

STATUS OF THE SPECIES – Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*)

Legal Status – On March 11, 1967, the Service listed the panther as endangered (32 FR 4001) throughout its historic range, and they received Federal protection under the passage of the Act in 1973. In addition, the Florida Panther Act (Florida Statute 372.671), a 1978 Florida State law, made killing a panther a felony. The panther is listed as endangered by the States of Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi in addition to its Federal listing. Critical habitat has not been designated for the panther.

Species Description

Appearance/Morphology

An adult panther is unspotted and typically rusty reddish-brown on the back, tawny on the sides, and pale gray underneath. Adult males can reach a length of 7 feet (ft) (2.1 meters [m]) from their nose to the tip of their tail and may exceed 161 pounds (lbs) (73 kg) in weight; but, typically adult males average around 116 lbs (52.6 kg) and stand about 24 to 28 inches (in) (60 to 70 centimeters [cm]) at the shoulder (Roelke 1990). Female panthers are smaller with an average weight of 75 lbs (34 kg) and length of 6 ft (1.8 m) (Roelke 1990). Panther kittens are gray with dark brown or blackish spots and five bands around the tail. The spots gradually fade as the kittens grow older and are almost unnoticeable by the time they are 6 months old. At this age, their bright blue eyes slowly turn to the light-brown straw color of the adult (Belden 1988).

Three external characteristics: a right angle crook at the terminal end of the tail, a whorl of hair or cowlick in the middle of the back, and irregular, white flecking on the head, nape, and shoulders – not found in combination in other subspecies of *Puma* (Belden 1986), were commonly observed in panthers through the mid-1990s. The kinked tail and cowlicks were considered manifestations of inbreeding (Seal 1994); whereas the white flecking was thought to be a result of scarring from tick bites (Machr 1992). Four other abnormalities prevalent in the panther population prior to the mid-1990s were cryptorchidism (one or two undescended testicles), low sperm quality, atrial septal defects (the opening between two atria in the heart fails to close normally during fetal development), and immune deficiencies; and these were suspected to be the result of low genetic variability (Roelke et al. 1993).

Taxonomy

The panther was first described by Charles B. Cory in 1896 as *Felis concolor floridana* (Cory 1896). The type specimen was collected in Sebastian, Florida. Bangs (1899), however, believed the panther was restricted to peninsular Florida and could not intergrade with other *Felis* sp. Therefore, he assigned it full specific status and named it *Felis coryi* since *Felis floridana* had been used previously for a bobcat (*Lynx rufus*).

Culver et al. (2000) examined genetic diversity within and among the described subspecies of *Puma concolor* using three groups of genetic markers and proposed a revision of the genus to include only six subspecies, one of which encompassed all puma in North America including the panther. They determined the panther was one of several smaller populations that had unique features. Specifically, the number of polymorphic microsatellite loci and amount of variation were lower, and it was highly inbred. The degree to which the scientific community accepted the results of Culver et al. (2000) and the proposed change in taxonomy is not resolved (Service 2008). The panther remains listed as a subspecies, and continues to receive protection pursuant to the Act.

Life History

Male panthers are polygynous, maintaining large, overlapping home ranges containing several adult females and their dependent offspring. Breeding activity peaks from December to March (Shindle et al. 2003). Litters ($n = 82$) are produced throughout the year, with 56 to 60 percent of births occurring between March and June (Jansen et al. 2005; Lotz et al. 2005). The greatest number of births occurs in May and June (Jansen et al. 2005; Lotz et al. 2005). Average litter size is 2.4 ± 0.91 (standard deviation) kittens. Seventy percent of litters are comprised of either two or three kittens.

Panther dens are usually located closer to upland hardwoods, pinelands, and mixed wet forests and farther from freshwater marsh-wet prairie (Benson et al. 2008). Most den sites are located in dense saw palmetto (*Serenoa repens*), shrubs, or vines (Maehr 1990a; Shindle et al. 2003, Benson et al. 2008). Den sites are used for 6 to 8 weeks by female panthers and their litters from birth to weaning (Benson et al. 2008). Independence and dispersal of young typically occurs at 18 months, but may occur as early as one year (Maehr 1992).

Benson et al. (2009) analyzed survival and cause-specific mortality of subadult and adult panthers. They found that sex and age influenced panther survival, as females survived better than males, and older adults (≥ 10 years) survived poorly compared with younger adults. Genetic ancestry strongly influenced annual survival of subadults and adults after introgression, as F1 generation admixed panthers survived longer than pre-introgression panthers and non-F1 admixed individuals (Benson et al. 2009).

Mortality records for uncollared panthers have been kept since February 13, 1972, and for radio-collared panthers since February 10, 1981 (FWC 2013, and FWC unpublished data). Through June 25, 2014, 424 mortalities have been documented (FWC 2014). Of the 424 total mortalities, 181 were radio-collared. Intraspecific aggression was the leading cause of mortality for radio-collared panthers, and was more common for males than females (Benson et al. 2009). Older-adult males had significantly higher, and subadult males had marginally higher, mortality due to intraspecific aggression than adult males in their prime (Benson et al. 2009). Most

intraspecific aggression occurs between male panthers; but, aggressive encounters between males and females have occurred, resulting in the death of the female. Defense of kittens or of a kill is suspected in half (five of ten) of the known instances through 2003 (Shindle et al. 2003).

Following intraspecific aggression, the greatest causes of mortality for radio-collared panthers was from unknown causes, vehicles, and other (Benson et al. 2009). From February 13, 1972, through June 30, 2014, 215 panthers (radio-collared and uncollared) were hit by vehicles (FWC 2014). These collisions resulted in 203 panther fatalities and 12 non-fatal injuries. The number of panther/vehicle collisions per year is positively correlated with the annual panther count (McBride et al. 2008).

Female panthers are considered adult residents if they are older than 18 months, have established home ranges, and have bred (Maehr et al. 1991). Land et al. (2004) reported 23 of 24 female panthers first captured as kittens survived to become residents and 18 (78.3 percent) produced litters; 1 female was too young to determine residency. Male panthers are considered adult residents if they are older than 3 years and have established a home range that overlaps with females. Thirty-one (31) male panthers were captured as kittens and 12 (38.7 percent) of these cats survived to become residents (Jansen et al. 2005). “Successful male recruitment may depend on the death or home range shift of a resident adult male” (Maehr et al. 1991). Turnover in the breeding population is low with documented mortality in radio-collared panthers being greatest in subadult and non-resident males (Maehr et al. 1991; Shindle et al. 2003).

Den sites of female panthers have been visited since 1992 and the kittens tagged with passive integrated transponder chips. Annual survival of these kittens has been determined to be 0.328 ± 0.072 (SE) (Hostetler et al. 2009). There was no evidence survival rate differed between male and female kittens or was influenced by litter size. Hostetler et al. (2009) found kitten survival generally increased with degree of admixture with introduced Texas pumas and decreased with panther abundance. Kitten survival is lowest during the first 3 months of their lives (Hostetler et al. 2009).

Panther dispersal begins after a juvenile becomes independent from its mother and continues until it establishes a home range. Dispersal distances are greater for males than females. The maximum dispersal distance recorded for a young male was 139.2 mi (224.1 km) over a 7-month period followed by a secondary dispersal of 145 mi (233 km). Comiskey et al. (2002) found males disperse an average distance of 25 mi (40 km) and females typically remain in or disperse short distances from their natal ranges. Female dispersers establish home ranges less than one average home range width from their natal range (Maehr et al. 2002a). Maehr et al. (2002a) reported all female dispersers ($n = 9$) were successful at establishing a home range whereas only 63 percent of males ($n = 18$) were successful. Dispersing males usually go through a period as transient (non-resident) subadults, moving through the fringes of the resident population and often occupying suboptimal habitat until an established range becomes vacant (Maehr 1997).

Most panther dispersal occurs south of the Caloosahatchee River. However, panthers have been documented north of the Caloosahatchee River many times since February 1972 through field signs (e.g., tracks, urine markers, scats), camera-trap photographs, carcasses from vehicle-related mortalities, telemetry from radio-collared animals (Land and Taylor 1998; Land et al. 1999; Shindle et al. 2000; Maehr et al. 2002b; Belden and McBride 2005), captured animals (one of which was radio collared), and one skeleton.

The Caloosahatchee River, a narrow (295-328 ft [90-100 m]), channelized river, is probably not a significant barrier to panther movements. Western subspecies of *Puma* are known to cross wide, swift-flowing rivers up to a mile in width (Seidensticker et al. 1973; Anderson 1983). However, the combination of the river, SR 80, and land uses along the river seems to have somewhat restricted panther dispersal northward (Maehr et al. 2002b). Documented physical evidence of at least 15 uncollared male panthers has been confirmed north of the river since 1972, but neither female panthers nor reproduction have been documented in this area since 1973 (Belden and McBride 2005).

Panthers require large areas to meet their needs. Numerous factors influence panther home range size, including: habitat quality, prey density, and landscape configuration (Belden 1988; Comiskey et al. 2002). Home range sizes of six radio-collared panthers monitored between 1985 and 1990 averaged 128,000 ac (51,800 hectares [ha]) for resident adult males and 48,000 ac (19,425 ha) for resident adult females; transient males had a home range of 153,599 ac (62,160 ha) (Maehr et al. 1991). Comiskey et al. (2002) examined the home range size for 50 adult panthers (residents greater than 1.5 years old) monitored in south Florida from 1981 to 2000 and found resident males had a mean home range of 160,639 ac (65,009 ha) and females had a mean home range of 97,920 ac (39,627 ha). Beier et al. (2003) found home range size estimates for panthers reported by Maehr et al. (1991) and Comiskey et al. (2002) to be reliable.

Annual minimum convex polygon home range sizes of 52 adult radio-collared panthers monitored between 1998 and 2002 ranged from 15,360 to 293,759 ac (6,216 to 118,880 ha), averaging 89,600 ac (36,260 ha) for 20 resident adult males and 44,160 ac (17,871 ha) for 32 resident adult females (Land et al. 1999, 2002; Shindle et al. 2000, 2001). The most current estimate of home-range sizes (minimum convex polygon method) for established, non-dispersing, adult, radio-collared panthers averaged 29,056 ac (11,759 ha) for females ($n = 11$) and 62,528 ac (25,304 ha) for males ($n = 11$) (Lotz et al. 2005). The average home range was 35,089 ac (14,200 ha) for resident females ($n = 6$) and 137,143 ac (55,500 ha) ($n = 5$) for males located at Big Cypress National Preserve (BICY) (Jansen et al. 2005). Home ranges of resident adults tend to be stable unless influenced by the death of other residents.

Activity levels for panthers are greatest at night with peaks around sunrise and after sunset (Maehr et al. 1990b). The lowest activity levels occur during the middle of the day. Female panthers at natal dens follow a similar pattern with less difference between high and low activity periods.

Telemetry data indicate panthers typically do not return to the same resting site day after day, with the exception of females with dens or panthers remaining near kill sites for several days. The presence of physical evidence such as tracks, scats, and urine markers, confirms panthers move extensively within home ranges, visiting all parts of the range regularly in the course of hunting, breeding, and other activities (Maehr 1997; Comiskey et al. 2002). Males travel widely throughout their home ranges to maintain exclusive breeding rights to females. Females without kittens also move extensively within their ranges (Maehr 1997). Panthers are capable of moving large distances in short periods of time. Nightly panther movements of 12 mi (20 km) are not uncommon (Maehr et al. 1990a).

Adult females and their kittens interact more frequently than any other group of panthers. Interactions between adult male and female panthers last from 1 to 7 days and usually result in pregnancy (Maehr et al. 1991). Aggressive interactions between males often result in serious injury or death. Independent subadult males have been known to associate with each other for several days and these interactions do not appear to be aggressive in nature. Based on radio-collared panthers, aggression between males is the most common cause of male mortality (FWC 2014) and an important determinant of male spatial and recruitment patterns based on (Maehr et al. 1991; Shindle et al. 2003).

Primary panther prey species are white-tailed deer and feral hog (*Sus scrofa*) (Maehr et al. 1990b; Dalrymple and Bass 1996). Generally, feral hogs constitute the greatest biomass consumed by panthers north of the Alligator Alley section of I-75, while white-tailed deer are the greatest biomass consumed to the south (Maehr et al. 1990b). Secondary prey species include raccoons (*Procyon lotor*), nine-banded armadillos (*Dasypus novemcinctus*), marsh rabbits (*Sylvilagus palustris*) (Maehr et al. 1990b), and American alligators (*Alligator mississippiensis*) (Dalrymple and Bass 1996). No seasonal variation in diet has been detected. Maehr et al. (1990b) rarely observed domestic livestock in scats or kills of the panther, although cattle were readily available in the study area. In a study of calf depredation on two ranches in southwest Florida (Main and Jacobs 2014), panthers were determined to be the cause of calf mortality for 0.5 percent of calves on one ranch and 5.3 percent of calves on the other ranch.

Little information on the feeding frequency of the panther is available. However, the feeding frequency of the Puma is likely similar to the feeding frequency of the panther. Ackerman et al. (1986) reported a resident adult male puma generally consumes one deer-sized prey every 8 to 11 days. Moreover, a resident female puma will consume one deer-sized prey item every 14 to 17 days, and one deer-sized prey item every 3.3 days for a female with three 13-month-old kittens.

Habitat

Noss and Cooperrider (1994) considered the landscape implications of maintaining viable panther populations. Assuming a male home range size of 137,599 ac (55,685 ha) (Maehr 1990), an adult sex ratio of 50:50 (Anderson 1983), and some margin of safety, they determined a reserve network as large as 15,625 to 23,438 mi² (40,469 to 60,703 km²) would be needed to

support an effective population size of 50 individuals (equating to an actual adult population of 100 to 200 panthers [Ballou et al. 1989]). However, to provide for long-term persistence based on an effective population size of 500 individuals (equating to 1,000 to 2,000 adult panthers [Ballou et al. 1989]), could require as much as 156,251 to 234,376 mi² (404,687 to 607,031 km²). This latter acreage corresponds to roughly 60 to 70 percent of the panther's historical range. Although it is uncertain whether this much land is needed for panther recovery, it does provide some qualitative insight into the importance of habitat conservation across large landscapes for achieving a viable panther population (Noss and Cooperrider 1994).

Radio-collar data and ground tracking indicate that panthers use the mosaic of habitats available to them as resting and denning sites, hunting grounds, and travel routes. The majority of telemetry locations (Belden 1986; Belden et al. 1988; Maehr 1990; Maehr et al. 1991; Maehr 1992; Smith and Bass 1994; Kerkhoff et al. 2000; Comiskey et al. 2002, Cox et al. 2006, Kautz et al. 2006, Land et al. 2008) and natal den sites (Benson et al. 2008) were within or close to forested cover types, particularly cypress swamp, pinelands, hardwood swamp, and upland hardwood forests. Global Positioning System data has shown panthers (n = 12) use all habitats contained within their home ranges by selecting for forested habitat types and using all others in proportion to availability (Land et al. 2008).

Kautz et al. (2006) found that the smallest class of forest patches (*i.e.*, 9 to 26 ac [3.6 to 10.4 ha]) were the highest ranked forest patch sizes within panther home ranges. The diverse woody flora of forest edges probably provides cover suitable for stalking and ambushing prey (Belden et al. 1988; Cox et al. 2006). Also, dense understory vegetation comprised of saw palmetto provides some of the most important resting and denning cover for panthers (Maehr 1990; Benson et al. 2008). Shindle et al. (2003) estimated 73 percent of panther dens were in saw palmetto thickets.

Between 1981 and 2010, more than 90,000 locations were collected from more than 180 radio-collared panthers. Belden et al. (1988); Maehr et al. (1991); Maehr and Cox (1995); Maehr (1997); Kerkoff et al. (2000); Comiskey et al. (2002); Cox et al. (2006); and Kautz et al. (2006) provide information on habitat use based on various subsets of these data. Land et al. (2008), investigated habitat selection of 12 panthers in the northern portion of the breeding range using Global Positioning System (GPS) telemetry data collected during nocturnal and diurnal periods, as well as VHF telemetry data collected only during diurnal periods, and found analysis of both types of telemetry data yielded similar results.

Even though some suitable panther habitat remains in south-central Florida, it is widely scattered and fragmented (Belden and McBride 2005). Thatcher et al. (2006) used a statistical model in combination with a geographic information system (GIS) to develop a multivariate landscape-scale habitat model based on the Mahalanobis distance statistic (D^2) to evaluate habitats in south central Florida for potential expansion of the panther population. They identified four potential habitat patches: the Avon Park Bombing Range area, Fisheating Creek/Babcock-Webb Wildlife Management Area (WMA), eastern Fisheating Creek, and the Duette Park/ Manatee County area. These habitat patches are smaller and more isolated compared with the current panther

range, and the landscape matrix where these habitat patches exist provides relatively poor habitat connectivity among the patches (Thatcher et al. 2006, 2009). Major highways and urban or agricultural development isolate these habitat patches, and they are rapidly being lost to the same development that threatens southern Florida (Belden and McBride 2005).

Travel and dispersal corridors

In the absence of direct field observations/measurements, Harrison (1992) suggested landscape corridors for wide-ranging predators should be half the width of an average home range size. Following Harrison's (1992) suggestion, corridor widths for panthers would range from 6.1 to 10.9 mi (9.8 to 17.6 km) depending on whether the target animal was an adult female or a transient male. Beier (1995) suggested that corridor widths for transient male puma in California could be as small as 30 percent of the average home range size of an adult panther; however, topography in California is dramatically different from that in Florida. Without supporting empirical evidence, Noss (1992) suggests regional corridors connecting larger hubs of habitat should be at least 1.0 mi (1.6 km) wide. Beier (1995) makes specific recommendations for very narrow corridor widths based on short corridor lengths in a California setting of wild lands completely surrounded by urban areas; he recommended corridors with a length less than 0.5 mi (0.8 km) should be more than 328 ft (100 m) wide, and corridors extending 0.6 to 4 mi (1 to 7 km) should be more than 1,312 ft (400 m) wide. The Dispersal Zone, which connects lands between the Panther Focus Area south of the Caloosahatchee River and the Panther Focus Area north of the Caloosahatchee River, encompasses 44 mi² (113 km²) with a mean width of 3.4 mi (5.4 km) (Figure 5). Although it is not adequate to support a single panther, the Dispersal Zone is strategically located and expected to function as an important landscape linkage to south-central Florida (Kautz et al. 2006). Transient male panthers currently use this zone as they disperse northward into south-central Florida.

Distribution

The panther is the last subspecies of *Puma* (also known as mountain lion, cougar, panther, or catamount) still surviving in the eastern United States. Historically occurring throughout the southeastern United States (Young and Goldman 1946), today the panther is restricted to less than 5 percent of its historic range located in south Florida.

When Europeans first came to this country, pumas roamed most all of North, Central, and South America. Early settlers attempted to eradicate pumas by every means possible. By 1899, it was believed panthers had been restricted to peninsular Florida (Bangs 1899). By the late 1920s to mid-1930s, it was thought by many the panther had been completely extirpated (Tinsley 1970). In 1935, Dave Newell, a Florida sportsman, hired Vince and Ernest Lee, Arizona houndsmen, to hunt for panthers in Florida. They killed eight in the Big Cypress Swamp (Newell 1935). Every survey conducted since then confirmed a breeding panther population in southern Florida south of the Caloosahatchee River, and no survey since then has been able to confirm a reproducing panther population outside of southern Florida.

Although generally considered unreliable, sightings of panthers regularly occur throughout the southeast. Nonetheless, a reproducing population of panthers has not been documented to occur outside of south Florida for at least 30 years despite an extensive search effort (Belden et al. 1991; McBride et al. 1993; Clark et al. 2002). Survey reports and more than 70,000 locations of radio-collared panthers recorded between 1981 and 2004 clearly define the panther's current breeding range. Reproduction is known only in the Big Cypress Swamp and Everglades physiographic region in Collier, Lee, Hendry, Miami-Dade, and Monroe Counties, south of the Caloosahatchee River (Belden et al. 1991). As discussed previously, panthers occasionally disperse north of the Caloosahatchee River. However, these animals are likely all males searching to establish new territories. There is no evidence of female panthers or successful panther reproduction currently occurring north of the Caloosahatchee River (Nowak and McBride 1974; Belden et al. 1991; Land and Taylor 1998; Land et al. 1999; Shindle et al. 2000; McBride 2002; Belden and McBride 2005). In 1973, McBride captured one female in Glades County (Nowak and McBride 1974). This was the last time a female panther was identified north of the Caloosahatchee River.

Population Dynamics

McBride et al. (2008) and McBride (2010) reported minimum population counts (*i.e.*, number known alive) based on physical evidence (*e.g.*, tracks, urine markers, panther treed with hounds, trail-camera photos). They counted adult and subadult panthers, but not kittens at the den. Three rules were used to distinguish individuals: (1) gender was determined by track size or stride length; (2) time (freshness) was determined by known events within the past 24 hours, such as wind or rain; and (3) distance between individual track sets. These rules were used as an exclusionary tool to avoid over-counting (McBride et al. 2008). The number of panthers detected and verified by physical evidence from 1981 to 1994 fluctuated between a high of 30 and a low of 19 adult and juvenile panthers, with the lowest point occurring in 1991 following the removal of seven juveniles and three kittens to initiate a captive breeding program (McBride et al. 2008). In 1995, eight female pumas from Texas were released to address suspected deleterious effects of inbreeding. From 1996 to 2003, the panther population increased at a rate of 14 percent per year with 26.6 kittens being produced annually (Johnson et al. 2010). The effective population size (N_e) rose from 16.4 in 1995 to 32.1 in 2007, with corresponding census populations (N) of 26 and 102, respectively. The population tripled since 1995 (McBride et al. 2008, Johnson et al. 2010), reaching a high of 117 by 2007 (mortalities not subtracted). Data reported in McBride (2000, 2001, 2002, 2003, 2004, 2006, 2007, 2008, and 2009), McBride et al. (2010, 2011, 2012, and 2013), and Johnson et al. (2010) noted minimum population counts of 62 panthers in 2000, 78 in 2001, 80 in 2002, 87 in 2003, 78 in 2004, 82 in 2005, 97 in 2006, 117 in 2007, 104 in 2008, 113 in 2009, 115 in 2010, 111 in 2011, 123 in 2012, and 133 in 2013.

Machr et al. (1991) provide an estimate of population density of 1 panther per 27,520 ac, based on 17 radio-collared and 4 uncollared panthers. They extrapolated this density to the area occupied by radio-collared panthers (1,245,435 ac) during the period 1985 to 1990 to achieve a

population estimate of 46 adult panthers for southwest Florida (excluding Everglades National Park [ENP], eastern BICY, and Glades and Highlands Counties). Beier et al. (2003), however, argued this estimate of density, although “reasonably rigorous,” could not be extrapolated to other areas because it was not known whether densities were comparable in those areas. Kautz et al. (2006) provided a density estimate of 1 panther per 31,923 ac by dividing the panther count at that time (67) by the area within the Primary Zone. This estimate does not take into account the variability in panther densities across the landscape. Using an average of the 2007 to 2009 panther counts in the eight survey units covered by McBride et al. (2008) and Kautz et al. (2006), the density estimates range from a low of one panther per 81,479 ac to a high of one panther per 7,850 ac for the Primary Zone lands within these survey units.

The FWC (2010) provided an upper bound population estimate of 0.0177 panthers per square-kilometer (km^2) or one panther per 13,929 ac. Applying this density estimate to the Primary Zone (9,189 km^2) (2,270,652 ac) yields an upper estimate of 163 adult panthers. The FWC’s lower estimate is 100 panthers (1.09 panthers per 100 km^2 or 1 panther per 22,707 ac) and is based on annual verified panther sign data (McBride et al. 2008) and minimum number of panthers known to be alive (FWC 2010). Applying the four densities to the Primary Zone would yield a population based on Kautz et al.’s (2006) density estimate of 71 panthers (1 panther per 31,923 ac). Maehr et al.’s (1991) estimate would yield a population of 83 panthers (1 panther per 27,520 ac) and the FWC’s (2010) estimate would yield a low of 100 panthers (1 panther per 22,707 ac) and a high of 163 panthers (1 panther per 13,929 ac). For our evaluations however, the Service is continuing to use the average densities provided by Kautz et al. (2006) of one panther per 31,923 ac (12,919 ha) or one panther per 129 km^2 .

Population Viability Analysis (PVA) has emerged as a key component of endangered species conservation. This process is designed to incorporate demographic information into models that predict if a population is likely to persist in the future. PVAs incorporate deterministic and stochastic events including demographic and environmental variation, and natural catastrophes. PVAs have been criticized as being overly optimistic about future population levels (Brook et al. 1997) and should be viewed with caution; however, they are and have been shown to be surprisingly accurate for managing endangered taxa and evaluating different management practices (Brook 2000).

Shaffer (1981) originally defined a viable population as follows: “a minimum viable population for any given species in any given habitat is the smallest isolated population having a 99 percent chance of remaining extant for 1,000 years despite the foreseeable effects of demographic, environmental and genetic stochasticity, and natural catastrophes.” However, the goal of 95 percent probability of persistence for 100 years is the standard recommended by population biologists and is used in management strategies and conservation planning, particularly for situations where it is difficult to accurately predict the future (Shaffer 1978, 1981, 1987).

From 1981 through 2010, 182 panthers were been radio-collared and monitored on public and private lands throughout south Florida (FWC 2010). Radio-collar data were used by researchers to estimate survival rates and fecundity and were incorporated into PVA models previously developed for the panther (Seal and Lacy 1989, 1992; Cox et al. 1994; Maehr et al. 2002b). These models incorporated a range of different model parameters such as sex ratios, kitten survival rates, age distributions, and various levels of habitat loss, density dependence, and intermittent catastrophes or epidemics. The outputs of these models predicted a variety of survival scenarios for the panther and predicted population levels needed to ensure the survival of the species.

Root (2004) developed an updated set of PVA models for the panther based on RAMAS GIS software (Akçakaya 2002). These models were used to perform a set of spatially explicit PVAs. Three single-sex (*i.e.*, females only) models were constructed using demographic variables from Maehr et al. (2002b) and other sources. A conservative model was based on Seal and Lacy (1989), a moderate model was based on Seal and Lacy (1992), and an optimistic model was based on the 1999 consensus model of Maehr et al. (2002b). In each model, first-year kitten survival was set at 62 percent based on information from panther population monitoring (Shindle et al. 2001). All of the models assumed a 1:1 sex ratio, a stable age distribution, 50 percent of females breeding in any year, and an initial population of 41 females (82 individuals), which was the approximate population size in 2001 and 2002 (McBride 2001, 2002).

The basic versions of each model incorporated no catastrophes or epidemics, no change in habitat quality or amount, and a ceiling type of density dependence. The basic versions of the models incorporated a carrying capacity of 53 females (106 panthers with a 50:50 sex ratio). The models were run with differing values for density dependence, various levels of habitat loss, and intermittent catastrophes or epidemics. Each simulation was run with 10,000 replications for a 100-year period. The minimum number of panthers needed to ensure a 95 percent probability of persistence for 100 years was estimated in a series of simulations in which initial abundance was increased until probability of extinction at 100 years was no greater than 5 percent. More detailed information concerning the PVA model parameters appears in Root (2004).

The results of an earlier, conservative PVA model run done by Seal and Lacy (1989) predicted a probability of extinction of 78.5 percent in 100 years with a mean final total abundance of 3.5 females. Also, the probability of a large decline in abundance (50 percent) was 94.1 percent. Later work based on improved panther modeling and a larger sample of monitored panthers produced both a moderate and optimistic scenario (Root 2004). The moderate model resulted in a 5 percent probability of extinction and a mean final abundance of 42.3 females in 100 years. The probability of panther abundance declining by half the initial amount was 20 percent in 100 years under the moderate model. The optimistic model resulted in a 2 percent probability of extinction and mean final abundance of 51.2 females in 100 years. The probability of panther abundance declining by half the initial amount was only 9 percent in 100 years under the

optimistic model. These models also provide a probability of persistence (100 percent minus probability of extinction) over a 100-year period of 95 percent for the moderate model and 98 percent for the optimistic model.

Model results were also provided by Root (2004) for probability of extinctions for 1 percent loss of habitat per year, within the first 25 years of the model run, based on both the moderate and optimistic scenarios. The 1 percent loss of habitat equates to essentially all remaining non-urban privately owned lands in the Primary Zone and corresponds to the estimated rate of habitat loss from 1986 to 1996 for the five southwest counties based on land use changes (Root 2004). For the moderate model, the model runs predict a probability of extinction increase of about 1 percent to 6 percent with 1.0 percent habitat loss per year for the first 25 years. For the optimistic model, probability of extinction increased from about 2 percent with no loss of habitat to 3 percent with 1.0 percent habitat loss per year, for the first 25 years. These models also predicted the mean final abundance of females would decrease from 41 to 31 females, a 24.3 percent reduction for the moderate model and from 41 to 38 females, a 7.3 percent reduction for the optimistic model.

The probability of persistence over a 100-year period with a 1 percent loss of habitat changed to approximately 94 percent for the moderate model and 97 percent for the optimistic model. The model runs also predicted a mean final abundance of 62 individuals (31 females and 31 males) for the moderate model and 76 individuals (38 females and 38 males) for the optimistic model.

The results of the PVA lead to the development of population guidelines for the panther. Kautz et al. (2006) developed recommendations for panther population size as it relates to persistence following review of the output of Root's PVA models (2004) and those of other previous PVAs for the panther. These recommendations are: (1) populations of less than 50 individuals are likely to become extinct in less than 100 years; (2) populations of 60 to 70 are barely viable and expected to decline by 25 percent over 100 years; (3) populations of 80 to 100 are likely stable but would still be subject to genetic problems (*i.e.*, heterozygosity would slowly decline); and (4) populations greater than 240 have a high probability of persistence for 100 years and are demographically stable and large enough to retain 90 percent of original genetic diversity. Kautz et al.'s (2006) population recommendations, when applied to the populations predicted by Root's (2004) moderate models, describe the "with habitat loss" population (62 panthers) as barely viable and expected to decline by 25 percent over a 100-year period. The "without habitat loss" population (84 panthers) is likely stable but would still be subject to genetic problems.

The Service believes McBride's verified population of 97 panthers in 2006, 117 panthers in 2007, 104 in 2008, 113 in 2009, 115 in 2010, and 111 in 2011, 123 in 2012, and 133 in 2013 is within Kautz et al.'s (2006) population recommendations representing a population that is likely stable but still may be subject to genetic problems.

The Service also believes the model runs show lands in the Primary Zone are important to the survival and recovery of the panther, and sufficient lands need to be managed and protected in south Florida to provide for a population of 80 to 100 panthers, the population range defined as likely stable over 100 years, but subject to genetic problems.

Critical Habitat

Critical habitat has not been designated for the panther.

Threats

Present or Threatened Destruction, Modification or Curtailment of its Habitat or Range

Panthers, because of their wide-ranging movements and extensive spatial requirements, are particularly sensitive to habitat fragmentation (Harris 1984). Mac et al. (1998) defines habitat fragmentation as: “The breaking up of a habitat into unconnected patches interspersed with other habitat which may not be inhabitable by species occupying the habitat that was broken up. The breaking up is usually by human action, as, for example, the clearing of forest or grassland for agriculture, residential development, or overland electrical lines.” The reference to “unconnected patches” is a central underpinning of the definition. For panther conservation, this definition underscores the need to maintain contiguous habitat and protected habitat corridors in key locations in south Florida and throughout the panther’s historic range. Habitat fragmentation can result from road construction, urban development, and agricultural land conversions.

Roads and highways facilitate the movement of people and goods by cars and trucks, and may adversely affect the panther. The construction of new roads and the widening of existing roads can result in the direct loss of wildlife habitat (Forman et al. 2003). In addition, disturbance resulting from motorized vehicles may cause panthers to avoid busy roads. Maher (1990) reported that female panthers are less likely to cross busy highways. Consequently, roads may act as barriers affecting panther movement and fragmenting panther habitat. Panthers can also be injured or killed due to collisions with motorized vehicles when attempting to cross highways, and the potential for collisions increases as traffic increases. Adverse effects resulting from roads and highways represent a potential threat to the existing panther population.

Collisions with motor vehicles on highways are a significant source of mortality for the panther. The FWC documented 165 vehicle-related panther mortalities and 8 vehicle-related panther injuries from 1972 to the present on highways in south Florida. In portions of the panther’s range, the rate of panther vehicle-related mortalities may be increasing. Smith et al. (2006) found that vehicle-related panther mortalities in Collier

County increased by a factor of four from 2000 to 2005, compared to previous decades. This increase in panther mortality is likely related to the increase in traffic from Collier County's population growth. Unfortunately, the effect of vehicle-related mortality on the existing panther population is largely unknown.

Wildlife underpasses, or crossings, can be constructed within highway corridors to reduce the potential for panther injuries and mortalities resulting from vehicle collisions. Underpasses allow panthers and other wildlife to safely cross under busy roadways, and maintain connectivity and gene flow within the panther population. Underpasses usually consist of a bridge, prefabricated concrete box, or culvert (Forman et al. 2003). Effective crossing structures are large enough to allow the passage of panthers and include adequate wing fencing to funnel panthers to the crossing site. Crossings should be designed so panthers have an unobstructed view of habitat on the opposite side of the underpass (Foster and Humphrey 1995). The status of lands adjacent to the crossing site should also be considered when determining the location of a crossing. Unprotected private lands adjacent to the crossing could be developed and render the crossing unviable. Accordingly, lands adjacent to crossings should be acquired or placed under a conservation easement or other protective covenant to ensure the crossing will function in perpetuity. A number of wildlife crossings with associated fencing have already been constructed on major roadways in southwest Florida to benefit the panther and other wildlife species. In 1991, the FDOT finished the construction of 28 wildlife crossings within the I-75 corridor from U.S. Highway 27 to just west of Everglades Boulevard.

The FDOT also constructed six wildlife crossings on SR 29 between Oil Well Road and US 41. Crossings A, B, C, and D are located north of I-75 and Crossings E and F are located south of I-75. Crossings A and B were constructed in 2007, Crossings C and D were constructed in 1995, Crossing E was constructed in 1997, and Crossing F was constructed in 1999. Prior to construction of the SR 29 Crossings, a total of 10 vehicle-related panther mortalities were recorded near the locations of Crossings A and B from 1980 through 2004, and 2 vehicle-related panther mortalities were recorded near the location of Crossings C and D from 1979 through 1990. Vehicle-related panther mortalities have not been recorded in the vicinity of Crossings A, B, C, or D following their installation. A total of two vehicle-related panther mortalities were documented within 3.5 mi of the location of Crossing E prior to construction, and vehicle-related panther mortalities were not observed within 2.5 mi of the location of Crossing F prior to construction. Following construction of Crossings E and F, a total of four vehicle-related panther mortalities have been reported within 3 mi of Crossing E, and two vehicle-related panther mortalities have been documented within 1 mi of Crossing F.

Lee County, Collier County, and other entities have been working with the Service to construct additional needed crossings for the panther. For example, the Collier County Road Department recently constructed two wildlife underpasses and barrier fencing

within the Oil Well Road (CR 858) corridor at Camp Keais Strand, in association with the Oil Well Road widening project. Lee County constructed a wildlife underpass and barrier fencing on Corkscrew Road in 2004. Moreover, in 2011, a wildlife underpass and barrier fencing was installed east of Immokalee on County Road (CR) 846 in Collier County, as part of a Habitat Conservation Plan. A wildlife underpass has also been installed on Immokalee Road near CR 951.

Although these wildlife crossings have contributed to minimization of panther-vehicle interactions, more crossings are needed within the major roadways of south Florida to further reduce this threat to the panther and other wildlife species (Smith et al. 2006). Recent studies have been conducted to identify locations for wildlife crossings in south Florida. Swanson et al. (2005) used a Least Cost Pathway (LCP) modeling approach to identify the most likely travel routes for panthers among six major use areas in southwest Florida. LCP modeling takes into consideration elements in the landscape that permit or impede panther movement when traveling. Swanson et al. (2005) identified 20 key highway segments where LCPs intersected improved roadways. Smith et al. (2006) studied the movements of the panther, the Florida black bear, and other wildlife species along SR 29, CR 846 and CR 858 in Collier County, Florida. Data analyzed in the study were obtained from roadkill and track surveys, infra-red camera monitoring stations, existing data provided by the FWC (panther radio telemetry and vehicle mortality reports), and other studies. Smith et al. (2006) recommended new wildlife crossings be considered at various sites along these roadways to reduce vehicle-related mortality of panthers and other wildlife species, and to increase connectivity among wildlife populations. The Service continues to work with the FDOT, county road departments, and other entities to ensure wildlife crossings are installed as needed to promote safe passage of panthers and other wildlife across roadways.

Overutilization for Commercial, Recreational, Scientific, or Educational Purposes

Prior to 1949, panthers could be killed in Florida at any time of the year. In 1950, the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission (now Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission [FWC]) declared the panther a regulated game species due to concerns over declining numbers. The FWC removed panthers from the game animal list in 1958 and gave them complete legal protection. On March 11, 1967, the Service listed the panther as endangered (32 FR 4001) throughout its historic range, and these animals received Federal protection under the passage of the Act in 1973. In addition, the Florida Panther Act (Florida Statute 372.671), a 1978 Florida State law, made killing a panther a felony. The panther is listed as endangered by the States of Florida, Georgia, Louisiana, and Mississippi in addition to its Federal listing.

Restricted Range

Historically occurring throughout the southeastern United States (Young and Goldman 1946), today the panther is restricted to south Florida in an area that is less than 5 percent of its historic range.

Ongoing Conservation Efforts

Habitat protection has been identified as being one of the most important elements to achieving panther recovery. While efforts have been made to secure habitat, continued action is needed to obtain additions to and inholdings for public lands, assure linkages are maintained, restore degraded and fragmented habitat, and obtain the support of private landowners for maintaining property in a manner that is compatible with panther use. Conservation lands used by panthers are held and managed by a variety of entities including the Service, NPS, Seminole Tribe of Florida, Miccosukee Tribe of Indians of Florida, FWC, Florida Department of Environmental Protection (DEP), Florida Division of Forestry (FDOF), Water Management Districts, non-governmental organizations, counties, and private landowners.

To further refine the land preservation needs of the panther, and to specifically develop a landscape-level program for the conservation of the panther population in south Florida, the Service appointed a Florida Panther Subteam in February 2000. The Subteam was charged with developing a landscape-level strategy for the conservation of the panther population in south Florida. The results of this collaborative effort are partially presented in Kautz et al. (2006). One of the tasks for this subteam was to identify a strategically located set of lands containing sufficient area and appropriate land cover types to ensure the long-term survival of the south Florida population of the panther. Kautz et al. (2006) focused their efforts on the area south of the Caloosahatchee River, where the reproducing panther population currently exists.

Kautz et al. (2006) created an updated panther potential habitat model. The potential habitat map was reviewed in relation to telemetry data, recent satellite imagery (where available), and panther home range polygons. Boundaries were drawn around lands defined as the Primary Zone, the most important area needed to support a self-sustaining panther population. Kautz et al. (2006) referred to these lands as essential; however, as observed in the two previous plans (Logan et al. 1993; Cox et al. 1994), lands within the boundaries of the Primary Zone included some urban areas and other lands not considered to be panther habitat (*i.e.*, active rock and sand mines). The landscape context of areas surrounding the Primary Zone was modeled and results were used to draw boundaries of the Secondary Zone (Figure 5), the area capable of supporting the panther population in the Primary Zone, but where habitat restoration may be needed (Kautz et al. 2006).

Kautz et al. (2006) also identified, through a LCP model, the route most likely to be used by panthers crossing the Caloosahatchee River and dispersing out of south Florida into south-central Florida. Kautz et al. (2006) used GIS-based analysis to construct the LCP models and identify

optimum panther dispersal corridor(s). The LCP models operated on a cost surface that ranked suitability of the landscape for use by dispersing panthers with lower scores indicating higher likelihood of use by dispersing panthers. Those dispersal routes connecting lands between the Panther Focus Area south of the Caloosahatchee River and the Panther Focus Area north of the Caloosahatchee River were defined as the Dispersal Zone (Kautz et al. 2006). The preservation of lands within this zone is important for the survival and recovery of the panther, as these lands are the dispersal pathways for expansion of the panther population.

LITERATURE CITED

- Ackerman, B. B., F. G. Lindzey, and T. P. Hemker. 1986. Predictive energetics model for cougars. Pages 333-352 in S. D. Miller and D. D. Everett (eds). *Cats of the world: biology, conservation, and management*. National Wildlife Federation and Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, Washington, D. C. and Kingsville, Texas.
- Akçakaya, H. R. (2002). RAMAS Metapop: viability analysis for stage-structured metapopulations. Version 4.0 (pre-release). Applied Biomathematics, Setauket, New York.
- Anderson, A.E. 1983. A critical review of literature on puma (*Felis concolor*). Special Report No. 54. Colorado Division of Wildlife, Fort Collins, Colorado.
- Ballou, J.D., T.J. Foose, R.C. Lacy, and U.S. Seal. 1989. Florida panther (*Felis concolor coryi*) population viability analysis and recommendations. Captive Breeding Specialist Group, Species Survival Commission, IUCN, Apple Valley, Minnesota.
- Bangs, O. 1899. The Florida puma. *Proceedings of the Biological Society of Washington* 13:15-17.
- Beier, P. 1995. Dispersal of juvenile cougars in fragmented habitat. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 59:228-237.
- Beier P., M.R. Vaughan, M.J. Conroy, and H. Quigley. 2003. An analysis of scientific literature related to the Florida panther. Final report, Project NG01-105, Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Belden, R.C. 1986. Florida panther recovery plan implementation - a 1983 progress report. Pages 159-172 in S.D. Miller and D.D. Everett (eds). *Cats of the world: biology, conservation, and management*. National Wildlife Federation and Caesar Kleberg Wildlife Research Institute, Washington, D.C. and Kingsville, Texas.
- Belden, R.C. 1988. The Florida panther. Pages 515-532 in *Audubon Wildlife Report* 1988/1989. National Audubon Society, New York, New York.
- Belden, R.C., and R.T. McBride. 2005. Florida panther peripheral areas survey final report 1998-2004. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Belden, R.C., W.B. Frankenberger, R.T. McBride, and S.T. Schwikert. 1988. Panther habitat use in southern Florida. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 52:660-663.

- Belden, R.C., W.B. Frankenberger, and J.C. Roof. 1991. Florida panther distribution. Final Report 7501, E-1 II-E-1. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Benson, J.F., M.A. Lotz, and D. Jansen. 2008. Natal den selection by Florida panthers. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 72:405-410.
- Benson, J.F., J.A. Hostetler, D.P. Onorato, W.E. Johnson, M.E. Roelke, S.J. O'Brien, D. Jansen, and M.K. Oki. 2009. Chapter 2: Survival and cause-specific mortality of sub-adult and adult Florida panthers. Pages 10 – 61 in J.A. Hostetler, D.P. Onorato, and M.K. Oli, (eds). Population ecology of the Florida panther. Final report submitted to Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- Brook, B. 2000. Pessimistic and optimistic bias in population viability analysis. *Biology Conservation* 14:564-566.
- Brook, B.W., L. Lim, R. Harden, and R. Frankham. 1997. Does population viability analysis software predict the behaviour of real populations? A retrospective study of the Lord Howe Island Woodhen *Tricholimnas sylvestris* (Sclater). *Biology Conservation* 82:119-128.
- Clark J.D., D. Huber, and C. Servheen. 2002. Bear reintroductions: lessons and challenges. *Ursus* 13:335-345.
- Comiskey, E.J., O.L. Bass, Jr., L.J. Gross, R.T. McBride, and R. Salinas. 2002. Panthers and forests in south Florida: an ecological perspective. *Conservation Ecology* 6:18.
- Cory, C.B. 1896. Hunting and fishing in Florida. Estes and Lauriat, Boston, Massachusetts.
- Cox J., R. Kautz, M. MacLaughlin, and T. Gilbert. 1994. Closing the gaps in Florida's wildlife habitat conservation system. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Cox, J.J., D.S. Maehr, and J.L. Larkin. 2006. Florida panther habitat use: New approach to an old problem. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 70:1778-1785.
- Culver, M., W.E. Johnson, J. Pecon-Slattery, and S.J. O'Brien. 2000. Genomic ancestry of the American puma (*Puma concolor*). *Journal of Heredity* 91:186-197.
- Dalrymple, G.H. and O.L. Bass. 1996. The diet of the Florida panther in Everglades National Park, Florida. *Bulletin of the Florida Museum of Natural History* 39:173-193.

- Dees, C.S., J.D. Clark, and F.T. Van Manen. 2001. Florida panther habitat use in response to prescribed fire. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 65:141-147.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2006. Use of least cost pathways to identify key highway segments for panther conservation. Tallahassee, Florida.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2010. Statement on estimating panther population size. Tallahassee, Florida. <http://myfwc.com/news/resources/fact-sheets/panther-population/>
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2013. Mortality data via email transmittal. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute and Division of Habitat and Species Conservation. Naples, Florida.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission. 2014. Annual report on the research and management of Florida panthers: 2013-2014. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute & Division of Habitat and Species Conservation, Naples, Florida, USA.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission-Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. 2015. Mortality data via email transmittal. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute and Division of Habitat and Species Conservation. Naples, Florida.
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission-Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. 2014a. Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*) telemetry locations Feb 1981-June 2014. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. St. Petersburg, Florida. <http://www.floridapanthernet.org/>
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission-Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. 2014b. Cooperative Land Cover v3.0 Raster - Site Classes. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. Tallahassee, Florida. <http://myfwc.com/research/gis/applications/articles/Cooperative-Land-Cover>
- Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission-Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. 2014c. Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*) mortality locations 1972-2014. Fish and Wildlife Research Institute. Tallahassee, Florida. <http://www.floridapanthernet.org>
- Forman, R. T. T., D. Sperling, J. A. Bissonette, A. P. Clevenger, C. D. Cutshall, V. H. Dale, L. Fahrig, R. France, C. R. Goldman, K. Heanue, J. A. Jones, F. J. Swanson, T. Turrentine, and T. C. Winter. 2003. Road Ecology: Science and Solutions. Island Press, Washington, D.C.

- Foster, M.L. and S.R. Humphrey. 1995. Use of highway underpasses by Florida panthers and other wildlife. *Wildlife Society Bulletin*. 23(1):95-100.
- Harris, L.D. 1984. *The fragmented forest: island biogeography theory and the preservation of biotic diversity*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Harrison, R.L. 1992. Toward a theory of inter-refuge corridor design. *Conservation Biology* 6:293-295.
- Hostetler, J.A., D.P. Onorato, and M.K. Oli (eds). 2009. *Population ecology of the Florida panther*. Final report submitted to Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission and U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service.
- IPCC 2013. Annex III: Glossary [Planton, S. (ed.)]. Pp. 1147-1465 In: *Climate Change 2013: The Physical Science Basis. Contribution of Working Group I to the Fifth Assessment Report of the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change* [Stocker, T.F., D. Qin, G.-K. Plattner, M. Tignor, S.K. Allen, J. Boschung, A. Nauels, Y. Xia, V. Bex and P.M. Midgley (eds.)]. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, United Kingdom and New York, New York, USA. https://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/wg1/WG1AR5_AnnexIII_FINAL.pdf
- IPCC 2014. *Climate Change 2014 Synthesis Report*. [Pachauri, R.K. et al.] 133 pp. http://www.ipcc.ch/pdf/assessment-report/ar5/syr/AR5_SYR_FINAL_SPM.pdf
- Jansen, D. K., S.R. Schulze, and A.T. Johnson. 2005. Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*) research and monitoring in Big Cypress National Preserve. Annual report 2004-2005. National Park Service, Ochopee, Florida.
- Johnson, W.E., D.P. Onorato, M.E. Roelke, E.D. Land, M. Cunningham, R.C. Belden, R. McBride, D. Jansen, M. Lotz, D. Shindle, J. Howard, D.E. Wildt, L.M. Penfold, J.A. Hostetler, M.K. Oli, and S.J. O'Brien. 2010. Genetic restoration of the Florida panther. *SCIENCE* 329:1641-1645.
- Kautz, R., R. Kawula, T. Hctor, J. Comiskey, D. Jansen, D. Jennings, J. Kasbohm, F. Mazzotti, R. McBride, L. Richardson, and K. Root. 2006. How much is enough? Landscape-scale conservation for the Florida panther. *Biological Conservation*.
- Kerkhoff, A.J., B.T. Milne, and D.S. Maehr. 2000. Toward a panther-centered view of the forests of south Florida. *Conservation Ecology* 4:1.

- Land, E.D. 1994. Response of the wild Florida panther population to removals for captive breeding. Final Report 7571. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Land, E.D. and S.K. Taylor. 1998. Florida panther genetic restoration and management annual report 1997-98. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Land, E.D., B. Shindle, D. Singler, and S. K. Taylor. 1999. Florida panther genetic restoration annual report 1998-99. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Land, E.D., D. Shindle, M. Cunningham, M. Lotz, and B. Ferree. 2004. Florida panther genetic restoration and management annual report 2003-04. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Land, E.D., M. Cunningham, R. McBride, D. Shindle, and M. Lotz. 2002. Florida panther genetic restoration and management annual report 2001-02. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Land, E.D., D.B. Shindle, R.J. Kawula, J.F. Benson, M.A. Lotz, and D.P. Onorato. 2008. Florida panther habitat selection analysis of Concurrent GPS and VHF telemetry data. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 72:633-639.
- Logan, T.J., A.C. Eller, Jr., R. Morrell, D. Ruffner, and J. Sewell. 1993. Florida panther habitat preservation plan - south Florida population. Prepared for the Florida Panther Interagency Committee.
- Lotz, M., D. Land, M. Cunningham, and B. Ferree. 2005. Florida panther annual report 2004-05. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Mac, M.J., P.A. Opler, C.E. Puckett Haecker, and P.D. Doran. 1998. Status and trends of the nation's biological resources. 2 volumes. U.S. Department of the Interior, U.S. Geological Survey, Reston, Virginia.
- Maehr, D.S. 1990. Florida panther movements, social organization, and habitat utilization. Final Performance Report 7502. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Maehr, D.S. 1992. Florida panther. Pages 176 189 *in* S.R. Humphrey (ed). Rare and endangered biota of Florida. Volume I: mammals. University Press of Florida, Gainesville, Florida.

- Maehr, D.S. 1997. The comparative ecology of bobcat, black bear, and Florida panther in south Florida. *Bulletin of the Florida Museum of Natural History* 40:1-176. Maehr, D.S. and J.A. Cox. 1995. Landscape features and panthers in Florida. *Conservation Biology* 9:1008-1019.
- Maehr, D.S. and J.A. Cox. 1995. Landscape features and panthers in Florida. *Conservation Biology*, 9: 1008-1019.
- Maehr, D.S. and J.L. Larkin. 2004. Do prescribed fires in south Florida reduce habitat quality for native carnivores. *Natural Areas Journal* 24:188-197.
- Maehr, D.S., E.D. Land, J.C. Roof, and J.W. McCown. 1990a. Day beds, natal dens, and activity of Florida panthers. *Proceedings of Annual Conference of Southeastern Fish and Wildlife Agencies* 44:310-318.
- Maehr, D.S., R.C. Belden, E.D. Land, and L. Wilkins. 1990b. Food habits of panthers in southwest Florida. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 54:420-423.
- Maehr, D.S., E.D. Land, and J.C. Roof. 1991. Social ecology of Florida panthers. *National Geographic Research and Exploration* 7:414-431.
- Maehr, D.S., E.D. Land, D.B. Shindle, O.L. Bass, and T.S. Hootor. 2002a. Florida panther dispersal and conservation. *Biological Conservation* 106:187-197.
- Maehr, D.S., R.C. Lacy, E.D. Land, O.L. Bass, T.S. Hootor. 2002b. Population viability of the Florida Panther: A multi-perspective approach. In S. Beissinger and D. McCullough (Eds). *Population Viability Analysis*. University of Chicago Press, Chicago, Illinois.
- Main, M.B., and C.E. Jacobs. 2014. Calf Depredation by the Florida panther in Southwest Florida. Final Report to the US Fish and Wildlife Service. University of Florida IFAS, Gainesville, Florida. 46 pp.
- McBride, R.T. 2000. Current panther distribution and habitat use: a review of field notes, fall 1999-winter 2000. Report to Florida Panther Subteam of MERIT, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Vero Beach, Florida.
- McBride, R.T. 2001. Current panther distribution, population trends, and habitat use: report of field work: fall 2000-winter 2001. Report to Florida Panther Subteam of MERIT, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Vero Beach, Florida.
- McBride, R.T. 2002. Current panther distribution and conservation implications -- highlights of field work: fall 2001 -- winter 2002. Report to Florida Panther Subteam of MERIT, U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Vero Beach, Florida.

- McBride, R.T. 2003. The documented panther population (DPP) and its current distribution from July 1, 2002 to June 30, 2003. Appendix IV in D. Shindle, M. Cunningham, D. Land, R. McBride, M. Lotz, and B. Ferree. Florida panther genetic restoration and management. Annual report 93112503002. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- McBride, R.T. 2004. Personal communication, Chris Belden. Professional Tracker-Houndsman. Rancher's Supply Incorporated, P.O. Box 725, Alpine, Texas 79831.
- McBride, R.T. 2005. Personal communication, Chris Belden. Professional Tracker-Houndsman. Rancher's Supply Incorporated, P.O. Box 725, Alpine, Texas 79831.
- McBride, R.T. 2006. Personal communication, Chris Belden. Professional Tracker-Houndsman. Rancher's Supply Incorporated, P.O. Box 725, Alpine, Texas 79831.
- McBride, R.T. 2007. Personal communication, Chris Belden. Professional Tracker-Houndsman. Rancher's Supply Incorporated, P.O. Box 725, Alpine, Texas 79831.
- McBride, R.T. 2008. Personal communication, Chris Belden. Professional Tracker-Houndsman. Rancher's Supply Incorporated, P.O. Box 725, Alpine, Texas 79831.
- McBride, R.T. 2010. Synoptic survey of Florida panthers 2010. Annual Report submitted to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Agreement #401817G005). Rancher's Supply, Incorporated, Alpine, Texas.
- McBride, R.T., R.M. McBride, J.L. Cashman, and D.S. Maehr. 1993. Do mountain lions exist in Arkansas? Proceedings Annual Conference Southeastern Fish and Wildlife Agencies 47:394-402.
- McBride, R.T., R.T. McBride, R.M. McBride, and C.E. McBride. 2008. Counting pumas by categorizing physical evidence. Southeastern Naturalist 7:381-400.
- McBride, R. T., C.E. McBride, and R. Sensor. 2012. Synoptic Survey of Florida Panthers 2011. Annual Report to U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Agreement #401817G005), South Florida Ecological Services Office, Vero Beach, Florida. 145 pp.
- Melillo J. M., T.C. Richmond, and G. W. Yohe, Eds. 2014. *Climate Change Impacts in the United States: The Third National Climate Assessment*. U.S. Global Change Research Program. <http://nca2014.globalchange.gov/downloads>
- Miller, L. 2010. Climate of South Florida; Everglades Restoration Transition Plan Phase I Biological Opinion. Vero Beach, Florida: U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

- Newell, D. 1935. Panther. The Saturday Evening Post. July 13:10-11, 70-72.
- Noss, R.F. 1992. The wildlands project land conservation strategy. Wild Earth (Special Issue):10-25.
- Noss, R.F. and A.Y. Cooperrider. 1994. Saving Nature's Legacy: Protecting and Restoring Biodiversity. Island Press, Washington, D.C.
- Nowak, R.M., and R.T. McBride. 1974. Status survey of the Florida panther. Project 973. World Wildlife Fund Yearbook 1973-74:237-242.
- Roelke, M. E. 1990. Florida panther biomedical investigation. Final Performance Report 7506. Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Roelke, M.E., J.S. Martenson, and S.J. O'Brien. 1993. The consequences of demographic reduction and genetic depletion in the endangered Florida panther. Current Biology 3:340-350.
- Root, K. 2004. Florida panther (*Puma concolor coryi*): Using models to guide recovery efforts. Pages 491-504 in H.R. Akcakaya, M. Burgman, O. Kindvall, C.C. Wood, P. Sjogren-Gulve, J. Hatfield, and M. McCarthy (eds). Species Conservation and Management, Case Studies. Oxford University Press, New York, New York.
- Seal, U.S. (ed). 1994. A plan for genetic restoration and management of the Florida panther (*Felis concolor coryi*). Report to the Florida Game and Fresh Water Fish Commission, by the Conservation Breeding Specialist Group, Species Survival Commission, IUCN, Apple Valley, Minnesota.
- Seal, U.S. and R.C. Lacy (eds). 1989. Florida panther (*Felis concolor coryi*) viability analysis and species survival plan. Report to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, by the Captive Breeding Specialist Group, Species Survival Commission, IUCN, Apple Valley, Minnesota.
- Seal, U.S. and R.C. Lacy (eds). 1992. Genetic management strategies and population viability of the Florida panther (*Felis concolor coryi*). Report to the U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, by the Captive Breeding Specialist Group, Species Survival Commission, IUCN, Apple Valley, Minnesota.
- Seidensticker, J.C., IV, M.G. Hornocker, W.V. Wiles, and J.P. Messick. 1973. Mountain lion social organization in the Idaho primitive area. Wildlife Monographs 35:1-60.

- Shaffer, M.L. 1978. Determining Minimum Viable Population Sizes: A Case Study of the Grizzly Bear. Ph. D. Dissertation, Duke University.
- Shaffer, M.L. 1981. Minimum population sizes for species conservation. *BioScience*
- Shaffer, M.L. 1987. Minimum viable populations: coping with uncertainty. Pages 69-86 *in* M.E. Soulé (ed). Viable populations for conservation. Cambridge University Press, New York.
- Shindle, D., D. Land, K. Charlton, and R. McBride. 2000. Florida panther genetic restoration and management. Annual Report 7500. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Shindle, D., D. Land, M. Cunningham, and M. Lotz. 2001. Florida panther genetic restoration and management. Annual Report 7500. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Shindle D., M. Cunningham, D. Land, R. McBride, M. Lotz, and B. Ferree. 2003. Florida panther genetic restoration and management. Annual Report 93112503002. Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission, Tallahassee, Florida.
- Smith, D.J., R.F. Noss, and M.B. Main. 2006. East Collier County wildlife movement study: SR 29, CR 846, and CR 858 wildlife crossing project. Unpublished report. University of Central Florida, Orlando, Florida.
- Smith, T.R., and O.L. Bass, Jr. 1994. Landscape, white-tailed deer, and the distribution of Florida panthers in the Everglades. Pages 693-708 *in* S.M. Davis and J.C. Ogden (eds). Everglades: the ecosystem and its restoration. Delray Beach, Florida.
- South Florida Water Management District. 2015. ERR Environmental Resource Permits. West Palm Beach, Florida.
http://www.sfwmd.gov/gisapps/sfwmdxwebdc/dataview.asp?query=unq_id=1128
- Swanson, K., D. Land, R. Kautz and R. Kawula. 2005. Use of least cost pathways to identify key highway segments for Florida panther conservation. Pages 191-200 *in* R.A. Beausoleil and D.A. Martorello, editors. Proceedings of the Eighth Mountain Lion Workshop, Olympia, Washington.
- Thatcher, C., F.T. van Manen, and J.D. Clark. 2006. Identifying suitable sites for Florida panther reintroduction. *Journal of Wildlife Management*.

- Thatcher, C., F.T. van Manen, and J.D. Clark. 2009. A Habitat Assessment for Florida Panther Population Expansion into Central Florida. *Journal of Mammalogy* 900:918-925.
- Tinsley, J.B. 1970. The Florida panther. Great Outdoors Publishing Company, St. Petersburg, Florida.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2000. Florida panther final interim standard local operating procedures (SLOPES) for endangered species. Fish and Wildlife Service; Vero Beach, Florida.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. 2008. Florida panther recovery plan: third revision. January 2006. Prepared by the Florida Panther Recovery Team and the South Florida Ecological Services Office. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; Atlanta, Georgia.
- U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (Service). 2012. Panther Habitat Assessment Methodology. U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service; South Florida Ecological Services Offices; Vero Beach, Florida.
http://www.fws.gov/verobeach/MammalsPDFs/20120924_Panther%20Habitat%20Assessment%20Method_Appendix.pdf
- Van Dyke, F.G., R.H. Brocke, H.G. Shaw, B.B. Ackerman, T.P. Hemker, and F.G. Lindzey. 1986. Reactions of mountain lions to logging and human activity. *Journal of Wildlife Management* 50:95-102.
- Young, S.P., and E.A. Goldman. 1946. The puma-mysterious American cat. American Wildlife Institute, Washington, D.C.