

1 **Advice to the Minister for the Environment, Heritage and the Arts**
2 **from the Threatened Species Scientific Committee (the Committee)**
3 **on Amendment to the list of Threatened Species**
4 **under the *Environment Protection and Biodiversity Conservation Act 1999* (EPBC Act)**
5

6 **1. Scientific name (common name)**

7 *Prasophyllum limnetes* (Marsh Leek-orchid)
8

9 **2. Reason for Conservation Assessment by the Committee**

10 This advice follows assessment of information provided by a public nomination to list the
11 Marsh Leek-orchid. The nominator suggested listing in the critically endangered category of
12 the list.

13 The Committee provides the following assessment of the appropriateness of the species'
14 inclusion in the EPBC Act list of threatened species.

15 This is the Committee's first consideration of the species under the EPBC Act.
16

17 **3. Summary of Conclusion**

18 The Committee judges that the species has been demonstrated to have met sufficient elements
19 of Criterion 2 to make it **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered**.

20 The Committee judges that the species has been demonstrated to have met sufficient elements
21 of Criterion 3 to make it **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered**.

22 The Committee judges that the species has been demonstrated to have met sufficient elements
23 of Criterion 4 to make it **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered**.

24 The highest category for which the species is eligible to be listed is **critically endangered**.
25

26 **4. Taxonomy**

27 The species is conventionally accepted as *Prasophyllum limnetes* (Marsh Leek-orchid)
28 (D.L.Jones, 2006). It was previously considered to belong to *Prasophyllum pyriforme*
29 (Graceful Leek-orchid) which is no longer recognised as occurring in Tasmania (Jones, 2006).
30

31 **5. Description**

32 The Marsh Leek-orchid is a small, fleshy, terrestrial orchid with a solitary erect leaf that is
33 20–35 cm long and 2–4 mm wide. Flowers are densely crowded along a flower spike 8–12 cm
34 long. The flowers are greenish in colour with brown, pink or mauve tones in the labellum
35 (modified middle petal). The labellum is 6–7 mm long, with broadly flared margins at the
36 base, sharply recurved and constricted near the middle, and with a tail-like tip (Jones, 2006;
37 Jones and Rouse, 2006).
38
39

40 **6. National Context**

41 The Marsh Leek-orchid is endemic to Tasmania. It has been recorded only at the Rubicon
42 Sanctuary, near Port Sorell, in the central north of Tasmania, approximately 20 km west of
43 Devonport. The site is approximately 10 m above sea level. It is located within the North
44 West Natural Resource Management Region. This species is listed as endangered (the highest
45 risk category for extant species) under the Tasmanian *Threatened Species Protection Act*
46 *1995*.

47

48 **7. Relevant Biology/Ecology**

49 The Marsh Leek-orchid grows in an ecotone between low-lying marshy heath/sedgeland
50 dominated by rushes and sedges with scattered patches of *Lomandra longifolia* (Spiny-headed
51 Mat-rush) and *Themeda triandra* (Kangaroo Grass), and coastal *Eucalyptus amygdalina*
52 woodland with a heathy/grassy understorey. The Marsh Leek-orchid flowers in late
53 November and December. The species may require disturbance to stimulate emergence and
54 flowering and is currently only found in areas that are slashed or burned regularly. Studies on
55 the related *Prasophyllum correctum* (Gaping Leek-orchid) indicate that plants may not appear
56 every year, and may survive below ground in a dormant state for up to five years (Coates et
57 al., 1999). Orchids, including the Marsh Leek-orchid, have a complex and poorly understood
58 interrelationship with species-specific mycorrhizal fungi and insect pollinators (Jones et al.,
59 1999). Native bees, wasps and beetles are known to be effective pollinators for other
60 *Prasophyllum* species, while some species can also be self-pollinating (Jones et al., 1999).
61 Leek-orchids are not known to reproduce vegetatively and recruitment is from seed. Evidence
62 suggests that the species does not self-pollinate without intervention.

63

64 **8. Description of Threats**

65 The main threats to the Marsh Leek-orchid are inappropriate disturbance, loss of pollinators
66 and climate change. Historically, decline in the species is likely to have been caused by
67 vegetation clearance and fragmentation; however, the species is now restricted to a reserve
68 where it is protected from these threats.

69 Long periods without disturbance may lead to prolonged dormancy with increased risk of
70 mortality through depletion of stores of starch in underground tubers. Conversely, burning too
71 frequently (e.g. annually) may adversely affect mycorrhizal fungi communities, rendering the
72 site unsuitable for fungal-dependent orchid species (Brundrett, 2007), including the Marsh
73 Leek-orchid. Slashing at the wrong time of year can damage plants and prevent seed from
74 being produced.

75 Potential threats include the loss of pollinators and associated mycorrhizal fungi. The Marsh
76 Leek-orchid has a very small population, which may lead to inbreeding problems and
77 increases the species' susceptibility to stochastic events. The small size of the population may
78 also be insufficient to sustain pollinators and associated mycorrhizal fungi.

79 Climate change is a further potential threat as changes in the rainfall pattern may lead to the
80 habitat becoming unsuitable for the species and associated pollinators and mycorrhizal fungi.
81 As a near-coastal species, the Marsh Leek-orchid is also particularly susceptible to changes in
82 sea level and extreme tidal variations, which may result from climate change.

83

84 **9. Public Consultation**

85 The information used in this assessment was made available for public exhibition and
86 comment for 30 business days. No comments were received.

87

88 **10. How judged by the Committee in relation to the criteria of the EPBC Act and**
89 **Regulations**

90 The Committee judges that the species is **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered** under
91 the EPBC Act. The assessment against the criteria is as follows:

92

93 **Criterion 1: It has undergone, is suspected to have undergone or is likely to undergo in**
94 **the immediate future a very severe, severe or substantial reduction in**
95 **numbers**

96 There are insufficient data to determine historic or current population trends for the Marsh
97 Leek-orchid. However, it is likely that the species was more widespread prior to the
98 vegetation clearance and fragmentation that occurred since European settlement of the area.
99 The Marsh Leek-orchid is now known from only one population in the Rubicon Sanctuary.
100 Some decline in this population may have occurred, as 12 individuals were recorded in 1999
101 (DPIWE, 2000) and five individuals were recorded in 2007 (Collier and Garnett, pers. comm.,
102 2007). However, studies on the related Gaping Leek-orchid indicate that plants may not
103 appear every year, and may survive below ground in a dormant state for up to five years
104 (Coates et al., 1999). Therefore, the fewer number of individuals counted in 2007 may be a
105 result of dormancy rather than decline.

106 It is likely that there has been an historic decline in the species' numbers due to vegetation
107 clearance and fragmentation, which may continue in the future due to current and potential
108 threats, including inappropriate disturbance, loss of pollinators and climate change. However,
109 there are insufficient quantitative data available to judge whether this decline has been very
110 severe, severe, substantial or not substantial, or whether there will be a certain decline in the
111 immediate future. Therefore, the species has not been demonstrated to have met each of the
112 required elements of Criterion 1, and is **not eligible** for listing in any category under this
113 criterion.

114

115 **Criterion 2: Its geographic distribution is precarious for the survival of the species and**
116 **is very restricted, restricted or limited**

117 The Marsh Leek-orchid has been recorded at one location in 19 hectares of remnant
118 vegetation in the Rubicon Sanctuary, near Port Sorell, central north Tasmania. The species'
119 distribution is very restricted, as the known population is small and exists within a patch of
120 remnant vegetation surrounded by improved pasture and housing estates. The species also has
121 very specific habitat requirements, growing in an ecotone between low-lying marshy
122 heath/sedgeland dominated by rushes and sedges with scattered patches of Spiny-headed Mat-
123 rush (*Lomandra longifolia*) and Kangaroo grass (*Themeda triandra*), and coastal woodland
124 with a heathy/grassy understorey. This is an unusual habitat (Harris and Kitchener, 2005), and
125 is rare in the near-coastal areas of northern Tasmania (Tonelli, pers. comm., 2007).

126 The species' area of occupancy is estimated to be a few square metres (Tonelli, pers. comm.,
127 2007). This geographic distribution is considered to be very restricted.

128 As discussed under Criterion 1, the Marsh Leek-orchid is likely to have experienced an
129 historic decline caused by vegetation clearance and fragmentation and this decline may
130 continue due to current and potential threats, including inappropriate disturbance, loss of
131 pollinators and climate change.

132 The Committee considers that the Marsh Leek-orchid has a very restricted geographic
133 distribution, which is precarious for the survival of the species due to its likely continuing
134 decline, single location, and current and potential threats. Therefore, the species has been
135 demonstrated to have met the relevant elements of Criterion 2 to make it **eligible** for listing as
136 **critically endangered**.

137

138 **Criterion 3: The estimated total number of mature individuals is limited to a**
139 **particular degree; and either**
140 **(a) evidence suggests that the number will continue to decline at a**
141 **particular rate; or**
142 **(b) the number is likely to continue to decline and its geographic**
143 **distribution is precarious for its survival**

144 A survey in 1999 found a total of 12 mature Marsh Leek-orchids (DPIWE, 2000), and a
145 survey in 2007 found only five plants (Collier and Garnett pers. comm., 2007). The
146 Committee considers that for the purposes of this criterion these numbers are very low.
147 Current and potential threats, such as loss of pollinators, inappropriate disturbance and
148 climate change, may cause this number to decline. The geographic distribution is considered
149 precarious for the species' survival, due to its likely ongoing decline, single location and
150 threats.

151 The Committee considers that the estimated total number of mature individuals of the species
152 is very low and that the number is likely to decline in the future. The Committee also
153 considers that the species' geographic distribution is precarious for its survival. Therefore, the
154 species has been demonstrated to have met the relevant elements of Criterion 3 to make it
155 **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered**.

156

157 **Criterion 4: The estimated total number of mature individuals is extremely low, very**
158 **low or low**

159 A survey in 1999 found a total of 12 mature Marsh Leek-orchids (DPIWE, 2000), and a
160 survey in 2007 found only five plants (Collier and Garnett pers. comm., 2007).

161 For the purposes of Criterion 4, the Committee considers that the estimated total number of
162 mature individuals of the species is extremely low. Therefore, the species has been
163 demonstrated to have met the required elements of Criterion 4, to make it **eligible** for listing
164 as **critically endangered**.

165

166 **Criterion 5: Probability of extinction in the wild that is at least:**
167 **a) 50% in the immediate future; or**
168 **b) 20% in the near future; or**
169 **c) 10% in the medium-term future.**

170 There are insufficient data available to estimate a probability of extinction of the species in
171 the wild over a relevant timeframe. Therefore, as the species has not been demonstrated to
172 have met the required elements of Criterion 5, it is **not eligible** for listing in any category
173 under this criterion.

174

175 **11. CONCLUSION**

176 **Conservation Status**

177 The Committee considers that there may have been a decline in the number of mature
178 individuals but notes that there are insufficient data to judge the extent of any decline. The
179 Committee accepts that the area of occupancy is a few square metres, which represents a very
180 restricted geographic distribution. This geographic distribution is considered precarious for
181 the survival of the species given its likely ongoing decline, single location and current and
182 potential threats. Therefore, the species has been demonstrated to have met sufficient
183 elements of Criterion 2 to make it **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered**.

184 The Committee accepts that two surveys undertaken since 1999 have found between five and
185 12 mature individuals. This is judged by the Committee to be very low for the purposes of
186 Criterion 3. Given that its geographic distribution is also precarious for its survival, the
187 species has been demonstrated to have met sufficient elements of Criterion 3 to make it
188 **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered**.

189 The total number of mature individuals is judged by the Committee to be extremely low for
190 the purposes of Criterion 4. The species has been demonstrated to have met sufficient
191 elements of Criterion 4 to make it **eligible** for listing as **critically endangered**.

192 The highest category for which the species is **eligible** to be listed is **critically endangered**.

193

194 **Recovery Plan**

195 The Committee considers that there should not be a recovery plan for this species.

196 The Tasmanian Government is implementing a Flora Recovery Plan: Threatened Tasmanian
197 Orchids 2006-10 (DPIW, 2006b) which addresses the Marsh Leek-orchid under its former
198 name (*Prasophyllum pyriforme*). A recovery plan has not been recommended because the
199 existing plan does not need review until 2011. A decision to have a recovery plan should be
200 revisited at this time. The actions covered by the conservation advice are considered to be
201 sufficient at this time.

202

203 **12. Recommendations**

204 (i) The Committee recommends that the list referred to in section 178 of the EPBC Act be
205 amended by **including** in the list in the **critically endangered** category:

206 *Prasophyllum limnetes* (Marsh Leek-orchid)

207 (ii) The Committee recommends that there should not be a recovery plan for this species.

208

209

210

211

212

Associate Professor Robert J.S. Beeton

Chair

Threatened Species Scientific Committee

213

214 **13. References cited in the advice**

- 215 Brundrett MC (2007). Scientific approaches to Australian temperate terrestrial orchid
216 conservation. *Australian Journal of Botany* 55: 293–307.
- 217 Coates E, Lunt I and Wapstra H (1999). Draft Recovery Plan 2000-2003 *Prasophyllum*
218 *correctum* (Gaping leek-orchid). Unpublished report to Environment Australia. LaTrobe
219 University, Bundoora.
- 220 Collier P and Garnett R (2007). Personal communication 2007, Rubicon Sanctuary.
221 Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment (DPIWE) (2000). Listing
222 statement Graceful Leek Orchid *Prasophyllum pyriforme*. Department of Primary
223 Industries, Water and Environment, Tasmania.
- 224 Harris S and Kitchener A (2005). From Forest to Fjaeldmark: Descriptions of Tasmania's
225 Vegetation. Department of Primary Industries, Water and Environment. Printing
226 Authority of Tasmania, Hobart.
- 227 Jones D, Wapstra H, Tonelli P and Harris S (1999). *The Orchids of Tasmania*. Melbourne
228 University Press, Carlton South, Victoria.
- 229 Jones DL (2006). A complete guide to the native orchids of Australia, including the island
230 territories. Reed New Holland, Sydney.
- 231 Jones DL and Rouse DT (2006). Fourteen new species of *Prasophyllum* from eastern
232 Australia. *Australian Orchid Research* 5: 143–156.
- 233 Tonelli P (2007). Personal communication 2007. Private consultant.
234