonal cold temperatures and seasonal drying) are maintained, and
40 barriers to dispersal from canal waters to marsh habitats are removed. Design alternatives should be

1 explored that would allow seasonal cooling of water in the canals. Cooler water temperatures will reduce
2 the refuge capacity for cold temperature sensitive non-native fish. In some cases, such as the coastal
3 canals, aquatic-barrier technologies could be used to mitigate the spread of non-native aquatic species.

4 Cost-saving measures to consider during design and construction include:

- 5 • Seeking input from invasive species management staff from the Corps, SFWMD, and other partner
6 agencies throughout the design and construction phases.
- 7 • Working with subject matter experts to identify design features that may create habitat or entry
8 points for invaders. Evaluating design alternatives to mitigate potential design vulnerabilities.
- 9 • Designing to promote the establishment of native species.
- 10 • Using construction methods that minimize ground disturbance whenever possible.
- 11 • Containing mobilized nutrients resulting from soil disturbances.
- 12 • Requiring all construction contractors to follow vehicle and equipment decontamination
13 protocols prior to deployment. Coordinating with invasive species specialists for decontamination
14 protocol specifications.
- 15 • Evaluating cost/benefit ratios for treating invasive/nuisance species prior to construction
16 activities. In some cases, pre-construction removal of a species may significantly reduce its spread.
- 17 • Implementing a monitoring and rapid response protocol aimed at detecting and controlling new
18 invasions early.
- 19 • Managing and controlling invasive/nuisance species during the entire construction phase.
- 20 • Using plant material from regional sources that are weed and pathogen free when native planting
21 is specified in the plans.

22 Both the Corps and SFWMD are committed to requiring the construction contractor to implement
23 preventive measures and best management practices that will minimize the potential introduction and
24 spread of invasive and nuisance species due to construction equipment (including personal protective
25 equipment) and activities. This commitment is also included in **Section 5.2.5** (Environmental
26 Commitments).

27 The Corps currently includes the following language in all of their specifications (Specification # 01 57 20
28 Environmental Protection, "Prevention of Invasive and Nuisance Species Transfer"):

29 *The Contractor shall thoroughly clean equipment prior to and following work on the project site to*
30 *ensure that items/materials including, but not limited to, soil, vegetative debris, eggs, mollusk*
31 *larvae, seeds, and vegetative propagules are not transported from a previous work location to this*
32 *project site, nor transported from this project site to another location. Prevention protocols*
33 *require cleaning all equipment surfaces, including but not limited to, undercarriages, tires, and*
34 *sheet metal. All equipment, including but not limited to, heavy equipment, vehicles, trailers, ATVs,*
35 *and chippers must be cleaned. Smaller equipment, including, but not limited to, chainsaws, loppers,*
36 *shovels, and backpack sprayers, must be cleaned and inspected to ensure they are free of eggs,*
37 *vegetative debris, vegetative propagules, etc. The Contractor may utilize any method accepted*
38 *by the Government; common accepted methods include pressure washing and steam*

1 *cleaning/washing equipment. Prevention protocols should also address clothing and personal*
2 *protective equipment.*

3 *Prior to the commencement of work, the Contractor shall complete and provide an invasive and*
4 *nuisance species transfer prevention plan to the Corps for approval. This plan shall be part of the*
5 *Environmental Protection Plan as defined in subparagraph “Environmental Protection Plan” of*
6 *paragraph SUBMITTALS (Part 1.5) above. The invasive and nuisance species transfer prevention*
7 *plan shall identify specific transfer prevention procedures and designated cleaning sites/locations.*
8 *Prevention protocols may vary depending upon the nature of the project site. It will be the*
9 *responsibility of the Contractor to ensure all equipment coming onto and leaving the project site*
10 *is inspected and not harboring materials that would spread, or potentially spread, invasive and*
11 *nuisance species onto or off the project site. The Contractor shall provide a report verifying*
12 *equipment brought on site was cleaned and shall provide a report verifying equipment was*
13 *cleaned prior to removal from the project site.*

14 **F.6.6 Operational Testing and Monitoring Period**

15 The operational testing and monitoring period is the timeframe from the end of construction until the
16 project is transferred and accepted by the local sponsor. EDRR is very critical and the most cost-effective
17 management measure during this period. Disturbed areas, such as areas impacted from construction
18 activities, are prone to the establishment of invasive and nuisance species. Early detection of invasive and
19 nuisance species and immediate treatment/control measures prevent these species from establishing and
20 becoming long-term problems, ecologically and economically.

21 **F.6.7 OMRR&R Phase**

22 The “Prevention of Invasive and Nuisance Species Transfer” language above applies not only to the
23 construction phase but also to the OMRR&R phase. The preventive measures apply to contractors and
24 government employees. Maintenance equipment and rental equipment are often used at multiple
25 locations. As equipment is moved from one location to another, this potential spread vector can easily be
26 reduced or prevented simply by ensuring the equipment is clean prior to arrival on site and prior to leaving
27 the site.

28 In addition, numerous operational aspects of the restoration can influence mechanisms of invasion. For
29 example, many non-indigenous species become more invasive in environments with elevated nutrient
30 availability. With large pulses of only slightly elevated phosphorus levels, some invasive plant species
31 could establish and spread.

32 **F.6.8 Specific Control by Project Feature – Construction Phase**

33 The Recommended Plan includes a 200,000-acre-foot (ac-ft) aboveground storage reservoir north of Canal
34 41A (C-41A). The reservoir would cover an area of approximately 12,800 ac and be designed to have an
35 average storage depth of 17 feet at its normal full-storage level. The reservoir would include two pump
36 stations, two outflow culverts, an outflow canal, an interior divider dam with a gated control structure,
37 and two ungated overflow spillways.

38 **Construction.** The reservoir would be constructed with a perimeter dam and an interior divider dam each
39 having an average height of approximately 33 feet above the ground. The perimeter dam would be

1 approximately 18 miles around, allowing for recreational opportunities. Material from the Project
2 footprint and the surrounding seepage canal would be used to construct the dams. A gated outflow culvert
3 would be constructed on the west side of the reservoir to discharge water into C-41A upstream of
4 Structure 83 (S-83), while another gated culvert would be constructed near the southeast side of the
5 reservoir to discharge water into C-41A downstream of S-83.

6 The reservoir would be constructed to have two storage cells (i.e., east and west) split by an interior
7 divider dam to reduce wave runup. The interior divider dam would include a 1,500-cubic-foot-second (cfs),
8 gated water-control structure to allow for controlled conveyance of water between the two cells. Each
9 cell would include an ungated overflow spillway designed to discharge into C-41A.

10 A seepage canal would be constructed outside the perimeter dam of the reservoir. Seepage from the
11 reservoir would collect in the canal and be returned to the reservoir via seepage pump stations. If the
12 seepage pump stations were not operational, the seepage collected in the canal would eventually
13 overflow into the C-41A via overflow weir structures.

14 **Operations.** Two pump stations would be used to fill the reservoir at 1,500 cfs. One pump station would
15 be located downstream of Structure 84 (S-84) and move water from Canal 38 (C-38) into C-41A, upstream
16 of S-84. The second pump would be located on the C-41A canal upstream of State Highway 70 to pump
17 water from C-41A directly into the reservoir. Water would be conveyed to the reservoir in one of two
18 ways: (1) full or partial diversion of flow in C-41A downstream of S-83, or (2) back-pumping water from
19 Lake Okeechobee via pumping from C-41A downstream of S-84 into C-41A between S-83 and S-84. Water
20 would be returned to Lake Okeechobee by discharging from the reservoir to C-41A upstream and/or
21 downstream of S-83. The location of the reservoir outflow culverts would allow for water to be conveyed
22 south to provide opportunities for storage in surrounding canals (e.g., C-41A, C-41, C-40, and C-39A).

23 **Embankments, Seepage Canals, and Pump Stations.** Surveys of the Project Area should be completed
24 prior to construction to identify priority species that may be spread by construction activities as well as
25 species that should be treated prior to the beginning of construction. Periodic surveys of the new
26 structures should be conducted throughout the construction phase to identify growth of priority species.
27 Water diverted may result in the spread of priority species and should therefore be closely monitored.
28 Priority plant species in these areas should be treated. Priority species located within the excavation area
29 for the seepage canals shall be treated and surveilled throughout the construction period. It is
30 recommended that adjacent areas within 0.5 mile of the spoil mound be systematically surveyed and
31 treated to eliminate close proximity seed sources, thereby preventing spread of priority plant species such
32 as Brazilian pepper and cogongrass.

33 **F.6.9 Specific Control by Project Feature – OMRR&R Phase**

34 Vegetation within the reservoir will likely be difficult to manage due to high nutrient loading from surface
35 water inflows. Similar conditions are experienced in the STAs, and maintenance control of many invasive
36 plant species have proven difficult and not cost-effective. Vegetation management within the reservoir
37 should focus on maintaining functionality. Vegetation should be controlled to ensure adequate surface
38 water conveyance and minimal impact to infrastructure (e.g., levee instability, floating tussocks).
39 However, any invasive species capable of establishing in the reservoir and spreading to natural areas
40 should be a priority for control. Chemical treatments of floating and submerged vegetation should be

1 performed upstream and downstream of water control structures. Occasional mechanical removal of
2 tussocks or uprooted submerged species may be required to maintain operations and the function of the
3 reservoir. Vegetation should be maintained throughout the OMRR&R phase, with an emphasis on
4 minimizing the spread of invasive plants capable of spreading to natural areas (e.g., cogon grass). Non-
5 native invasive animal species that have potential to damage infrastructure or hinder recovery efforts
6 should be removed from the Project.

7 **F.7 Education/Outreach**

8 **F.7.1 Education / Outreach Opportunities at Recreational Areas**

9 Recreational opportunities will be created by the LOCAR. Planned public-use access points and associated
10 recreational facilities such as boat ramps, picnic shelters, and interpretive kiosks offer excellent venues
11 for public outreach and environmental education. Recreation area rules signs and interpretive kiosks
12 should provide information regarding the purpose and goals of the water resource project, what entities
13 are responsible for its construction and management, how it functions, and what the expected
14 environmental benefits are to the south-central Florida ecosystem and its residents. Information on the
15 identification and ecology of the flora and fauna likely to be encountered at the site should also be
16 provided on interpretive signage.

17 Recreation facilities such as boat ramps, hiking trails, and hunting areas can serve as vectors and pathways
18 for aquatic and terrestrial invasive species. For example, invasive species can be transferred from
19 one area to another by hikers, boats, and trailers. Many recreational users are unaware of their role
20 in the spread of unwanted species. Hence, educating the public on preventing the spread of invasive
21 species can be a cost-effective component of the overall management strategy. The recreation access
22 points can be used to display educational information on invasive species identification,
23 prevention/control measures, and awareness of the invasive species programs in the area and how
24 individuals can contribute to invasive species prevention. Educational kiosks are recommended and
25 should include information on:

- 26 • Specific priority invasive species in the area;
- 27 • Impacts and costs of invasive species on conservation, human health, and recreation;
- 28 • Preventative measures, such as removing vegetation from boats/trailers before leaving the boat
29 ramp or removing vegetation from shoes and clothing before leaving the area;
- 30 • Ways to report invasive species observations;
- 31 • Programs that citizens can get involved with and learn more about invasive species; and
- 32 • Laws against the release of non-native wildlife.

33 **F.8 Costs**

34 A summary of invasive and nuisance species management costs is presented in **Table F-4**. It was assumed
35 that in the field, baseline and potential invasive species treatments and management would need to occur
36 starting about 2 years prior to the actual construction start date. Costs were estimated for the life of the
37 project, assuming a 50-year life.

1 **Table F-4. Invasive and Nuisance Species Management Costs.**

Invasive and Nuisance Species Management	
1 Year Pre-Construction	\$153,875
Construction Phase	\$93,050
Operational Testing & Monitoring Phase	\$99,050
1 Year OMRR&R Phase	\$99,050
50-Year OMRR&R Phase (Includes Year 1)	\$6,690,633
Total Management Cost	\$7,030,608
Invasive and Nuisance Species Management Monitoring	
1 Year Pre-Construction	10,000
Construction Phase	10,000
1 Year OMRR&R Phase	10,000
10-Year OMRR&R Phase (Includes Year 1)	\$100,000
Total Monitoring Cost	\$130,000

2 OMRR&R—operation, maintenance, repair, replacement, and rehabilitation

3 **F.9 References**

- 4 Baber, D.W. and B.E. Coblenz. 1986. Density, home range, habitat use, and reproduction in feral pigs on
5 Santa Catalina Island. *Journal of Mammalogy* 67:512–525.
- 6 Baber, D.W. and B.E. Coblenz. 1987. Diet, nutrition, and conception in feral pigs on Santa Catalina Island.
7 *Journal of Wildlife Management* 51:306–317.
- 8 Barnett D.T., T.J. Stohlgren, C.S. Jarnevich, G.W. Chong, J.A. Ericson, T.R. Davern, and S.E. Simonson. 2007.
9 The art and science of weed mapping. *Environ. Monit. Assess.* 132:235–252.
- 10 Barrett, R.H. 1978. The feral hog at Dye Creek Ranch, California. *Hilgardia* 46:283–355.
- 11 Barrett, R.H. and D. S. Pine. 1980. History and status of wild pigs, *Sus scrofa*, in San Benita County,
12 California. *California Fish and Game* 67:105–17.
- 13 Belden, R.C. and M.R. Pelton. 1975. European Wild Hog Rooting in the Mountains of Eastern Tennessee.
14 *Proceeding of the Annual Conference of the Southeastern Association of Game and Fish*
15 *Commissioners* 29:665-671.
- 16 Bieber, C. and T. Ruf. 2005. Population dynamics in wild boar *Sus scrofa*: ecology, elasticity of growth rate
17 and implications for the management of pulsed resource consumers. *Journal of Applied Ecology*
18 42:1203–1213.
- 19 Corps and SFWMD (U.S. Army Corps of Engineers and South Florida Water Management District). 2010.
20 Melaleuca Eradication and Other Exotic Plants Implement Biological Controls, Final Integrated
21 Project Implementation Report and Environmental Assessment.
- 22 Cuda, J.P. 2009a. Invasive Species: A Florida Perspective. Entomology and Nematology Department,
23 University of Florida, Institute of Food and Agricultural Sciences.
- 24 Cuda, J.P. 2009b. Chapter 8: Introduction to Biological Control of Aquatic Weeds, pp. 55-60. In: *Biology*
25 *and control of aquatic plants: a best management practices handbook* (L.A. Gettys, W.T. Haller and
26 M. Bellaud, eds.). Aquatic Ecosystem Restoration Foundation, Marietta GA. 210 pp.

- 1 Dandelot, S., C. Robles, N. Pech, R. Verlaque and A. Caxaubon. 2008. Allelopathic potential of two invasive
2 *Ludwigia* spp. *Aquatic Botany* 88:311-316.
- 3 Dewey, S.A. and K.A. Andersen. 2004. Distinct roles of surveys, inventories, and monitoring in adaptive
4 weed management. *Weed Technology* 18:1449-1452.
- 5 Dorcas, M.E., J.D. Willson, R.N. Reed, R.W. Snow, M.R. Rochford, M.A. Miller, W.E. Meshaka, P.T.
6 Andreadis, F.J. Mazzotti, C.M. Romagosa, and K.M. Hart. 2012. Severe mammal declines coincide
7 with proliferation of invasive Burmese pythons in Everglades National Park. *Proceedings of the*
8 *National Academy of Sciences of the United States of America* Vol 109 no. 7 pages 2418-2422.
- 9 Doren, R.F., A.P. Ferriter, and H. Hastings (Eds.). 2001. Weeds Won't Wait!: The Strategic Plan for
10 Managing Florida's Invasive Exotic Plants, Part One: An Assessment of Invasive Plants in Florida. A
11 Report to the South Florida Ecosystem Restoration Task Force and Working Group, FL. 273 pp.
- 12 Doren, R.F., J.C. Volin and J.H. Richards. 2009. Invasive exotic plant indicators for ecosystem restoration:
13 An example from the Everglades Restoration Program. *Ecological Indicators* 1634 9S:S29-S36.
- 14 Duever, M.J., J.E. Carlson, J.F. Meeder, L.C. Duever, L.H. Gunderson, L.A. Riopelle, T.R. Alexander, R.L.
15 Myers and D.P. Spangler. 1986. *The Big Cypress National Preserve*. Research Report 8, National
16 Audubon Society, New York, NY.
- 17 Elzinga, C.L., D.W. Salzer and J.W. Willoughby. 1998. Measuring and Monitoring Plant Populations. *BLM*
18 *Technical Reference* 1730-1. Executive Order Number 13112 64 F.R. 6183 (February 8, 1999).
- 19 Fasulo, Thomas R. 2004. Latest revision July 2011. Featured Creatures, Entomology and Nematology
20 Department, Division of Plant Industry. University of Florida.
- 21 Ferreira, V., Figueiredo, A., Graça, M. A., Marchante, E., and Pereira, A. 2021. Invasion of temperate
22 deciduous broadleaf forests by N-fixing tree species—consequences for stream
23 ecosystems. *Biological Reviews* 96(3): 877-902.
- 24 Frank, J.H., and R.D. Cave. 2005. *Metamasius callizona* is Destroying Florida's Native Bromeliads. In:
25 Second International Symposium on Biological Control of Arthropods, September 12–16, 2005,
26 Davos, Switzerland, Volume I. Forest Service Publication FHTET-2005-08, M.S. Hoddle (ed.),
27 United States Department of Agriculture, Washington, DC., pp. 91-101.
- 28 FLEPPC (Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council). 2011. Florida Exotic Pest Plant Council's 2011 list of invasive
29 plant species. *Wildland Weeds* 14(3-4):11-17.
- 30 Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services. 2011. Laurel Wilt/Redbay Ambrosia Beetle
31 Detection Update. Tallahassee, FL.
- 32 Francis, J.K. n. d. Brazilian pepper tree. U.S. Department of Agriculture, Forest Service, International
33 Institute of Tropical Forestry, San Juan, Puerto Rico, in cooperation with the University of Puerto
34 Rico, Rio Piedras, Puerto Rico.
- 35 Haack, R.A. 2003. Intercepted Scolytidae (Coleoptera) at U.S. ports of entry: 1985-2000. *Integrated Pest*
36 *Management Reviews* 6: 253-282 (2001).

- 1 Haller, W. 2009. Chapter 7: Mechanical Control of Aquatic Weeds. In *Biology and control of aquatic plants:
2 a best management practices handbook*, L.A. Gettys, W.T. Haller and M. Bellaud, (eds.). Aquatic
3 Ecosystem Restoration Foundation, Marietta GA. pp. 41-46.
- 4 Hanula, J.L., A.E. Mayfield, S.W. Fraedrich, and R.J. Rabaglia. 2008. Biology and host associations of redbay
5 ambrosia beetle (Coleoptera: *Curculionidae: Scolytinae*), exotic vector of laurel wilt killing redbay
6 trees in the southeastern United States. *Journal of Economic Entomology* 101: 1276-1286.
- 7 Holm, L.G., D.L. Plucknett, J.V. Pancho, and J.P. Herberger. 1977. *The World's Worst Weeds: Distribution
8 and Biology*. Honolulu: University Press of Hawai'i.
- 9 Holmes, C.W., J.A. Robbins, R.A. Reddy, S.A. Neuman, and M. Marot. The effect of phosphorous- enriched
10 waters on the timing and rate of cattail growth in the northern Florida Everglades: American
11 Geophysical Union (AGU) Spring Meeting, Washington, D.C., May 28-31, 2002.
- 12 Hughes, T. W. 1985. Home range, habitat utilization, and pig survival of feral swine on the Savannah River
13 Plant. Thesis, Clemson University, Clemson, South Carolina, USA.
- 14 Johnson, S. 2007. The Cuban Treefrog (*Osteopilus septentrionalis*) in Florida. Publication WEC 218, Institute
15 of Food and Agricultural Sciences, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL.
- 16 Langeland, K.A., and K. Craddock Burks. 1998. Identification and Biology of Non-Native Plants in Florida's
17 Natural Areas. IFAS Publication SP 257. University of Florida, Gainesville.
- 18 Langeland K.A., and J. Hutchinson. 2005. Natural Area Weeds: Old World Climbing Fern (*Lygodium
19 microphyllum*). UF/IFAS document SS-AGR-21..
- 20 Langeland, K.A., H.M. Cherry, C.M. McCormick, and K.A. Craddock Burks. 2008. Identification and Biology
21 of Non-Native Plants in Florida's Natural Areas. IFAS Publication SP 257. 2nd Edition. University of
22 Florida, Gainesville.
- 23 Lass, L.W., T.S. Prather, N.F. Glenn, K.T. Weber, J.T. Mundt, and J. Pettingill. 2005. A review of remote
24 sensing of invasive weeds and example of the early detection of spotted knapweed (*Centaurea
25 maculosa*) and babysbreath (*Gypsophila paniculata*) with a hyperspectral sensor. *Weed Sci.*
26 53:242-251.
- 27 Laycock, G. 1966. *The Alien Animals*. Natural History Press, Garden City, N.Y.
- 28 Martin, S. 2015. Researchers identify, name toxic cyanobacteria killing American bald eagles. University of
29 Georgia News. Available online at [http://m.phys.org/news/2015-02-toxic-cyanobacteria-
30 americanbald-eagles.html](http://m.phys.org/news/2015-02-toxic-cyanobacteria-americanbald-eagles.html).
- 31 Maskell, A.J., J.H. Waddle and K.G. Rice. 2003. *Osteopilus septentrionalis* diet. *Herpetological Review*
32 34(2):137.
- 33 Mayfield, A.E. and M.C. Thomas. 2009. Florida Department of Agriculture and Consumer Services, Division
34 of Forestry, Gainesville, FL; and J.A. Smith, M. Hughes and T.J. Dreaden, School of Forest Resource
35 and Conservation, University of Florida, Gainesville. The redbay ambrosia beetle, *Xyleborus
36 glabratus Eichhoff (Scolytinae: Curculionidae)*.

- 1 Mazzotti, F.J., T. Center, F.A. Dray, D. Thayer. 2008. Ecological Consequences of Invasion by *Melaleuca*
2 *quinquenervia*. In *South Florida Wetlands: Paradise Damaged, not Lost*. IFAS Publication
3 SSWEC123. University of Florida, Gainesville.
- 4 Minter, C. R., Smith, M. C., Madeira, P., Goosem, C., Zonneveld, R., Makinson, J., ... & Purcell, M. (2020).
5 Is biological control for earleaf acacia (*Acacia auriculiformis*) Feasible in the United
6 States?. *Biocontrol Science and Technology*, 30(12), 1275-1299.
- 7 Myers, J. H., D. Simberloff, A. M. Kuris, and J. R. Carey. 2000. Eradication revisited: dealing with exotic
8 species. *Trends Ecol. Evol.* 15:316–320.
- 9 National Invasive Species Council. 2008. 2008-2012 National Invasive Species Management Plan.
10 Department of Interior, Office of the Secretary, Washington, D.C. 35 pp.
- 11 National Park Service. n . d . National Resources Management: Island Apple Snail. U.S. Department of the
12 Interior. Everglades National Park. South Florida Natural Resources Center, 950 Krome Avenue,
13 Homestead, FL 33030.
- 14 Pimentel, D., R. Zuniga, and D. Morrison. 2005. Update on the Environmental and Economic Costs
15 Associated with Alien-invasive Species in the United States. *Ecological Economics* 52:273–288.
- 16 Rejmanek, M., and M.J. Pitcairn. 2002. When is eradication of exotic pest plants a realistic goal? In:
17 *Turning the tide: the eradication of invasive species*. C.R. and M.N. Clout (eds.). IUCN SSC Invasive
18 Species Specialist Group, IUCN, Gland, Switzerland and Cambridge, UK. pp. 249-253.
- 19 Rew, L.J., B.D. Maxwell, and R. Aspinall. 2005. Predicting the occurrence of nonindigenous species using
20 environmental and remotely sensed data. *Weed Sci.* 53:236–241.
- 21 Rice, K.G., J.H. Waddle, M.W. Miller, M.E. Crockett, F.J. Mazzotti, and H.F. Percival. 2011. Recovery of
22 native treefrogs after removal of nonindigenous Cuban treefrogs, *Osteopilus septentrionalis*.
23 *Herpetologica* 67(2):105-117.
- 24 Shafii, B., W. J. Price, T. S. Prather, L. W. Lass and D. C. Thill. 2003. Predicting the likelihood of yellow
25 starthistle (*Centaurea solstitialis*) occurrence using landscape characteristics. *Weed Sci.* 51:748-
26 751.
- 27 Singer, F.J. 2005. Wild pig populations in the national parks. *Environmental Management* 5:263-270.
- 28 South Florida Environmental Report. 2013. Chapter 7: Status of Nonindigenous Species. South Florida
29 Water Management District.
- 30 South Florida Environmental Report. 2011. Chapter 9: Status of Nonindigenous Species in the South
31 Florida Environment. South Florida Water Management District.
- 32 Stein, B.A., L.S. Kutner, and J.S. Adams (Eds.). 2000. Precious Heritage: The Status of Biodiversity in the
33 United States. Oxford University Press, Oxford, England.
- 34 Sweeney, J.R., J.M. Sweeney, and S.W. Sweeney. 2003. Feral hog. In *Wild mammals of North America*. G.
35 A. Feldhamer, B. C. Thompson, and J. A. Chapman (eds.). Johns Hopkins University Press,
36 Baltimore, Maryland, USA. pp 1164–1179.

- 1 U.S. Congress, Office of Technology Assessment. 1993. Harmful Non-indigenous Species in the United
2 States, OTA-F-565. Washington, DC: U.S. Government Printing Office.
- 3 USDA Forest Service Remote Sensing Applications Center. 2012. A weed manager's guide to remote
4 sensing and GIS. <http://www.fs.fed.us/eng/rsac/invasivespecies/index.htm> Accessed: October 29,
5 2012.
- 6 Waddle, J. H., R.M. Dorazio, S.C. Walls, K.G. Rice, J. Beauchamp, M.J. Schuman, and F.J. Mazzotti. 2010. A
7 new parameterization for estimating co-occurrence of interacting species. *Ecological Applications*
8 20(5):1467-1475.
- 9 Wilcove, D.S., D. Rothstein, J. Dubow, A. Phillips, and E. Losos. 1998. Quantifying threats to imperiled
10 species in the United States. *Bioscience* 48: 607-615.
- 11 Wilde, S.B. 2005. Avian vacuolar myelinopathy linked to exotic aquatic plants and a novel cyanobacterial
12 species. *Environmental Toxicology* 20(3):348-353.
- 13 Wilde, S.B. 2014. *Aetokthonos hydrillicola*: Epiphytic cyanobacteria on invasive aquatic plants implicated
14 in Avian Vacuolar Myelinopathy. *Phytotaxa* 181(5):243-260.
- 15 Wilde, S.B., T.M. Murphy, C.P. Hope, S.K. Habrun, J. Kempton, A. Birrenkott, F. Wiley, W.W. Bowerman and
16 A.J. Lewitus. 2005. Avian vacuolar myelinopathy of the central nervous system of bald eagles and
17 American coots. *Veterinary Pathology* 35:479-487.
- 18 Wolverton, B. C. and R.C. McDonald. 1978. Water hyacinth (*Eichhornia crassipes*) productivity and
19 harvesting studies. *Economic Botany* 33:1-10.
- 20 Wunderlin, R.P., and B.F. Hansen. 2008. Atlas of Florida Vascular Plants. [S.M. Landry and K.N. Campbell
21 (application development,) Florida Center for Community Design and Research.] Institute for
22 Systematic Botany, University of South Florida, Tampa. Available online at:
23 <http://www.plantatlas.usf.edu/>.