

# **Pillar Coral Biological Status Review Report**

**March 31, 2011**



**FLORIDA FISH AND WILDLIFE CONSERVATION COMMISSION**  
**620 South Meridian Street**  
**Tallahassee, Florida 32399-1600**

**Biological Status Review  
for the  
Pillar Coral  
(*Dendrogyra cylindrus*)  
March 31, 2011**

**EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The Florida Fish and Wildlife Conservation Commission (FWC) directed staff to evaluate all species listed as Threatened or Species of Special Concern as of November 8, 2010 that had not undergone a status review in the past decade. Public information on the status of the pillar coral was sought from September 17 to November 1, 2010. The members of the Biological Review Group (BRG) met on November 30, 2010. Group members were Kate Semon (FWC lead), Dave Gilliam (Nova Southeastern University), and Margaret Miller (National Marine Fisheries, NOAA) (Appendix 1). In accordance with rule 68A-27.0012 Florida Administrative Code (F.A.C.), the BRG was charged with evaluating the biological status of the pillar coral using criteria included in definitions in 68A-27.001, F.A.C., and following the protocols in the *Guidelines for Application of the IUCN Red List Criteria at Regional Levels (Version 3.0)* and *Guidelines for Using the IUCN Red List Categories and Criteria (Version 8.1)*. Please visit <http://myfwc.com/wildlifehabitats/imperiled/listing-action-petitions/> to view the listing process rule and the criteria found in the definitions.

In late 2010, staff developed the initial draft of this report which included BRG findings and a preliminary listing recommendation from staff. The draft was sent out for peer review and the reviewers' input has been incorporated to create this final report. The draft report, peer reviews, and information received from the public are available as supplemental materials at <http://myfwc.com/wildlifehabitats/imperiled/biological-status/>.

The Pillar Coral BRG concluded from the biological assessment that pillar coral met at least one listing criterion. FWC staff recommend that the pillar coral be listed as a Threatened species.

This work was supported by a Conserve Wildlife Tag grant from the Wildlife Foundation of Florida. FWC staff gratefully acknowledges the assistance of the biological review group members and peer reviewers.

**BIOLOGICAL INFORMATION**

**Life History References** – Vaughan (1915), Lewis and Price (1975), Bak and Elgershuizen (1976), Szmant (1986), Wittenburg and Hunte (1992), Hudson et al. (1997), Wallace (1999)

**Taxonomic Classification** -- This biological status report is for pillar coral (*Dendrogyra cylindrus*) in Florida. The genus *Dendrogyra* (Ehrenberg, 1834), which contains only one species, is a member of the Meandrinidae family (Linnaeus, 1758). Most colonies are fused

solidly to the underlying substratum; cylindrical columns develop from the base and extend upward in an undulating fashion. Large colonies may include multiple columns that attain several meters in upward growth. Colonies that do not settle and grow on solid substratum are prone to fall over and form new upward growth from the older horizontal columns. This cycle of upward growth followed by toppling over limits these colonies to small size; however, the process may generate large numbers of small colonies. The skeleton is brain coral-like, with a series of meandering ridges and valleys. Tentacles are often exposed during daylight and give a colorful fur-like appearance, light-brown in color.

**Population Status and Trend** – Although conspicuous, the species has been described as rare on many Caribbean reefs, and small colonies are unusual (Szmant 1986). No specific population trends are available, but low colony density and infrequent encounter rates are reported from monitoring programs (Chiappone, Ruzicka, unpublished data). Additionally, no juvenile pillar coral have been identified from Florida Keys reef surveys during 1999-2009 (M. Chiappone, pers. comm.).

**Geographic Range and Distribution** – Pillar coral is widely distributed throughout coral reefs of the Caribbean Sea and the subtropical and tropical West Atlantic, ranging from the northern coast of South America (Colombia) to southern Florida (Smith 1971, Veron 2000). Reported distributions on wider Caribbean reefs include (Goreau 1959): rear zone, reef flat, buttress zone and *A. cervicornis* zone; Goreau and Wells (1967): 2 to 20 m, but typically occurs from 3-8 m depth; Pressick (1970): rear zone from 2-3 m depth; Cairns (1982): spur-and-groove reefs (14 m) and back reef (1 m); Tomascik and Sander (1987): spur-and-groove reefs; and Wheaton and Jaap (1988): spur-and-groove reefs.

Within Florida, the species is most frequently encountered at high-relief spur and groove reefs of the Florida Keys, and very rarely on mid-channel patch reefs and deep fore-reef (M. Chiappone, unpublished data, see <http://people.uncw.edu/millers>). *D. cylindrus* has a wide niche range within Florida, and also occurs in patch reef and hardbottom habitats. Reports of geographic distribution range from Palm Beach county to the Dry Tortugas.

**Quantitative Analyses** – No population viability analyses exist for Florida pillar coral to date.

## BIOLOGICAL STATUS ASSESSMENT

**Threats** – This species is highly susceptible to white plague disease (Bruckner and Bruckner 1997, Porter et al. 2001, Santavy et al. 2001, Miller et al. 2003, Weil 2004), protozoan parasites (E.C. Peters, pers. comm. to M. Chiappone), and sedimentation (Bak and Elgershuizen 1976). Localized impacts have been associated with hurricane damage (Rogers et al. 1991), damselfish predation, physical colony damage induced by anchors and boats, and bioerosion by sponges. Prior to its ban, collection for curios was once widespread off Florida (Colin 1978), and focused within Coffins Patch Reef off Marathon (Jaap, pers. comm.). Additional threats to population persistence may be attributed to projected global climate change (i.e., prolonged periods of high sea surface temperatures, which can induce region-wide bleaching events; increases in the frequency and intensity of storm events and ocean acidification, which can cause

physical and skeletal damage, impair sexual reproduction, and prevent larval settlement and metamorphosis), and habitat loss or a reduction in habitat quality attributed to poor water quality and coastal development (Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2007, Webster et al. 2005).

Taxonomic distinctness should also be considered as a threat, as the genus *Dendrogyra* contains a single species. A genus with one species has a high conservation value relative to a genus with multiple species when contributions to the gene pool of that genus are considered (Clarke and Warwick 1998; Warwick and Clarke 1998, 2001).

This species' biology also threatens its own local extirpation. As a gonochoric broadcast spawner that currently exists in extremely low densities in Florida, an Allee effect exists such that there is a low probability of resident colonies' gametes successfully fertilizing in the water column and recruiting (Szmant 1986, M. Chiappone, unpublished data). This Allee effect is supported by the absence of juveniles in Florida.

**Population Assessment** – Findings from the BRG are included in Biological Status Review Information Findings tables. The BRG found that at least one listing criterion was met. A peer reviewer suggested “Given the numerous threats to the reef ecosystem from climate change and LBPS [Land-based sources of pollution], one could project a reduction in quality of habitat, which may lead to a reduction of area of extent.” Staff considered this information in making the listing recommendation.

## **LISTING RECOMMENDATION**

As a relict population at the northernmost edge of its range that met at least one of the listing criteria, staff recommends that the pillar coral be listed as a Threatened species.

## **SUMMARY OF THE INDEPENDENT REVIEW**

This Biological Status Review was sent to 4 independent scientists. Comments were received from Dr. Walt Jaap (Lithophyte Research LLC) and Ms. Jennifer Moore (National Marine Fisheries, NOAA). No comments were received that changed the staff recommendation. Peer reviews are available at MyFWC.com.

Dr. Jaap provided additional, detailed taxonomic information, and broader insight into pillar coral collection for the curio trade. Most of this information is included in this status review; however, some taxonomic comments were of a level of detail above what was required for this Biological Status Review, and will be maintained for future reference.

Dr. Jaap commented “Mostly, we have very little information to understand the decline of this rare and iconic coral species. The review covered the aspects as defined in FWC and Florida statutes. The majority of the area inhabited by *Dendrogyra cylindrus* is in federal waters; however, being that FKNMS is a joint venture, management and conservation of *D. cylindrus* is most important to Florida citizens so this effort is relevant and should be given a high priority. I believe that the biological review team provided a reasonable review of salient facts, and the recommendation is logical given that this species is probably the rarest of zooxanthellate scleractinian coral species in Florida.”

Ms. Moore suggested that one could project a reduction in quality of habitat which may lead to a reduction of area of extent.

Ms. Moore commented “Given the criteria under which a species is evaluated, I found the BSR to be complete and accurate. As described in the review, there are few data specific to pillar coral on declines or trends. The BSR included the best available data, including unpublished data, and identified where the data may have limitations. Where assumptions were necessary (i.e., population size of mature adults), the BSR provided reasonable scenarios and evaluated the species’ status for that criteria under both scenarios. Please note one comment in the document on page 8 regarding the criteria evaluating habitat area, extent, and quality. The BSR provides a sound evaluation of pillar coral under the FWC criteria for listing as a threatened species. The references are appropriate and complete for the species and threats. The species meets several of the criteria; therefore, the recommendation to list as threatened is appropriate.”

## LITERATURE CITED

- Bak, R. P. M. and J. H. B. W. Elgershuizen. 1976. Patterns of oil-sediment rejection in corals. *Marine Biology* 37:105-113.
- Baums, I. B., M. W. Miller, and M. E. Hellberg. 2005. Regionally isolated populations of an imperiled Caribbean coral, *Acropora palmata*. *Molecular Ecology* 14:1377-1390.
- Bruckner, A. W. and R. J. Bruckner. 1997. The persistence of black-band disease in Jamaica: Impact on Community Structure. Eighth International Coral Reef Symposium 1: 601-606.
- Cairns, S. D. 1982. Stony corals of Carrie Bow Cay, Belize. *Smithsonian Contributions to Marine Science* 12:271-302.
- Clarke, K.R. and R.M. Warwick. 1998. A taxonomic distinctness index and its statistical properties. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 35:523-531.
- Colin, P. I. 1978. Caribbean Reef Invertebrates and Plants. THF Publications Inc., Hong Kong.
- Goreau, T. F. 1959. The ecology of Jamaican coral reefs. I. Species composition and zonation. *Ecology* 40(1):67-90.
- Goreau, T. F. and J. W. Wells. 1967. The shallow-water Scleractinia of Jamaica: Revised list of species and their vertical distribution range. *Bulletin of Marine Science* 17: 442-453.
- Hoegh-Guldberg, O., P. J. Mumby, A. J. Hooten, R. S. Steneck, P. Greenfield, E. Gomez, C. D. Harvell, P. F. Sale, A. J. Edwards, K. Caldeira, N. Knowlton, C. M. Eakin, R. Iglesias-Prieto, N. Muthiga, R. H. Bradbury, A. Dubi, and M. E. Hatziolos. 2007. Coral reefs under rapid climate change and ocean acidification. *Science* 318 (5857):1737-1742.
- Hudson, J. H., W. B. Goodwin, H. A. Lessios, and I. G. Macyintyre. 1997. Restoration and growth rate of hurricane damaged pillar coral (*Dendrogyra cylindrus*) in the Key Largo National Marine Sanctuary, Florida. Proceedings of the eighth international coral reef symposium, Panama, June 24-29, 1996. Pp. 567-570.
- Jaap, W. C. 1984. The Ecology of the South Florida Coral Reefs: A community profile. U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Office of Biological Services, Washington, D.C. FWS/OBS-82/08. 138 pp.
- Jaap, W. C., A. Szmant, K. Jaap, J. Dupont, R. Clarke, P. Somerfield, J. S. Ault, J. A. Bohnsack, S. G. Kellison, and G. T. Kellison. 2008. A perspective on the biology of Florida Keys coral reefs. In: R. E. Dodge and B. M. Riegl (eds.). *Coral Reefs of the USA*. Pp. 75-126. Springer Verlag, NY.

- Levitán, D. R., H. Fukami, J. Jara, D. Kline, T. M. McGovern, K. E. McGhee, C. A. Swanson, and N. Knowlton. 2004. Mechanisms of reproductive isolation among sympatric broadcast spawning corals of the *Montastraea annularis* species complex. *Evolution* 58:308–323.
- Lewis, J. B. and W. S. Price. 1975. Feeding mechanisms and feeding strategies of Atlantic reef corals. *Journal of Zoology* 176:527-544.
- Miller, J., C. Rogers, and R. Waara. 2003. Monitoring the coral disease, plague type II, on coral reefs in St. John, U.S. Virgin Islands. *Revista de Biología Tropical* 51:47-55.
- Porter, J. W., P. Dustan, W. C. Jaap, K. L. Patterson, V. Kosmynin, O. W. Meier, M. E. Patterson, and M. Parsons. 2001. Patterns of spread of coral disease in the Florida Keys. *Hydrobiologia* 460(1-3): 1-24.
- Pressick, M. L. 1970. Zonation of stony coral of a fringing reef southeast of Icacos Island, Puerto Rico. *Caribbean Journal of Science* 10(3-4):137-139.
- Rogers, C. S., L. N. McLain, and C. R. Tobias. 1991. Effects of Hurricane Hugo (1989) on a coral reef in St. John, USVI. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 78: 189-199.
- Santavy, D. L., E. Mueller, E. C. Peters, L. MacLaughlin, J. W. Porter, K. L. Patterson, and J. Campbell. 2001. The condition of coral reefs in South Florida (2000) using coral disease and bleaching as indicators. *Environmental Monitoring and Assessment* 100:129-152.
- Smith, F. G. W. 1971. Atlantic reef corals. University of Miami Press, Coral Gables.
- Szmant, A. M. 1986. Reproductive ecology of Caribbean reef corals. *Coral Reefs* 5:43-53.
- Tomascik, T. and F. Sander. 1987. Effects of eutrophication on reef-building corals. II. Structure of scleractinian coral communities on fringing reefs, Barbados, West Indies. *Marine Biology* 94:53-75.
- Vaughan, W. 1915. The geologic significance of the growth-rate of the Floridian and Bahaman shoal-water corals. *Journal of the Washington Academy of Sciences* 5:591-600.
- Veron, J. 2000. *Corals of the World*, vol 3. Australian Institute of Marine Science, Townsville, Australia.
- Vollmer, S. V., and S. R. Palumbi. 2006. Restricted gene flow in the Caribbean staghorn *Acropora cervicornis*: Implications for the recovery of endangered reefs. *Journal of Heredity* 98(1):40-50.
- Wallace, C. C. 1999. *Staghorn corals of the world: a revision of the coral genus Acropora*. CSIRO, Collingwood.

- Wagner, D. E., P. Kramer, and R. van Woesik. 2010. Species composition, habitat, and water quality influence coral bleaching in southern Florida. *Marine Ecology Progress Series* 408:65-78.
- Warwick, R.M. and K.R. Clarke. 1998. Taxonomic distinctness and environmental assessment. *Journal of Applied Ecology* 35:532-543.
- Warwick, R.M. and K.R. Clarke. 2001. Practical measures of marine biodiversity based on relatedness of species. *Oceanography and Marine Biology: Annual Reviews* 39:207-231.
- Webster, P. J., G. J. Holland, J. A. Curry, and H. R. Chang. 2005. Changes in tropical cyclone number, duration, and intensity, in warming environment. *Science* 309:1844–1846.
- Weil, E. 2004. Coral reef diseases in the wider Caribbean. In: E. Rosenberg and Y. Loya (eds), *Coral Health and Diseases*, pp. 35-68. Springer Verlag, NY.
- Wheaton, J. L. and W. C. Jaap. 1988. Corals and other prominent benthic Cnidaria of Looe Key National Marine Sanctuary. Florida Marine Research Publication. 43:1-25.
- Wittenburg, M. and W. Hunte. 1992. Effects of eutrophication and sedimentation on juvenile corals: I. Abundance, mortality and community structure. *Marine Biology* 112:131-138.



# Biological Status Review Information

## Findings

Species/taxon: Pillar coral (*Dendrogyra cylindrus*)

Date: 11/30/10

Assessors: Kate Semon, David Gilliam, Margaret Miller

Generation length: 30+ years; 3 generations ~ 100 years (see notes)

Criterion/Listing Measure	Data/Information	Data Type*	Sub-Criterion Met?	References
*Data Types - observed (O), estimated (E), inferred (I), suspected (S), or projected (P). Sub-Criterion met - yes (Y) or no (N).				
<b>(A) Population Size Reduction, ANY of</b>				
(a)1. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of at least 50% over the last 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer, where the causes of the reduction are clearly reversible and understood and ceased <sup>1</sup>	Curio trade has stopped; perhaps was influential in causing past declines. No information on magnitude of population decline	S	N	Colin 1978
(a)2. An observed, estimated, inferred or suspected population size reduction of at least 30% over the last 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer, where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased or may not be understood or may not be reversible <sup>1</sup>	No information, although assumed to always have been rare.	S	N	Jaap 1984
(a)3. A population size reduction of at least 30% projected or suspected to be met within the next 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years) <sup>1</sup>	Based on the low reproductive potential of the current population, and the high level of threats (e) that are anticipated to be accelerated, it is highly likely that the population will have at least a 30% decline over the next 100 years. This species has exceedingly low resilience.	I, S, P	Y	Szmant 1986, Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2007, Webster et al. 2005, Chiappone unpub. data,
(a)4. An observed, estimated, inferred, projected or suspected population size reduction of at least 30% over any 10 year or 3 generation period, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future), where the time period must include both the past and the future, and where the reduction or its causes may not have ceased or may not be understood or may not be reversible. <sup>1</sup>	No information, although assumed to always have been rare.	S	N	Jaap 1984
<sup>1</sup> based on (and specifying) any of the following: (a) direct observation; (b) an index of abundance appropriate to the taxon; (c) a decline in area of occupancy, extent of occurrence and/or quality of habitat; (d) actual or potential levels of exploitation; (e) the effects of introduced taxa, hybridization, pathogens, pollutants, competitors or parasites.				
<b>(B) Geographic Range, EITHER</b>				
(b)1. Extent of occurrence < 20,000 km <sup>2</sup> (7,722 mi <sup>2</sup> ) OR	Extent of applicable state waters (oceanside of Martin County through the Tortugas Bank) is less than 20,000 km <sup>2</sup> (667 km X 7.8 km = 5203 km <sup>2</sup> ).	O	Y	Jaap et al. in Riegl and Dodge (eds) 2008
(b)2. Area of occupancy < 2,000 km <sup>2</sup> (772 mi <sup>2</sup> )	Based on IUCN Red List guidelines, area of occupancy probably much less than 2,000 km <sup>2</sup>	I	Y	Wagner et al. 2010, Chiappone unpub. data
AND at least 2 of the following:				

a. Severely fragmented or exist in $\leq 10$ locations	Florida reef tract can be considered a single location, subject to threats (temperature extremes, bleaching), or fewer than 5 locations for other threats (disease, hurricane).	I, S, P	Y	Wagner et al. 2010, FRRP unpub. data, CREMP unpub. Data
b. Continuing decline, observed, inferred or projected in any of the following: (i) extent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) area, extent, and/or quality of habitat; (iv) number of locations or subpopulations; (v) number of mature individuals	Projected continuing decline in area of occupancy (ii) and number of mature individuals (v)	P	Y	Szmant 1986, Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2007, Webster et al. 2005, Chiappone unpub. Data
c. Extreme fluctuations in any of the following: (i) extent of occurrence; (ii) area of occupancy; (iii) number of locations or subpopulations; (iv) number of mature individuals	Extreme fluctuations unknown, but not expected.		N	
<b>(C) Population Size and Trend</b>				
Population size estimate to number fewer than 10,000 mature individuals AND EITHER	Unknown at this time. Scenario 1: Under the assumption that existing colonies are all mature (i.e., capable of successful sexual reproduction), reports of population size within the Florida Keys has been estimated at 129,000 colonies, and within the Florida reef tract at 0.6 colonies / m <sup>2</sup> . Scenario 2: Under the assumption that censused colonies are at such low density that fertilization potential approaches zero, the number of mature individuals would be zero, suggesting that Florida's is a relict population.	Scenario 1:E, Scenario 2:S	Scenario 1: N. Scenario 2: Y (population is a relict?)	Scenario 1: Chiappone unpub data, FRRP unpub data, Wagner et al. 2010; Scenario 2: Szmant 1986, Levitan et al. 2004
(c)1. An estimated continuing decline of at least 10% in 10 years or 3 generations, whichever is longer (up to a maximum of 100 years in the future) OR	If either scenario, at least 10% continuing decline is estimated over next 100 years	P	Y	Szmant 1986, Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2007, Webster et al. 2005, Chiappone unpub. data,
(c)2. A continuing decline, observed, projected, or inferred in numbers of mature individuals AND at least one of the following:	If either scenario, at least 10% continuing decline is estimated over next 100 years	P	Y	Szmant 1986, Hoegh-Guldberg et al. 2007, Webster et al. 2005, Chiappone unpub. data,
a. Population structure in the form of EITHER				
(i) No subpopulation estimated to contain more than 1000 mature individuals; OR				
(ii) All mature individuals are in one subpopulation	Based on data for other broadcast-spawning coral, all Florida pillar coral constitute one subpopulation (if they are mature)	S	Y	Baums et al. 2005, Vollmer and Palumbi 2006.
b. Extreme fluctuations in number of mature individuals				
<b>(D) Population Very Small or Restricted, EITHER</b>				

(d)1. Population estimated to number fewer than 1,000 mature individuals; OR	Unknown at this time. Scenario 1: Under the assumption that existing colonies are all mature (i.e., capable of successful sexual reproduction), reports of population size within the Florida Keys has been estimated at 129,000 colonies, and within the Florida reef tract at 0.6 colonies / m2. Scenario 2: Under the assumption that censused colonies are at such low density that fertilization potential approaches zero, the number of mature individuals would be zero, suggesting that Florida's is a relict population.	Scenario 1:E, Scenario 2:S	Scenario 1: N; Scenario 2: Y	Scenario 1: Chiappone unpub data, FRRP unpub data, Wagner et al. 2010; Scenario 2: Szmant 1986, Levitan et al. 2004
(d)2. Population with a very restricted area of occupancy (typically less than 20 km <sup>2</sup> [8 mi <sup>2</sup> ]) or number of locations (typically 5 or fewer) such that it is prone to the effects of human activities or stochastic events within a short time period in an uncertain future	Florida reef tract can be considered a single location, subject to threats (temperature extremes, bleaching), or fewer than 5 locations for other threats (disease, hurricane).	I, S, P	Y	Wagner et al. 2010, FRRP unpub. data, CREMP unpub. data
<b>(E) Quantitative Analyses</b>				
e1. Showing the probability of extinction in the wild is at least 10% within 100 years	Not available.		N	
Initial Finding (Meets at least one of the criteria OR Does not meet any of the criteria)		Reason (which criteria are met)		
Meets at least one of the criteria		Scenario 1: A3e;B1+2ab(ii,v);D2 Scenario 2: A3e;B1+2ab(ii,v),C1+2a(ii); D1+2		
Is species/taxon endemic to Florida? (Y/N)		N		
If Yes, your initial finding is your final finding. Copy the initial finding and reason to the final finding space below. If No, complete the regional assessment sheet and copy the final finding from that sheet to the space below.				
Final Finding (Meets at least one of the criteria/subcriteria OR Does not meet any of the criteria)		Reason (which criteria/subcriteria are met)		
Meets at least one of the criteria		Scenario 1: A3e;B1+2ab(ii,v);D2 Scenario 2: A3e;B1+2ab(ii,v),C1+2a(ii); D1+2		

1	<p style="text-align: center;"><b>Biological Status Review Information</b> Regional Assessment</p>	<u>Species/taxon:</u>	Pillar coral ( <i>Dendrogyra cylindrus</i> )
2		<u>Date:</u>	11/30/10
3		<u>Assessors:</u>	Kate Semon, David Gilliam, Margaret Miller
4			
5			
6			
7			
8	Initial finding		Supporting Information
9			
10	2a. Is the species/taxon a non-breeding visitor? (Y/N/DK). If 2a is YES, go to line 18. If 2a is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 11.		DK
11	2b. Does the Florida population experience any significant immigration of propagules capable of reproducing in Florida? (Y/N/DK). If 2b is YES, go to line 12. If 2b is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 17.		N
12	2c. Is the immigration expected to decrease? (Y/N/DK). If 2c is YES or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 13. If 2c is NO go to line 16.		
13	2d. Is the Florida population a sink? (Y/N/DK). If 2d is YES, go to line 14. If 2d is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 15.		
14	If 2d is YES - Upgrade from initial finding (more imperiled)		
15	If 2d is NO or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding		
16	If 2c is NO or DO NOT KNOW - Downgrade from initial finding (less imperiled)		
17	If 2b is NO or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding		No change from initial finding
18	2e. Are the conditions outside Florida deteriorating? (Y/N/DK). If 2e is YES or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 24. If 2e is NO go to line 19.		
19	2f. Are the conditions within Florida deteriorating? (Y/N/DK). If 2f is YES or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 23. If 2f is NO, go to line 20.		
20	2g. Can the breeding population rescue the Florida population should it decline? (Y/N/DK). If 2g is YES, go to line 21. If 2g is NO or DO NOT KNOW, go to line 22.		
21	If 2g is YES - Downgrade from initial finding (less imperiled)		
22	If 2g is NO or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding		
23	If 2f is YES or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding		
24	If 2e is YES or DO NOT KNOW - No change from initial finding		
25			
26	Final finding		No change

**Additional notes** – Generation Time: Based on the published growth rates (18 to 24 mm / year) and the average size of colonies observed (> 1 m height), it seems likely that the generation time is long, presumed longer than 30 years. Therefore, we adopt 100 years to accommodate 3 generations and as the window of time to consider declines, etc. Population estimate determined by Chiappone (unpublished data) is based on extrapolation from a survey within one habitat type in the Keys, and Wagner et al.'s estimate may be suspect as well. This species' biology, as well as its Florida population structure, implies a very low reproductive potential (gonochoric, broadcast spawner, low fecundity, implying severe Allee effect) (Szmant 1986). This inference is supported by the observed lack of juveniles in Florida populations (Chiappone unpublished data). According to IUCN Red List guidelines for clonal species, we define individuals to be colonies, and area of occupancy to be the total area occupied by those colonies.

## APPENDIX 1. Brief biographies of the Pillar coral Biological Review Group members.

**David S. Gilliam** received his B.S. at the University of Miami in Marine Science/Biology, his M.S. from Nova Southeastern University Oceanographic Center in Marine Biology and his Ph.D. from Nova Southeastern University Oceanographic Center in Marine Biology. He is currently Assistant Professor at Nova Southeastern University Oceanographic Center and a Research Scientist with the National Coral Reef Institute. He is a coral reef and fish ecologist who focuses on fisheries, restoration, assessment, and monitoring, and collaborates with local, state, and federal agencies on projects that have strong resource management goals. He is currently the Vice Chairman of the Coral Advisory Panel for the South Atlantic Fisheries Management Council. Dr. Gilliam has held many grants and contracts, including several which investigate the distribution, population status, and restoration of the federally threatened stony coral, *Acropora cervicornis*.

**Margaret Miller** received her B.A. in Biology and Mathematics from Indiana University and her Ph.D. in Marine Ecology from the University of North Carolina (Chapel Hill). Her dissertation involved ecological studies of non-reef building coral, *Oculina* spp, off North Carolina and factors that determined their growth and distribution. She began work as an Ecologist with the NOAA Fisheries' Southeast Science Center in 1997 and has served as a foundation for the Miami Lab's growing coral reef program. Dr. Miller is an active field researcher and diver, and has been a primary participant in the federal ESA listing and recovery planning process for *Acropora palmata* and *A.cervicornis*. She is currently engaged as a Biological Review Team member for the federal status review of an additional 82 coral species.

**Kathleen Semon** received her B.S. in Ecology from University of Georgia and her Ph.D. in Biology from University of Miami. Dr. Semon gained a strong background in coral population and community ecology while conducting coral and benthic macro-invertebrate surveys and assessments across geographical gradients along coastlines of The Bahamas. She was awarded the Smithsonian Institution's Marine Science Network Postdoctoral Fellowship, facilitating her research on cyanobacterial bloom dynamics in coastal and coral reef systems. She is currently the Associate Research Scientist for the Fish and Wildlife Research Institute Corals Program, a member of the Coral Reef Evaluation and Monitoring Program (CREMP), and the Principal Investigator/Project Manager for the ESA Section 6-funded "Monitoring and Mapping of Threatened Acroporid Corals" project.

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

No public comments were received on the pillar coral during the public solicitation for information period.