

# Microsatellite Primers for Two Threatened Orchids in Florida: Encyclia tampensis and Cyrtopodium punctatum (Orchidaceae)

Authors: Weremijewicz, Joanna, Almonte, Jasmin I., Hilaire, Vanessa

S., Lopez, Frank D., Lu, Stephen H., et al.

Source: Applications in Plant Sciences, 4(4)

Published By: Botanical Society of America

URL: https://doi.org/10.3732/apps.1500095

BioOne Complete (complete.BioOne.org) is a full-text database of 200 subscribed and open-access titles in the biological, ecological, and environmental sciences published by nonprofit societies, associations, museums, institutions, and presses.

Your use of this PDF, the BioOne Complete website, and all posted and associated content indicates your acceptance of BioOne's Terms of Use, available at <a href="https://www.bioone.org/terms-of-use">www.bioone.org/terms-of-use</a>.

Usage of BioOne Complete content is strictly limited to personal, educational, and non - commercial use. Commercial inquiries or rights and permissions requests should be directed to the individual publisher as copyright holder.

BioOne sees sustainable scholarly publishing as an inherently collaborative enterprise connecting authors, nonprofit publishers, academic institutions, research libraries, and research funders in the common goal of maximizing access to critical research.

# PRIMER NOTE

# MICROSATELLITE PRIMERS FOR TWO THREATENED ORCHIDS IN FLORIDA: *Encyclia tampensis* and *Cyrtopodium punctatum* (Orchidaceae)<sup>1</sup>

Joanna Weremijewicz<sup>2,3</sup>, Jasmin I. Almonte<sup>2</sup>, Vanessa S. Hilaire<sup>2</sup>, Frank D. Lopez<sup>2</sup>, Stephen H. Lu<sup>2</sup>, Sarah M. Marrero<sup>2</sup>, Catherine M. Martinez<sup>2</sup>, Edson A. Zarate<sup>2</sup>, Ana K. Lam<sup>2</sup>, Samantha A. N. Ferguson<sup>2</sup>, Nicolas Z. Petrakis<sup>2</sup>, Kelsey A. Peeples<sup>2</sup>, Ebony D. Taylor<sup>2</sup>, Natalie M. Leon<sup>2</sup>, Carolina Valdes<sup>2</sup>, Michael Hass<sup>2</sup>, Andrew B. Reeve<sup>2</sup>, Danielle T. Palow<sup>2</sup>, and Jason L. Downing<sup>2,4,5</sup>

<sup>2</sup>Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden, 10901 Old Cutler Road, Coral Gables, Florida 33156 USA; <sup>3</sup>Department of Biology, University of Miami, 1301 Memorial Drive, Coral Gables, Florida 33126 USA; and <sup>4</sup>Department of Biological Sciences, Florida International University, 11200 SW 8th Street, Miami, Florida 33199 USA

- *Premise of the study:* The Million Orchid Project at Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden is an initiative to propagate native orchids for reintroduction into Miami's urban landscapes. The aim of this study was to develop microsatellites for *Encyclia tampensis* and *Cyrtopodium punctatum* (Orchidaceae).
- *Methods and Results:* Ten microsatellites were developed for each species. For *E. tampensis* sampled from the natural population, allele numbers ranged from one to four, with an average observed heterozygosity ( $H_o$ ) of 0.314 and average expected heterozygosity ( $H_o$ ) of 0.281. For the individuals from cultivation, allele numbers ranged from one to six, with an average  $H_o$  of 0.35 and an average  $H_o$  of 0.224. For *C. punctatum*, allele numbers ranged from one to three, with an average  $H_o$  of 0.257 and an average  $H_o$  of 0.272.
- Conclusions: These microsatellites will be used to assess the genetic diversity of natural and cultivated populations with the intention of guiding genetic breeding under the Million Orchid Project.

**Key words:** commercially exploited plants; *Cyrtopodium punctatum*; *Encyclia tampensis*; microsatellites; native Florida orchids; Orchidaceae.

Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden's Million Orchid Project (hereafter FTBG and MOP) is a special initiative to reintroduce millions of exploited and threatened native orchids into the urban landscapes of the Miami metropolitan area. The project focuses on reestablishment in schoolyards, roadways, and other public spaces. The focal species for this study, *Encyclia tampensis* (Lindl.) Small and *Cyrtopodium punctatum* (L.) Lindl. (Orchidaceae), were selected for reintroduction through the

<sup>1</sup>Manuscript received 10 August 2015; revision accepted 18 November 2015

The authors thank the Furniss Foundation, the American Orchid Society, the Hugh M. Matheson Family Fund, and the City of Coral Gables for supporting the Million Orchid Project and the Batchelor Foundation for supporting science education at Fairchild Tropical Botanic Garden. The authors also thank Fairchild Director Dr. C. Lewis and Fairchild Director of Education A. Padolf for developing the program concept; Fairchild Orchid Research Assistant J. Arce for his help with collecting photo vouchers and for technical support in the laboratory; University of Chicago undergraduate and Fairchild volunteer D. Weiss for her exceptional mentoring and laboratory support; R. Ricks for her commitment to the students and staff; and A. Noble and M. Litzinger for their critical support with the internship logistics.

<sup>5</sup>Author for correspondence: jdown003@fiu.edu

doi:10.3732/apps.1500095

MOP based on their conservation importance, potential to be grown epiphytically in street trees, and their history of human exploitation. Through volunteer and student efforts, this program has propagated thousands of orchids for reintroduction. However, the genetic diversity of existing wild and cultivated populations of these species in the region is unknown.

Encyclia tampensis, also known as the butterfly orchid, is an epiphytic orchid native to southern Florida, Cuba, and The Bahamas (Luer, 1972). In southern Florida, it is found primarily in cypress swamps and tropical hammocks. The flowers, which look like butterflies, have varying amounts of red, green, and yellow hues in the petals (Subrahmanyam, 2008). The flowering period of E. tampensis in southern Florida is from May through August (Luer, 1972). In Florida, this species is considered commercially exploited according to a Florida state statute (Stat. No. 581.185 subsection 2(a); http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/), suggesting that this species is subject to removal from the wild to be sold commercially.

Cyrtopodium punctatum, also known as the cigar or Florida cowhorn orchid, is a state-listed endangered orchid species native to southern Florida (Luer, 1972; Wunderlin et al., 2016). Wild populations of *C. punctatum* are also found in Mexico, the West Indies, and Central and South America (Romero-González and Fernández-Concha, 1999). Cyrtopodium punctatum is one of the only epiphytic species in the genus Cyrtopodium R. Br.,

Applications in Plant Sciences 2016 4(4): 1500095; http://www.bioone.org/loi/apps © 2016 Weremijewicz et al. Published by the Botanical Society of America.

This work is licensed under a Creative Commons Attribution License (CC-BY-NC-SA).

and in Florida is commonly found in cypress swamps and tropical hardwood hammocks (Chafin, 2000; Dutra et al., 2009). This orchid is characterized by bright yellow flowers splattered with dark burgundy spots and large pseudobulbs formed by former leaf bases. Populations have been degraded in southern Florida as a result of historic poaching, which has led to the legal protection of *C. punctatum* today (Stat. No. 581.185 subsection 2(a); http://www.leg.state.fl.us/statutes/).

The objectives of this study were to develop microsatellite markers for each species and assess the degree of genetic diversity of the existing populations at FTBG used in propagation efforts. These microsatellites were also tested for efficacy on two congeneric species for each focal species available at FTBG; congeneric species included *E. alata* (Bateman) Schltr., *Encyclia* hybrid 'Cindy' Das Orch. (*E. tampensis* × *E. alata*), *C. macrobulbon* (La Llave & Lex.) G. A. Romero-González & Carnevali f. *salvadorense* (Hamer & Garay) G. A. Romero-González & Carnevali, and *C. flavum* Link & Otto ex Rchb.

### METHODS AND RESULTS

Leaf tissue was collected from one plant of E. tampensis (accession no. 160744) and one plant of C. punctatum (accession no. 160984) for nextgeneration sequencing; both individuals are located at FTBG (Coral Gables, Florida, USA). Due to the rarity of these species and potential for poaching, GPS coordinates are not given for any individual plants in this study. Photo vouchers for each individual are deposited in the FTBG Herbarium (Coral Gables, Florida, USA). Genomic DNA was extracted from lyophilized tissue using the DNeasy Plant Mini Kit (QIAGEN, Venlo, The Netherlands) at FTBG laboratories. The total DNA was sent to the Georgia Genomics Facility at the University of Georgia (Athens, Georgia, USA) for next-generation sequencing using Illumina HiSeq 2000 (Illumina, San Diego, California, USA). The resulting 100-bp Illumina sequences were screened using the PERL script program PAL\_FINDER\_v0.02.03 to identify potential microsatellite repeat elements among the reads (Castoe et al., 2012). No additional sequencing was done after the Illumina run. Microsatellite repeats were detected in one direction; if one was found, the sequence was sent automatically to Primer3 version 2.0.0

(Koressaar and Remm, 2007; Untergasser et al., 2012) for primer design. We only considered primer pairs that occurred 1–10 times among the reads. Primers were designed for sequences containing a microsatellite region and sufficient flanking sequence.

For E. tampensis, 48 loci containing microsatellite motifs with at least seven uninterrupted repeats were selected for initial primer design. For C. punctatum, 48 microsatellite regions with at least three motifs were identified. The different PCR primer pairs were manufactured at Integrated DNA Technologies (Coralville, Iowa, USA). These unlabeled primers were screened for unique products on the same individuals used for next-generation sequencing. The PCR products were prepared using 1 µL of genomic DNA, 11.5 µL of ddH<sub>2</sub>O, 2.5 µL of TBT PAR (solution contains 750 mM trehalose [Sigma-Aldrich, St. Louis, Missouri, USA], 1 mg/mL nonacetylated bovine serum albumin [BSA; Sigma-Aldrich], 1% Tween-20 [Acros Organics, Geel, Belgium], and 8.5 mM Tris hydrochloride [pH 8.0; Fisher Scientific, Pittsburg, Pennsylvania, USA]), and a 10-μL mixture of the primer pairs (10 μM concentration) using a Dyad Peltier Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad Laboratories, Hercules, California, USA). The PCR conditions were as follows: initial denaturation at 94°C for 3 min: followed by 32 cycles of 94°C for 1 min, annealing for 1 min (temperature varied by species), and 72°C for 2 min; and elongation at 72°C for 30 min. Annealing temperatures were 62°C for the E. tampensis primer mix and 58°C for the C. punctatum primer mix (Tables 1 and 2). The PCR products were scored for presence or absence of a single appropriately sized DNA fragment using gel electrophoresis on 2% agarose gel. Based on these criteria, 13 and 11 of the 48 potential loci for E. tampensis and C. punctatum, respectively, were selected for dye-labeling at Applied Biosystems (Foster City, California, USA). Fragment analysis was then used to further detect any primer pairs that did not produce the expected PCR product, and any locus that showed multiple and/or overlapping peaks was omitted. For each species, the 10 best novel microsatellite loci were selected for their repeatability, potential polymorphism, and capacity for multiplexing (Tables 1 and 2).

Under these PCR conditions, 10 primers were then tested for polymorphism on a total of 20 individuals of *E. tampensis* from natural and cultivated sources, as well as one individual of *E. alata* and one individual of *Encyclia* hybrid 'Cindy'. Sampling for the natural population at FTBG consisted of 14 individuals, and the cultivated population was represented by six individuals. Cultivated individuals were obtained from a commercial nursery in Miami-Dade County, Florida.

Ten primer pairs containing microsatellite regions were screened on 21 individuals of *C. punctatum*, two individuals of *C. macrobulbon*, and one individual of *C. flavum*. The PCR reactions consisted of 1  $\mu$ L of genomic DNA, 14  $\mu$ L of ddH<sub>2</sub>O, and 10  $\mu$ L of a primer mix; the total mixture included seven primer pairs: 12  $\mu$ L of Y01, 24  $\mu$ L of Y02, 36  $\mu$ L of Y03, 24  $\mu$ L of B01, 36  $\mu$ L

Table 1. Characteristics of 10 microsatellite primer pairs developed for Encyclia tampensis.<sup>a</sup>

| Locusb | Primer sequences (5'-3')         | Repeat motif | Allele size (bp) | Fluorescent dyec | GenBank accession no. |
|--------|----------------------------------|--------------|------------------|------------------|-----------------------|
| YE1    | F: CTCAAACCACCTCCAACAGC          | $(AATT)_7$   | 156              | NED              | KT36366               |
|        | R: GGCATTTAATTAAGAGACTAACCTCC    |              |                  |                  |                       |
| YE2    | F: GCAAGTCTAGAATGAGATTTC TGGC    | $(AAAG)_8$   | 196              | NED              | KT363662              |
|        | R: CATCTGCTATTCAGTCTTTGTTCG      |              |                  |                  |                       |
| YE3    | F: TTAGTCGTTCATTCTCAGCCG         | $(ATAC)_7$   | 208              | NED              | KT363663              |
|        | R: AAATTCAGTTTGATCAGTGCCG        |              |                  |                  |                       |
| YE4    | F: CCATATCGAGATTGAATATCATCACC    | $(AAAT)_7$   | 265              | NED              | KT363664              |
|        | R: CACCGACTGTTATCTTCAACTGC       |              |                  |                  |                       |
| YE5    | F: GCAGGGATGAGGATTGTAAGG         | $(AATG)_7$   | 483              | NED              | KT363665              |
|        | R: TTCAACAGAGTTCTCATCAGTTACC     |              |                  |                  |                       |
| GE1    | F: GCCTCCTAAGATAATGCCTTCC        | $(AATT)_7$   | 154              | HEX              | KT363666              |
|        | R: AAATTGGGTTTGATTGAGGAGG        |              |                  |                  |                       |
| GE2    | F: ATGGGCGGTTTCTCATAACG          | $(AAAT)_7$   | 193              | HEX              | KT363667              |
|        | R: TTCTTTACGCGTCATTCTTTGG        |              |                  |                  |                       |
| GE3    | F: ATTGAATGGCCAAGGGACC           | $(AATT)_7$   | 144              | HEX              | KT363668              |
|        | R: GATGCCTTATCCCTCTTGGG          |              |                  |                  |                       |
| BE1    | F: CCACAATCATGCAAGTGATGC         | $(AAAT)_7$   | 169              | 6-FAM            | KT363669              |
|        | R: TTGTTGCACAGCCCTTGG            |              |                  |                  |                       |
| BE2    | F: GTTGTTTGTAGATTGATTCTCTTTCATCC | $(AAAT)_7$   | 232              | 6-FAM            | KT363670              |
|        | R: TTCATTAGCGATTTCTTCTCAAATGC    |              |                  |                  |                       |

*Note*:  $T_0$  = annealing temperature.

http://www.bioone.org/loi/apps 2 of 4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Annealing temperature was 62°C for all loci.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>Loci were named according to the color of the dyes used as follows: yellow (YE), green (GE), and blue (BE).

c5'-end dye labeled.

Table 2. Characteristics of 10 microsatellite primer pairs developed for Cyrtopodium punctatum.

| Locusa |    | Primer sequences (5′–3′)    | Repeat motif        | Allele size (bp) | $T_{\rm a}(^{\circ}{\rm C})$ | Fluorescent dyeb | GenBank accession no.                   |
|--------|----|-----------------------------|---------------------|------------------|------------------------------|------------------|---|
| Y01    | F: | GCTCCGAGATAATGCAGCG         | (TTC) <sub>15</sub> | 181              | 58                           | NED              | KT363671                                |
|        | R: | GAGCCTCCTCAGATAAATTCCC      |                     |                  |                              |                  |   |
| Y02    | F: | GGATAAAGCACCTGTAAGCAGC      | $(TTC)_{16}$        | 254              | 58                           | NED              | KT363672                                |
|        | R: | GACACTTCGAGCTGTCGTCC        |                     |                  |                              |                  |   |
| Y03    | F: | TGAGTGGTGTCCTAACCAACC       | $(ATGG)_{11}$       | 311              | 58                           | NED              | KT363673                                |
|        | R: | AAGGCCTTTACATTGAAGAATGG     |                     |                  |                              |                  |   |
| G01    | F: | GGTGGAGATGATGGG             | $(TTC)_{14}$        | 150              | 58                           | HEX              | KT363674                                |
|        | R: | AAACTCTAATTCTCAACA CAGAGGG  |                     |                  |                              |                  |   |
| G02    | F: | CCCTAAGATCTACGTGGTGTCG      | $(ATGG)_8$          | 233              | 58                           | HEX              | KT363675                                |
|        | R: |                             |                     |                  |                              |                  |   |
| G03    | F: | CAGGTTTCCTCTCTCTCG          | $(TTC)_{16}$        | 309              | 58                           | HEX              | KT363676                                |
|        | R: | CAATAATGGAGGATTGCGTGG       |                     |                  |                              |                  |   |
| B01    | F: | GGAAGAGCAACGAAAGAGGC        | $(AATC)_7$          | 195              | 58                           | 6-FAM            | KT363677                                |
| D.02   | R: | GCAATGCTAAGCACATAGACGG      | ( A GTTG)           | 200              |                              | 6.513.6          | *************************************** |
| B02    | F: | 1110101110001001111100      | $(AGTG)_9$          | 299              | 54                           | 6-FAM            | KT363678                                |
| D02    | R: | GGAGTCGAAGCTGAAGGAGC        | ( A (TOTE))         | 226              |                              | ( E434           | WTD (2 (70                              |
| B03    | F: | GAGCATTTGCATAAACATTGTGG     | $(ATT)_{17}$        | 226              | 54                           | 6-FAM            | KT363679                                |
| D04    | R: | TGAACATCGTATGGTACTAATTTGAGG | (TTTC)              | 107              |                              | C EAM            | IZT2 (2 (00                             |
| B04    | F: | TCAAGTTGGACAGTTGAGATGG      | $(TTC)_{15}$        | 187              | 55                           | 6-FAM            | KT363680                                |
|        | R: | GGCGAAATTTCTGTGAGTTCC       |                     |                  |                              |                  |   |

*Note*:  $T_a$  = annealing temperature.

of G01, 36  $\mu$ L of G02, and 36  $\mu$ L of G03 (10  $\mu$ M concentration), and PuReTaq Ready-To-Go PCR Beads (GE Healthcare, Little Chalfont, Buckinghamshire, United Kingdom) using a Dyad Peltier Thermal Cycler (Bio-Rad). As a result of interaction effects, three primer pairs—B02, B03, and B04—were run individually. Annealing temperature was 54°C for B02 and B03, and 55°C for B04 (Table 2).

The PCR products were prepared for fragment analysis in a reaction mixture of 1  $\mu$ L of amplified DNA, 9.5  $\mu$ L of Hi-Di Formamide (Applied Biosystems), and 0.5  $\mu$ L of MapMarker (BioVentures, Murfreesboro, Tennessee, USA). The samples were sent to the Core DNA Facility at Florida International University (Miami, Florida, USA) for fragment analysis. Resulting chromatograms were visualized and scored using GeneMapper version 5.0 software (Applied Biosciences). Genotypic and allelic frequencies were obtained using Hardy–Weinberg equilibrium (HWE) Calculator for 3 Alleles (Emerson, 2010) to describe differences in allelic equilibrium assumptions. A  $\chi^2$  analysis was used to test for statistically significant deviations from HWE for the observed genotype frequencies using Microsoft Excel (Microsoft Corporation, Seattle, Washington, USA).

For each population, the total number of alleles, fragment length, and the observed  $(H_o)$  and expected heterozygosity  $(H_e)$  were calculated for each microsatellite region, and the average heterozygosities and test statistics for HWE were calculated for each species (Tables 3 and 4). In the natural population of

E. tampensis, the number of alleles per locus varied from one to four, and three loci (YE3, GE1, and BE1) showed significant deviation from HWE (Table 3). In the cultivated population, the number of alleles per locus was greater, from one to six, and three loci (GE1, BE1, and BE2) showed significant deviation from HWE (Table 3). However, only the YE5 loci amplified six alleles; the other nine loci were composed of only one or two alleles. The average  $H_o$  and  $H_c$  for the natural population were 0.314 and 0.281, respectively (Table 3). For the cultivated population, average  $H_o$  was 0.35, higher than that of the natural population, with a lower average  $H_o$  of 0.224. For the closely related taxa, allele numbers ranged from one to three. For the congeneric E alata, nine of the 10 loci amplified, while for the hybrid Encyclia 'Cindy' all 10 loci successfully amplified, and we detected a different allele than E tampensis at the YE2 locus (Table 3).

Seven of the 10 primers tested for *C. punctatum* revealed polymorphism (Table 4). For the *C. punctatum* population at FTBG, the number of alleles per locus varied from one to three (Table 4). The average  $H_{\rm o}$  was 0.257, and average  $H_{\rm e}$  was 0.272. The  $H_{\rm o}$  for three alleles (G01, B03, and B04) showed significant deviations from HWE (Table 4). For the congener *C. macrobulbon*, all 10 microsatellite regions amplified with up to four alleles, and for *C. flavum* nine microsatellites amplified a maximum of two alleles, and the majority of the loci were monomorphic.

Table 3. Genetic properties and descriptive statistics of the 10 novel microsatellites for *Encyclia tampensis* and two closely related taxa, *E. alata* and *Encyclia* hybrid 'Cindy' (*E. tampensis* × *E. alata*).

| Locus   | Natural population $(N = 14)$ |               |                  | Cultivated population $(N = 6)$ |               |                  | E. alata and Encyclia 'Cindy' $(N = 2)$ |             |                  |
|---------|-------------------------------|---------------|------------------|---------------------------------|---------------|------------------|---|-------------|------------------|
|         | A                             | $H_{\rm o}$   | $H_{\mathrm{e}}$ | A                               | $H_{\rm o}$   | $H_{\mathrm{e}}$ | A                                       | $H_{\rm o}$ | $H_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| YE1     | 1                             | 0             | 0                | 1                               | 0             | 0                | 1                                       | 0           | 0                |
| YE2     | 2                             | 0.14          | 0.13             | 1                               | 0             | 0                | 2                                       | 1           | _                |
| YE3     | 2                             | $O^{\dagger}$ | 0.13             | 1                               | 0             | 0                | 2                                       | 0           | 0.38             |
| YE4     | 1                             | 0             | 0                | 1                               | 0             | 0                | 1                                       | 0           | 0                |
| YE5     | 4                             | 0.57          | 0.68             | 6                               | 0.83          | 0.81             | 1                                       | 0           | 0                |
| GE1     | 2                             | 1†            | 0.5              | 2                               | 1†            | 0.5              | 2                                       | 1           | 0.5              |
| GE2     | 4                             | 0.29          | 0.53             | 2                               | 0.67          | 0.44             | 3                                       | 1           | 0.63             |
| GE3     | 1                             | 0             | 0                | 1                               | 0             | 0                | 1                                       | 0           | 0                |
| BE1     | 2                             | 1†            | 0.5              | 2                               | 1†            | 0.05             | 3                                       | 1           | 0.5              |
| BE2     | 2                             | 0.14          | 0.34             | 2                               | $O^{\dagger}$ | 0.44             | 3                                       | 0.5         | 0.38             |
| Average | 2.1                           | 0.314         | 0.281            | 1.9                             | 0.35          | 0.224            | 1.9                                     | 0.45        | 0.265            |

Note: A = number of alleles per locus;  $H_e =$  expected heterozygosity;  $H_o =$  observed heterozygosity; N = number of individuals sampled. † Significant deviation from HWE (P < 0.05).

http://www.bioone.org/loi/apps 3 of 4

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>a</sup>Loci were named according to the color of the dyes used as follows: yellow (Y), green (G), and blue (B).

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>b</sup>5'-end dye labeled.

Table 4. Genetic properties and descriptive statistics of the 10 novel microsatellites for three species of Cyrtopodium.

| Locus   | C. punctatum $(N = 21)$ |                  |             | $C.\ macrobulbon\ (N=2)$ |             |                  | C. $flavum (N = 1)$ |             |                  |
|---------|-------------------------|------------------|-------------|--------------------------|-------------|------------------|---------------------|-------------|------------------|
|         | A                       | $H_{\mathrm{o}}$ | $H_{\rm e}$ | A                        | $H_{\rm o}$ | $H_{\mathrm{e}}$ | A                   | $H_{\rm o}$ | $H_{\mathrm{e}}$ |
| Y01     | 1                       | 0                | 0           | 2                        | 0           | 0                | 1                   | 0           | _                |
| Y02     | 2                       | 0.57             | 0.48        | 2                        | 0           | 0                | 1                   | 0           | _                |
| Y03     | 2                       | 0.62             | 0.66        | 2                        | 0.25        | 0.2              | 1                   | 0           | _                |
| G01     | 3                       | $0.14^{\dagger}$ | 0.29        | 3                        | 0.25        | 0.2              | 2                   | 1           | _                |
| G02     | 1                       | 0                | 0           | 1                        | 0           | 0                | 1                   | 0           | _                |
| G03     | 1                       | 0                | 0           | 1                        | 0           | 0                | 1                   | 0           | _                |
| B01     | 1                       | 0                | 0           | 1                        | 0           | 0                | 1                   | 0           | _                |
| B02*    | 3                       | 0.28             | 0.203       | 2                        | 0.25        | 0.2              | 1                   | 0           | _                |
| B03*    | 2                       | $0.48^{\dagger}$ | 0.25        | 4                        | 1           | 0.25             | 2                   | 1           | _                |
| B04*    | 2                       | $0.48^{\dagger}$ | 0.25        | 2                        | 1           | 0.25             | 2                   | 1           | _                |
| Average | 1.8                     | 0.257            | 0.272       | 2.0                      | 0.275       | 0.11             | 1.2                 |             |                  |

Note: A = number of alleles per locus;  $H_e =$  expected heterozygosity;  $H_o =$  observed heterozygosity; N = number of individuals sampled.

# **CONCLUSIONS**

Here we report 10 novel microsatellite loci each for two commercially exploited native Florida orchids, E. tampensis and C. punctatum. The microsatellites developed showed monomorphic and polymorphic differences in the two study populations, as well as some applicability for closely related taxa. Based on the number of alleles amplified and the average  $H_0$ values for E. tampensis, these results suggest that the cultivated population is more genetically diverse than the natural population at FTBG; however, this conclusion is given with caution, because our sampling effort (number of plants sampled) was not representative of the entire population, and only one locus showed amplification of six alleles in the cultivated population. Allele numbers for the other *Encyclia* species were comparable to that of the E. tampensis natural population. The genetic diversity of C. punctatum individuals at FTBG, on average, was not significantly different than the  $H_e$  (<2% difference). Because C. punctatum is an outcrossing species and the individuals sampled included several seedling volunteers, these findings indicate that an adequate amount of outcrossing is occurring in the garden population. Considering this evidence and the rarity of this species, this population may be an important source of diverse genetic material for diversifying the more vulnerable natural populations.

The resulting markers will be used to evaluate the genetic diversity, population demography, and potential gene flow of the remaining natural and cultivated populations in the region, with the intention of guiding the genetic breeding protocols for future reintroductions under the MOP. Specifically, we will assess the genetic diversity of all known individuals of *C. punctatum* and *E. tampensis* at FTBG. To ensure sufficiently diverse individuals are being selected for reintroduction, we will also screen offspring propagated from natural or artificial fruit set to be used for the MOP. More broadly, these microsatellite markers can be used to study genetic diversity of other populations

within Miami and will be imperative in any future conservation efforts for these endangered orchid species.

### LITERATURE CITED

Castoe, T. A., A. W. Poole, A. P. J. DE KONING, K. L. JONES, D. F. TOMBACK, S. J. OYLER-McCance, J. A. Fike, et al. 2012. Rapid microsatellite identification from Illumina paired-end genomic sequencing in two birds and one snake. *PLoS ONE* 7: e30953.

CHAFIN, L. G. 2000. Field guide to the rare plants of Florida. Florida Natural Areas Inventory, Tallahassee, Florida. Website http://www.fnai.org/FieldGuide/pdf/Cyrtopodium\_punctatum.pdf [accessed 24 June 2015].

Dutra, D., M. E. Kane, C. Reinhardt Adams, and L. Richardson. 2009. Reproductive biology of *Cyrtopodium punctatum* in situ: Implications for conservation of an endangered Florida orchid. *Plant Species Biology* 24: 92–103.

EMERSON, E. 2010. Hardy-Weinberg equilibrium calculator for 3 alleles. Website http://www.had2know.com/academics/hardy-weinberg-equilibrium-calculator-3-alleles.html [accessed 1 July 2015].

KORESSAAR, T., AND M. REMM. 2007. Enhancements and modifications of primer design program Primer3. *Bioinformatics (Oxford, England)* 23: 1289–1291.

Luer, C. A. 1972. The native orchids of Florida. The New York Botanical Garden, Bronx, New York, USA.

Romero-González, G. A., and G. C. Fernández-Concha. 1999. Notes on the species of *Cyrtopodium* (Cyrtopodinae, Orchidaceae) from Florida, the Greater Antilles, Mexico, Central and North America. *Harvard Papers in Botany* 4: 327–341.

Subrahmanyam, P. 2008. Florida's native and naturalized orchids. Website http://www.flnativeorchids.com/natives\_gallery/encyclia\_tampensis.htm [accessed 17 March 2016].

Untergasser, A., I. Cutcutache, T. Koressaar, J. Ye, B. C. Faircloth, M. Remm, and S. G. Rozen. 2012. Primer3—New capabilities and interfaces. *Nucleic Acids Research* 40: e115.

Wunderlin, R. P., B. F. Hansen, A. R. Franck, and F. B. Essig. 2016. Atlas of Florida plants. Institute for Systematic Botany, University of South Florida, Tampa, Florida, USA. Website http://florida.plantatlas.usf.edu/[accessed 29 February 2016].

http://www.bioone.org/loi/apps 4 of 4

<sup>\*</sup>Locus was not included in primer mix.

<sup>†</sup> Significant deviation from  $\hat{HWE}$  (P < 0.05).