FINAL REPORT

As Required by

THE ENDANGERED SPECIES ACT, SECTION 6

TEXAS

GRANT NUMBER E-1-8

ENDANGERED RESOURCES BRANCH

Project 27: Candidate Species Monitoring

Prepared by: Mary E. Candee



Andrew Sansom Executive Director

Gary L. Graham Endangered and Threatened Species Program Director

99

Robert L. Cook Director, Wildlife Division

ABSTRACT

Monitoring plans were developed for 278 candidate species or subspecies in Texas. Monitoring plans include information on species distribution, monitoring objectives, monitoring frequency and season, monitoring sites and methodology, red flag conditions for species declines, location of reference materials and resource names, and notes regarding opportunities for use of volunteers. All plans were reviewed by U. S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS) and Texas Parks and Wildlife Department (TPWD). Species were also assigned a monitoring priority to assist with implementation of candidate monitoring in Texas. These plans should prove useful in monitoring taxa of concern in Texas whether or not a candidate list continues to be maintained by the USFWS.

FINAL REPORT

STATE:

TEXAS

GRANT NO.:

E-1

GRANT TITLE:

Endangered and Threatened Species Conservation

PERIOD COVERED:

September 1, 1990 through August 31, 1996

PROJECT NO.:

27

PROJECT TITLE:

CANDIDATE SPECIES MONITORING

PROJECT OBJECTIVE:

To provide an annual, biennial, or triennial review (Depending upon the species) for each plant and animal species occurring in Texas that is deemed to be imminently imperiled through developing species specific monitoring plans.

ACCOMPLISHMENTS

CANDIDATE MONITORING APPROACH

The Candidate Monitoring approach was to develop species specific monitoring plans. A total of 332 candidate taxa were considered. The priority of the taxa was determined through interviews and input from TPWD and USFWS personnel familiar with the respective taxa. Because some low priority species were excluded, a total of 278 plans were written.

When developing these plans a few assumptions were made. When these plans are to be implemented a review of the element manual and geographic manual files will be completed prior to field work. There will undoubtedly be changes made in the field when trying to implement some of these plans. Monitoring sites were chosen based on best available knowledge at the time—this may change by the time these plans are implemented. Some monitoring sites will be chosen upon actual field review. In some cases, landowner contact and access will be a major factor in the success of implementing a monitoring strategy. Overall, TPWD will serve as coordinator of the monitoring efforts to ensure that standardization of monitoring techniques are implemented. When referring to the "Known Occurrences", this refers to the actual Element Occurrence Records in the TPWD Biological Conservation Database.

The estimated time element is for single species monitoring, typically with 2 days set aside for travel. Combined monitoring efforts will change the time factor. Field work is usually most efficient with at least two members performing the field work. In most instances field time can be reduced when more assistance is available.

The reference Candidate Species Monitoring Status Overview for the plants provides a synopsis of priority, county of occurrence, responsible party to monitor or coordinate monitoring,

expected staff and field time, approximate target sites to monitor, month(s) to monitor, monitoring frequency, level of monitoring, and any remarks relevant to that species. This document will be useful in scheduling, budgeting and long-range planning for the implementation aspect of this project.

The following is a description of the status of the monitoring plans for each of the taxa:

PLANTS:

Of the one hundred and sixty candidate plants, one hundred and seven plans were completed. A portion were excluded as low priority because they have not been seen in recent years. If these species are relocated, then monitoring priority should be considered high. Othere species were excluded because new information indicates that they are more abundant than previously thought. The plans submitted have had internal TPWD review and USFWS review. The current Candidate Species Monitoring Status Overview for plants is also included in this report.

INVERTEBRATES:

The candidate invertebrates include seventy-two species. These include 10 arachnids: 11 crustaceans; 33 insects; and 18 mollusks. A monitoring plan was developed for all species regardless of priority. The two recently listed C2 insects, Cheumatopsyche morsei, Morse's netspinning caddisfly; and the Hydroptila ouachita, a purse casemaker caddisfly were not addressed in this report. Those species that have been down listed to 3C or proposed for endangered listing were all included in this report. In most cases, very little is known about the species. It is strongly recommended that status surveys be completed for the invertebrates so we will know more about their life history, distribution and abundance. For some species the best season or month to initiate monitoring is not known. Where voucher specimens are collected, following coordination with the respective institutions, materials will be deposited in the best collection appropriate for that taxonomic group. It is suggested that the crustaceans, arachnids, cave invertebrates, and the snaits and mussels be deposited at the University of Texas-Austin, Texas Memorial Museum; and the insects deposited with Texas A & M University, Entomological Collection. In many cases, it is not possible to quantify the species being monitored; therefore, presence and absence may be the only indices to monitor until further status information can be gathered. Some species will not be able to withstand repeated collection pressures and noting presence/absence is considered the best approach at this time. In other instances it may be appropriate to monitor water or habitat quality. Other populations located on state, federal or other preserve land may be presumed protected and for that reason, monitoring frequency may be minimized. The final submitted reports for these species may vary depending upon when the actual lab identification-verification occurs. This may take six months or longer in some cases.

AMPHIBIANS AND REPTILES:

Included are monitoring plans for the ten amphibian and twelve reptile candidate species. These plans have had TPWD and USFWS review. For some species, there is a significant time commitment to monitor the species.

FISH:

The twenty species of candidate fish have also been reviewed by TPWD and USFWS staff.

MAMMALS:

The thirty-five plans for mammal candidates have been reviewed by both TPWD and USFWS staff. Species with a low priority usually have a brief description of monitoring methodology. When those low priority species will actually be addressed, more detail may be necessary to carry out the monitoring.

BIRDS:

The twenty-five plans for the candidate birds have been reviewed by both TPWD and USFWS staff. While a monitoring protocol is suggested for all candidate species, significant effort should be made to assess the usefulness of existing datasources, such as the Texas Colonial Waterbird Census, NBS Breeding Bird Surveys, and Audubon Christmas Bird Counts.

MONITORING REPORT FORMAT

Once the implementation of the monitoring is underway a standardized reporting format will be followed. An example of the information in the Report may include: the species being monitored, personnel monitoring, volunteer effort, site-specific location data, maps, search or monitoring hours, specimen data, habitat data, a discussion of the population status relative to previous monitoring years, and any threat to the species or their habitat.

VOLUNTEER OPPORTUNITIES

Opportunities for volunteer assistance was noted in each plan with anticipated coordinated participation by site managers on public lands and cooperating agencies and organizations. To date, there has been minimal volunteer involvement with this part of the project. Volunteers were involved with candidate bat research that was going on in east Texas and to some degree with monitoring candidate plants.

In order to best utilize volunteers to obtain useful information a comprehensive program should be developed to include program identity, public awareness, cooperation agreements, training opportunities, written resources, and a standard reporting mechanism. To ensure implementation of this project on available lands, cooperative agreements will be developed with various state and federal agencies and private organizations, including Texas Park & Wildlife Department-Public Lands Division, Wildlife Division, Non-game Program; National Park Service; US Fish and Wildlife Service; US Forest Service; Texas Forest Service; Texas Department of Transportation; The Nature Conservancy of Texas; and National Audubon Society. These efforts will be developed under the Section 6 Project 72 - Monitoring Program for Species of Concern in Texas, currently underway.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The assistance of many reviewers for this project is appreciated. Thanks is extended to Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Gena Janssen, Jackie Poole, Dean Keddy-Hector, Craig Farquhar, Gary Garrett, David Bowles, Kathryn Kennedy, Lisa O'Donnell, and Carol Beardmore.

ATTACHED:

Appendix A	List of candidate species with monitoring plans
Appendix B	Monitoring plans for ten species of amphibians
Appendix C	Monitoring plans for ten species of arachnids
Appendix D	Monitoring plans for twenty-five species of birds
Appendix E	Monitoring plans for eleven species of crustaceans
Appendix F	Monitoring plans for twenty species of fish
Appendix G	Monitoring plans for thirty-one species of insects
Appendix H	Monitoring plans for thirty-five species of mammals
Appendix I	Monitoring plans for eighteen species of mollusks
Appendix J	Monitoring plans for one hundred and six species of plants
Appendix K	Monitoring plans for twelve species of reptiles
Appendix L	Candidate Species Monitoring Status Overview - Plants

SIGNIFICANT DEVIATIONS

Although this project initially proposed to implement monitoring of candidate species in Texas, TPWD and USFWS staff mutually determined that developing monitoring plans should be the first priority. Implementation will follow through Section 6 Project 72.

PREPARED BY: Mary E. Candee 10-30-96
Lee Ann Johnson Linam

APPROVED BY: 11-27-96

Neil (Nick) E. Carter Federal Aid Coordinator

Appendix A:

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
amphibians			
Eurycea reoterics TEXAS SALAMANDER	GI SI CI	MEDIUM	HIGH
Eurycea robusta BLANCO BLIND SALAMANDER	GI SI C1	LOW	LOW
Eurycea sp 1 JOLLYVILLE PLATEAU SALAMANDER	GI SI CI	HIGH	нісн
Eurycea sp 2 SALADO SPRINGS SALAMANDER	G1 S1 CI	нісн	MEDIUM
Buyyee≱sp 5 GEORGETOWN SALAMANDER	GISICI	нідн	нібн
Surycea sp 6 PEDERNALES RIVER SPRINGS SALAMANDER	GI SI CI		MEDIUM
Euryces sp 7 EDWARDS PLATEAU SPRING SALAMANDER	6163Q \$153 CI		MEDJUM
Eurycea tridentifera COMAL BLIND SALAMANDER	GISICI	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
Notogathalmus meridionalis BLACK-SPOTTED NEWT	GI SI CZ		MEDIUM
Siren intermedia pop 1 LESSER SIREN (RIO GRANDE POPULATIO	G?Q \$? C2		MEDIUM

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
ARACHNIDS	<u> </u>		
Archeolarca guadalupensis GUADALUPE CAVE PSEUDOSCORPION	GI SI C2	MEDIUM	LOW
Cicurina bandida BANDIT CAVE SPIDER	G1 51 C2	мерним	нісн
Cicarina baroni ROBBER BARON CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	нібн
Cicurina cueva A CAVE SPIDER	GI\$I€2	MEDIUM	нібн
Cicurine madia MADLA'S CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	** Status survey recently completed	HIGH
Cicurina verii VENIS CAVE SPIDER.	G1 \$1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	нјан
Cicurina vesper VESPER CAVE SPIDER	GI \$I C2	**Status survey recently completed	нісн
Cicurina wartoni WARTON'S CAVE SPIDER	GI SI CI	2	нісн
Neolegioneta microps GOVERNMENT CANYON CAVE SPIDER	G1 \$1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	HIGH
Texalia cokendolphesi ROBBER BARON CAVE HARVETMAN	GISIC2	**Status survey recently completed	нісн

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
BIRDS			<u> </u>
Accipiter gentilis NORTHERN GOSHAWK	63 SA C2		Low
Aimophila aestivalis BACHMAN'S SPARROW	G3 S3B C2		MEDIUM-HIGH
Aimophilia botterii texana TEXAS BOTTERI'S SPARROW	G4T4 S4B C2		MEDIUM
Ammodramus bairdii BAIRD'S SPARROW	G3 \$2 C2		MEDIUM
Ammodramus henslowii HENSLOW'S SPARROW	G4 S2N,SXB €2		меріим
Arremonops rufivirganus rufivirganus TEXAS (*SENNETT'S) OLIVE SPARROW	G5T3 S3B C2		Low
Athere cunicularis hypuges WESTERN BURROWING OWL	G4TU S3B C2		LOW
Buteo nitidus maximus NORTHERN GRAY HAWK	G3G4T3T4 S2B C2		MEDIUM-HIGH
Buteo regalis FERRUGINOUS HAWK	G4 S3B,54N C2		MEDIUM
Charadrius alexandrinus SNOWY PLOVER	G4 S4B C2		
Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus WESTERN SNOWY PLOVER	G4T3 S2B €2		MEDIUM-HIGH
Charadrius alexandrinus tenuirostris SOUTHEASTERN SNOWY PLOVER	G4T3 S2B C2	•	нібн
Charadrius montanus MOENTAIN PLOVER	G3 S2B Ci		нсы
Chlidonias niger BLACK TERN	G4 S4 C2		low
Dendroica cerulea CERULEAN WARBLER	G4 S3B C2		LOW-MEDIUM
Egretta rufescens REDDISH EGRET	G4 S48 C2		MEDJUM-HIGH
Geothlypis trichas insperata BROWNSVILLE COMMON YELLOWTHROAT	G5T2 SIB C2		HIGH
feterus escullatus escullatus MEXICAN HOODED ORIOLE	GSTU S4B C2		LOW-MEDIUM
leterus cubulitatus sennetti SENNETTS HOODED ORIGLE	GSTU SAB C2		LOW-MEDIUM
Interus graduacauda audubonii AUDUBON'S ORIOLE	G5 T 4 \$3B C2		LOW-MEDIUM
Lanius Indovicianus LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE	G4G5 S4S5B C2		MEDIUM-LOW

Lanius Indovicianus migrans MiGRANT LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE	G4G\$T3T4 S2 C2	MEDIUM-LOW
Lateralius jamaicensis BLACK RAIL	G4? S2B C2	MEDLUM
Parula pitiayumi nigtilora TROPICAŁ PARULA	GSTU SJB C2	ŧow .
Plegadis obihi WHITE-FACED IBIS	G5 S4B C2	MEDIUM

	· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·		
SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
CRUSTACEANS			<u> </u>
Gammarus hyalleloided DIMINUTIVE AMPHIPOD	G) S1 C2	нюн	нісн
Genterizrus pecos PECOS AMPHIPOD	GI SI C2	нібн	нісн
Palaemonetes antrorum TEXAS CAVE SHRIMP	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Stygobromus balconius BALCONES CAVE AMPHIPOD	G1 \$1 C2	LOW	нісн
Stygobromus bifurcatus BIFURCATED CAVE AMPHIFOD	G1 \$1 C2	Low	нісн
Stygobromus dejectus CASCADE CAVE AMPHIPOD	GI SI C2	LOW	нісн
Stygobromus flagellatus EZELL'S CAVE AMPHIPOD	GI SI C2	Lów	жен
Stygobromus hadenoecus DEVIL'S SINKHOLE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	LOW	нієн
Stygobromus long:pes LONG-LEGGED CAVE AMPHIPOD	GI SI CZ	Low	нісн
Stygobromus pecki PECK'S CAVE AMPHIPOD	GI SI PE	2	нісн
Stygebromus reddelli REDDELL'S CAVE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	row	нон

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
FISHES			
Campostoma omatum MEXICAN STONEROLLER	G3 S1 C2	HIGH	LOW
Cycleptus elongatus BLUE SUCKER	G3 S3 C2		tow
Cyprinella proserpins PROSPERPINE SHINER	G3 S2 C2	нісн	LOW
Cyprinosion eximius CONCHOS PUPFISH	G€\$1 C2	нісн	MEDIUM
Cyprinodon pecasensis PECOS PUPFISH	GI SI CI	·	нюн
Dionda diaboli DEVIL'S RIVER MINNOW	G2 SI CI	2	ніся
Etheostoma grahami RIO GRANDE DARTER	G3 S2 C2	нідн	LOW
Gambusia sendis BLOTCHED GAMBUSIA	G4 SX C2	нен	Low
Hybognathus placius PLAINS MINNOW	G5 \$4 C2		row
letalurus iupus HEADWATER CATFISH	G3 52 C2	RIGH	MEDIUM
Icialurus sp. ! CHIHUAMUA CATFISH	G1G2 \$182 C2	нісн	?
Macrhybopsis aestivalis tetranemus ARKANSAS RIVER SPECKLED CHUB	GSTS SS C2		LOW
Micropterus trebuli GUADALUPE BASS	G3 \$3 C2	MEDIUM	low
Notropis baccula SMALLEYE SHINER	G2 S2 C2	MEDIUM	нюн
Notropis chihuahua CHIHUAHUA SHINER	G3 \$2 C2	нюн	tow
Notcopis jemezanus RIO GRANDE SHINER	G3 S3 C2		LOW
Notropis oxythynchus SHARPNOSE SHINER	G3 \$3 C2	MEDJUM	нен
Polyodon spathula PADDLEFISH	G4 S3 C2		LOW
Satan eurystomus WIDEMOUTH BLINDCAT	GI SI CZ	нібн	MEDIUM
Troglogianis pattersoni TOOTHLESS BLINDCAT	GI SI C2	HIGH	MEDIUM

SCIENTEFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONTT PRIORITY
INSECTS			
Adhemarius blanchardorum BLANCHARDS' SPHINX MOTH	GI \$1 C2	MEDIUM	нюн
Anomala tibialis TIBIAL SCARAB BEETLE	GH SH C2	MEDIUM	ЮGИ
Agria balmoritea BALMORREA DAMSELFLY	G2G3 S2 C3		LOW
Aşaphomyia texanus TEXAS ASAPHOMYIAN TABANID FLY	GH SH €2	MEDIUM	HIGH .
Austrotinodes sp 1 TEXAS AUSTROTINGDES CADDISFLY	G2 S2 C2	LOW	LOW
Batrisodes venyivi HELOTES MOLD BEETLE	GI SI C2	**Status Survey recently completed	H)GH
Chimatra holzenthali ROLZENTHAL'S PHILOPOTAMID CADDISFLY	G1 S1 C2		LOW
Cicindela cazien CAZIER'S TIGER BEETLE	G1 S1 C2	HIGH	нісн
Cicindela chlorocephala smythi SMYTH'S TIGER BEETLE	GНТИ SH С2	HIGH	нісн
Cicindela nevadica olmosa LOS OLMOS TIGER BEETLE	G5T2 S1\$2 C2		iow
Cícindela nigrocoerulea subrrogaca SUBTOPICAL BLUE-BLACK TIGER BEETLE	GST2 SH C2	HIGH	LOW
Cicindela obsoleta neojuvenilis NEOTIVENILE TIGER BEETLE	GST1 SH C2	нідн	LOW
Cicindela politula barbarannae BARBARA ANN'S TIGER BEETLE	GST1 S1 C2	нтсн	LOW
Cicindela politula petrophila GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS TIGER BEETLE	G\$T2 51 C2	нідн	LOW
Deronectes neomexicana BONITA DIVING BEETLE	GI SI C2		LOW
Eximacris superbum SUPERB GRASSHOPPER	GH SH 2	MEDIUM	HIGH
Haideoporus texanus EDWARDS AQUIFER WATER BEETLE	GISIC2	tow	HIGH
Haliplus nitens DISJUNCT CRAWLING WATER BEETLE	GH SH C2	LOW	нісн
Heterelmis comalensis COMAL SPRINGS RIFFLE BEETLE	G) \$1 PE	2	MEDIUM
Limnebius texanus TEXAS MINUTE MOSS BEETLE	GH SH C2	MEDIUM	LOW
Lordithon niger 8LACK LORDITHON ROVE BEETLE	GH SH С2		нісн

G3Q SRF C2		H)GH ,
G? S? C2		LOW
G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	LOW
G2 S1 C2		нісн
GI S1 C2	""Status Survey recemly completed	HIGH
GU SH C2		LOW
G1G3 S1S3 C2	LOW	LOW
G2 52 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
G) \$1 PE	1	MEDIUM
Q1 SI C2	MEDIUM	нісн
	G? S? C2 G1 S1 C2 G2 S1 C2 G1 S1 C2 GU SH C2 G1G3 S1S3 C2 G2 S2 C2	G? S? C2 G1 S1 C2 MEDIUM G2 S1 C2 G1 S1 C2 "Status Survey recembly completed GU SH C2 G1G3 S1S3 C2 LOW G2 S2 C2 MEDIUM G1 S1 PE 1

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
MAMMALS		<u> </u>	
Biarina hylophaga plumbea ARANSAS SHORT-TAILED SHREW	GST1Q S1 C2	<u> </u>	MEDIUM
Choeronycteris mexicana LONG-TONGUED BAT	G3G4 S1 C2		MEDIUM
Conepaius leiconotus texensis GLLF GOAST HOG-NOSED SKUNK	G\$T4? S2 C1		MEDIUM-HIGH
Conepaus mesoleucus telmalestes BIG THICKET HOG NOSED SKUNK	G512 S1 C2	MEDIUM	LOW
Corynorhinus (=Plecotus) rafinesquii EASTERN BIG-EARED BAT	G4 \$3 C2		MEDIUM
Cynomys Iudocicianus arizonensis ARIZONA BLACK-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG	G513 53 C2		LOW
Dipodomys clator TEXAS KANGAROO RAT	G2 52 C2	row	нібн
Eudenna maculatum SPOTTED BAT	G4 S2 C2		MEDIUM-LOW
Eumops perotis californicus CALIFORNIA MASTIFF BAT	G5T? \$3 C2		MEDIUM
Geomys arenarius DESERT POCKET GOPHER	G3 S2 C2		MEDIUM
Geomys personatus manitimus MARITIME POCKET GOPHER	G432 S2 C2		MED)UM
Geomys petsonatus streckeri CARRIZO SPRINGS POCKET GOPHER	G4T1 S1 C2		мертим
Geomys texensis bakeri FRIO POCKET GOPHER	6312 S2 C2	MEDITM	MEDIUM
Myotis austroripacius SOUTHEASTERN MYOTIS	G4 83 C2		MEDIUM
Myotis ciliolabrum WESTERN SMALL-FOOTED MYOTIS	GS 83 C2		меони
Myoris evotis LONG-EARED MYOTIS	G5 SX C2		LOW
Myotis lucifugus occultus OCCULT OR ARIZONA LITTLE BROWN MYOTIS	GST3T4 SA C⊒	<u> </u>	LOW
Myoris ulysanodes FRINGED MYOTIS	G5 S3 C2		LOW
Myotis velifer CAVE MYOTIS	G5 \$4 C2		LOW
Myodis volans LONG-LEGGED MYOTIS	G5 \$4 C2		Low
Myotis yumanensis YUMA MYOTIS	G5 \$4 C2		tow

Ondava zibethicus ripensis PECOS RIVER MUSKRAT	GST? S2S3 C2	MEDIUM	LOW
Oryzomys couesi aquaticus COUES' RICE RAT	G5T3? S2 C2		LOW
Peromyseus truei comanche PALO BURO MOUSE	GST2 S2 C2	TOM	MEDIUM-RIGH
Scalopus aquaticus texanus PRESIDIO MOLE	G5TIQ S1 €2	мерним	LOW
Sigmodon ochrograthus YELLOW-NOSED COTTON RAT	G5 \$3 C2		ilow
Spilogale putorius interrupta PLAINS SPOTTED SKUNK	G5T5 S3 C2		MEDIUM
Sylvilagus floridanus robustus DAVIS MOUNTAINS COTTONTAIL	G5T3 S3 C2	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
Tamias canipes GRAY-FOOTED CHIPMUNK	G3 \$2\$3 C2	Low	MEDIUM
Thomomys bottae guadalupensis GUADALUPE SOUTHERN POCKET GOPHER	GST2 SZ C2		MEDIUM
Thomomys bottae limpiae LIMPIA SOUTHERN POCKET GOPHER	G5T2 S2 C2	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
Thomomys bottae texensis Limpia Creek Pocket Gopher	G5T2 S2 C2	MED)CM	MEDIUM
Vulpes velox SWIFT FOX	G5 \$4 CI		RIGH
Vulpes velox macrotis KiT FOX	G5T5 S4 C1		MEDIUM
Vulpes velox velox SWIFT FOX	G5T4T5 \$37 C1		нісн
 -			

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
MOLLUSKS		<u> </u>	
Ashmunelia pasonis FRANKLIN MOUNTAIN WOOD SNAIL	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	HIGH
Assiminea pecos PECOS ASSIMINEA SNAIL	G2 S1 C1		MEDIUM
Cochliopa texana PHANTOM CAVE SNAIL	G1 S1 C2	HIGH	нісн
Disconsias satinsensis SALINA MUCKET	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн .
Euchemorema cheatumi PALMETTO PILL SNAIL	GISIC2	<u>.</u>	нібн
Fonteticella davisi DAVIS SPRING SNAM	G1 \$1 C2	MEDIUM	нібн
Fontelicella mettalfi METCALF SPRING SNATE	G1 S1 C2	нісн	нісн
Phreatodrobia imitata MIMIC CAVE SNAIL	GI S1 C2	MEDIUM	HIGH
Polygyta hippocrepis HORSESHOE LIPTOOTH	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Popenaias popei TEXAS HORNSHELL	G2 S2 C2		нібн
Potamilus amphichaenus TEXAS HEELSPLITTER	GISIC2	HIGH	нเGн
Quincuncina mitchelli FALSE SPIKE MUSSEL	G2 §2 C2	MEDIUM	HIGH .
Sonorella metcalfi FRANKLIN MOUNTAIN TALUS SNAIL	GI SI C2	MEDIUM	HIGH
Truncilla cognata MEXICAN FAWNSFOOT MUSSEL	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	HIGH
Tryonia adamantina DIAMOND Y SPRING SNAIL	G) SI C!	2	нсы
Tryonia brunci BRUNE SPRING SNAIL	GI \$1 C2	HIGH	нісн
Tryonia cheatumi PHANTOM LAKE TRYONIA	GI SI C2	нісн	HIGH
Tryonia stocktonensis GONZALES SPRING SNAIL	GI SI CI	2	нідн

List of Candidate Species with Monitoring Plans

PLANS	SCHENTIFIC NAME:	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI		COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE
x	PLANTS Acleisanthes crassifolia TEXAS TRUMPETS	G282 C2	8	MEDIÚM	Kinney, Maverick, Val Verde; Coahuila, Mex
	Agalinis auriculata AURICULATE FALSE FOXGLOVE	G2SX C2	2	Other Region	Tarrant (X-presumed extirpated); AL, AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, MD, MI, MN, MO, MS, NJ, OH, OK, PA, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV
X	Agave glomeruliflora CHISOS AGAVE	G2Q \$2 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth; Coahuila, Mex
	Agrimonia incisa INCISED GROOVEBUR	G3S1 C2	na	LOW	Angelina, Jasper: Sabine; AL, FL, GA, MS, NC, SC
X	Amsonia tharpii THARP'S BLUE-STAR	G1S1 C2	н	нісн	Pecos, NM
	Andrachne arida TRANS-PECOS MAIDENBUSH	G1S1 C2	}1	LOW Need to relocate	Presidio, Brewster, Chihuahua and Coahuila, Mexico
X	Anemone edwardsiana var. petraca EDGE FALLS ANEMONE	G3T1 SI C2	12	MEDIUM	Bandera, Kendall
х	Aquitegia chrysantha var hinckleyana HINCKLEY'S COLUMBINE	G4T1S1 C2	6	HIGH	Presidio
х	Aquilegia longissima LONG SPUR COLUMBINE	G3S2 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Jeff, Davis, Presidio, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Mexico
х	Arenaria livermorensis LIVERMORE SANDWORT	G1\$1 C2	5	MEDIUM	Jeff Davis
Х	Argythannia aphoroides HILL COUNTRY WILD MERCURY	G2S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Blanco, Comal, Gillespie, Hays (H), Kendall (H), Kerr, Menard, Mills (H), Tom Green, Uvalde
X	Asolepias prostrata PROSTRATE MILKWEED	GIS1 C2	8	LOW	Starr, Zapata; Tamaulipas Mexico
	Aster laevis var guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS ASTER	G5T2Q81 C2	9	LOW	Culberson City; NM
х	Aster puniceus ssp elliottii var scabricaulis ROUGH-STEM ASTER	G5TISI CI	3	MEDIUM	Anderson, Cherokee, Smith, Van Zandt, Wood
x	Astragalus mollissimus var marcidus WITHERED WOOLLY LOCO	G5T2S2 C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Dallam, Jeff Davis (H), Presidio
х	Batesimalva violacea PURPLE GAY-MALLOW	G2 S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	Brewster, Coabuila and Nuevo Leon, Mexico
x	Boerhavia mathisiana MATHIS SPIDERLING	G2 S1 C2	5	HIGH	Live Oak, San Patricio, San Luis Potosi and Tamaulipas, Mexico
X	Bonamia ovalifolia BIGPOD BONAMIA	G1\$1 C2	8	HIGH	Brewster County, Coahuila, Mexico
X	Brickeltia brachyphylla var hinckleyi HINCKLEY'S BRICKELLBUSH	G5T2 S2 C2	Ü	LOW	Brewster (H) and Jeff Davis

X	Brickellia brachyphylla var terlinguensis TERLINGUA BRICKELLBUSH	G5TH SH C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brewster (H) Hudspeth (H)
x	Brickellia viejensis SIERRA VIEJA BRICKELLBUSH	G1G2 S1S2 C2	11	LOW	Presidio
х	Brongniartia minutifolia LITTLE-LEAF BRONGNIARTIA	G2 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster County, Chihuahua, Mexico
x	Caesalpinia brachycarpa BROADPOD RUSHPEA	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Crockett (H), Edwards (H), Kinney, Llano (H), Sutton
	Carex hyalina TISSUB SEDGB	G5Q S4 C2	8	LOW faxonomy?'s	Bowie, Brazoria, Cass, Dallas (H), Denton, Houston, Lamar, Liberty, Madison, Morris, Polk, Red River, and Walker, AR, MS and OK
X	Castilleja ciliata FRINGED PAINTBRUSH	G1Q S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Jeff Davis
х	Castilleja elongata TALL PAINTBRUSH	G1Q S1 C2	5	HIGH	Brewster
	Cereus greggii var greggii DESERT NIGHT-BLOOMING CEREUS	G3T2S2 C2	9	Need to relocate	Brewster, El Paso, Hudspeth (H), Jeff Davis, Pecos (H), Presidio, Terrell (H); AZ, NM; Chihuahua, Coahuila, Durango, Zacatecas, Mexico
X	Chaetopappa hersheyi MAT LEASTDAISY	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW	Culberson, Hudspeth; NM
Х	Chamaesyce chaetocalyx var triligulata THREE-TONGUE SPURGE	G5T) \$1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Randall (?); Coahuila Mexico
х	Chamaesyce golondrina SWALLOW SPURGE	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brewster, Hudspeth, Presidio Counties; Chihushua and Coahuila, Mexico
	Chenopodium cycloides SANDHILL GOOSEFOOT	G4 S3 C2		LOW	Andrews, Crane, Culberson, El Paso, Jeff Davis, Jones, Kent, Loving, Ward, Winkler, CO, KS, and NM
х	Chloris texensis TEXAS WINDMILL-GRASS	G2 S2 C2	8	HIGH	Brazoria, Brazos (H) Chambers, Galveston, Harris, Hidalgo (?), Nueces, and Refugio
X	Chrysothamnus nauseosus ssp texensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS RABBITERUSH	G5T2 S1 C2	12	MEDĮUM	Culberson County; NM
	Cleome multicaulis MANYSTEM SPIDERFLOWER	G3 S1 C2	na	Need to relocate	Presidio County; AZ, CO, NM, WY; Chihuahua, Durango, Jalisco, Michoacan, Mexico
X	Colubrina stricta COMAL SNAKEWOOD	G2 S1 C2	11	HIGH	Comal (?), El Paso, Uvalde; Coahuila and Nuevo Leon Mexico
х	Condalia hookeri var edwardsiana EDWARDS PLATEAU CAPUL NEGRO	G5T1Q C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Edwards

x	Ci- i-4 ii-			Fow	Andrew Con Charles
	Coreopsis intermedia GOLDEN WAVE TICKSEED	G3S3 C2	na	LOW Need to relocate	Anderson, Cass, Cherokee, Franklin, Freestone, Harris, Harrison, Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches (?), Trinity, Upshur, Wood (H); LA
Х	Coryphantha albicolumnaria WHITE COLUMN	G2 S2 C2	2	LOW	Brewster, Pecos, Presidio; Chihuahua, Mexico
х	Coryphantha chaffeyi CHAFFEY'S CORY CACTUS	G2 \$1 C2	13	MEDIUM	Brewster, Coabuila, San Luis Potosi, Zacatecas Mexico
Х	Coryphantha dasyacantha var dasyacantha DENSE CORY CACTUS	G3T3 S2 C2	12	MEDIUM	Brewster, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, Pecos; NM(?); Chihuahua, Mexico
X	Coryphantha duncanii DUNCAN'S CORY CACTUS	G3 S1 C2	U	MEDIUM	Brewster, Presidio; NM
X	Coryphantha hesteri HESTER'S CORY CACTUS	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIÚM	Brewster, Pecos, Terrell
	Coryphantha sulcata var nickelsiae NICKEL'S CORY CACTUS	G4T2 SH C2	12	Need to relocate	Webb (H); Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, Mexico
x	Crataegus warneri WARNER'S HAWTHORN	G2Q S2 C2	11	MEDIUM Need to relocate	Anderson, Cherokee, Freestone, Franklin, Houston, Mortis, Panola, Smith (H), Upshur, Walker, Wood
x	Croton alabamensis var texensis TEXABAMA CROTON	G3T1S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	Bell, Coryell, Travis
	Cuscuta attenuata MARSHELDER DODDER	G2 S2 C2	5	LOW	Cameron (H) Jackson (H) Liberty (H) Rains and Van Zandt; KS, OK
	Cyperus cephalanthus GIANT SHARPSTEM UMBRELLA SEDGE	G2Q SH X2	na	Need to relocate	Texas (H; county unknown); LA
x	Cyperus grayioides MOHLENBROCK'S UMBRELLA SEDGE	G3G4 S3 C2	на	LOW	Anderson, Angelina, Burleson, Colorado, Franklin, Freestone, Hardin, Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches, Newton, Robertson, Rusk, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Tyler, Upshur, Van Zandt, Wood; AR, IL, LA, MO
х	Cyperus onerosus DUNE UMBRELLA SEDGE	G2 S2 C2	5	нісн	Andrews, Ward, Winkler
x	Cypripedium kentuckiense SOUTHERN LADY'S-SLIPPER	63 \$1 C2	ŋa	HIGH	Cass (?) Harrison, Nacogdoches, Newton (X), Sabine, and San Augustine, AL, AR, KY, LA, MS, OK, TN
х	Dalea bartonii COX'S DALEA	GI \$1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster
X	Dalea reverchonii COMANCHE PEAK PRAIRIE- CLOVER	G2 S2 C2	L1	MEDIUM	Hood (X), Parker, Wise
х	Dalea sabinalis SABINAL PRAIRIE-CLOVER	G1 S1 C2	8	LOW Need to relocate	Bandera (H), Uvalde (H), and Val Verde

	Hedyotis butterwickiae MARY'S BLUET	G1 \$1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster
X	Heilanthus paradoxus PUZZLE SUNFLOWER	G181 C1	2	НІСН	Pecos, Reeves; NM
X	Helianthus praecox ssp hirtus DIMMIT SUNFLOWER	G5T1QS1 C2		нісн	Dimmit and Zapata (M)
X	Hexalectris nitida GLASS MOUNTAIN CORAL- ROOT	G3 S3 C2	11	LOW	Bandera, Brewster, Comal, Coryell, Dallas, Hays, Kendall, Pecos (H), Taylor, Travis; NM Coahuila, Mexico
	Hexalectris revoluta CHISOS CORAL-ROOT	G1 S1 C2	1)	LOW	Brewster, Culberson; Nuevo Leon, San Luis Potosi, Mexico
x	Hexalectris warnockii WARNOCK'S CORAL-ROOT	G2 S2 C2	?	LOW	Brewster, Dallas, Gillespie, Hays, Jeff Davis (H), Taylor, Terrell; AZ, NM
x	Hibiscus dasycalyx NECHES RIVER ROSE-MALLOW	G1 S1 C2	2	HIGH	Cherokee, Harrison, Houston, Trinity
X	Isoetes lithophila ROCK QUILLWORT	G2 82 C2	8	MEDIUM	Burnet, Llano, Mason
X	Justicia runyonii RUNYON'S WATER-WILLOW	G282 C2	8	LOW	Brazoría (?), Cameron, Goliad (?), Hidalgo; Tamaulipas, Mexico
X	Justicia wrightii WRIGHT'S WATER-WILLOW	G2 S2 C2	8	Need to relocate	Brewster (H) Pecos, Val Verde; NM (?)
Х	Kallstroemia perennans PERENNIAL CALTROP	G1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Presidio, Val Verde
X	Lachnocaulon digynum TINY BOG BUTTONS	G3 S1 C2	па	MEDIUM	Jasper, Newton; AL, FL, LA, MS
X	Leavenworthia texana TEXAS GOLDEN GLADE CRESS	G1 S1 C2	2	HIGH	Nacogdoches (I), Sabine, San Augustine
	Lechea mensalis CHISOS PINWEED	G1Q S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Coahuila, Mexico
	Leitneria floridana CORKWOOD	G3G4 S1 C2		LOW	Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Jefferson; AL, AR, FL, GA, LA, MO
X	Lepidospartum burgessii GYPSUM SCALEBROOM	G2 S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	Hudspeth; NM
X	Lesquerella thamnophila ZAPATA BLADDERPOD	G1 S1 C2	2	нсн	Starr, Zapata
х	Liatris tenuis SLENDER GAY-FEATHER	G2G3 S2S3 C2	8	MEDIUM	Angelina, Hardin, Jasper, Newton, Orange, Sabine, San Augustine, Tyler, LA (7)
Х	Lycium texanum TEXAS WOLF-BERRY	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth
X	Machaetanthera aurea HOUSTON MACHAERANTHERA	G2 S2 C2	2	HIGH	Galveston, Harris
Х	Manfreda longiflora ST. JOSEPH'S STAFF	G2 S2 C2	5	MEDIUM	Cameron (H), Hidalgo, Starr, Tamaulipas, Mexico

į

	Desmodium lindheimeri LINDHEIMER'S TICKSEED	G4 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Comal (?); Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, San Luis Potosi, Tamaulipas Mexico
Х	Draba standleyi STANDLEY'S DRABA	G3 \$1 C2	?	MEDIUM -	Jeff Davis; AZ, NM; Coahuila, Mexico
X	Echeandia (Anthericum) chandleri LILA DE LOS LLANOS	G3Se C2	8	MËDIUM - LOW	Cameron, Kleberg, Nueces; Coahuila, Mexico (7)
	Echinocereus chloranthus var neocapillus GOLDEN-SPINE HEDGEHOG CACTUS	G4T1 S1 C2	9	No Access	Brewster, Presidio
х	Echinocereus papillosus var angusticeps SMALL PAPILLOSUS	G3T1 C2	3	HIGH Need to relocate	Hidalgo (Н), Jim Hogg (?), Starr
	Eleocharis brachycarpa SHORT-FRUITED SPIKESEDGE	Gi SH C2		Need to relocate	South coastal Texas (H); (county unknown); Tamaulipas, Mexico
x	Eleocharis cylindrica CYLINDER SPIKESEDGE	G1 S1 C2	2	LOW Need to relocate	Lubbock (H), Presidio
	Eleocharis wolfii WOLFS SPIKESEDGE	G4G5 S1 C2		row	Jefferson; AL, CO, IA, IL, IN, KS, LA, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, OK, TN, WI; Alberta and Saskatchewan, Canada
X	Erigeron mimegletes SONORA FLEABANE	G2 S2 C2	8	MBDIUM	Brewster (H), Crockett (H) Edwards (H), Kerr, Real, Schleicher, Sutton, Uvalde, Val Verde (H); Coahuila, Mexico
X	Eriocaulon koemickianum SMALL-HEADED PIPEWORT	G2G3 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM - HIGH	Anderson, Brazos, Limestone, Leon (?), Tyler (H); AR, GA, OK
X	Eriogonum suffruticosum BUSHY WILD BUCKWHEAT	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Pecos, Presidio
х	Bscobaria guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS PINCUSHION CACTUS	G1 St C2	!1	MEDIUM	Culberson; NM
X	Festuca ligulata GUADALUPE FESCUE	G1 S1 C1	8	нісн	Brewster, Culberson; Coahuila, Mexico
	Forsellesia texensis TEXAS GREASE BUSH	G1 81 C2	11	Need to relocate	Uvalde and Val Verde (H)
X	Fryxellia pygmaca SMALL FRYXELL WORT	G1 SH C2	10	Need to relocate	west Texas (H; county unknown);Coahuila, Mexico
X	Gaillardia aestivalis var winkleri WHITE FIREWHEEL	G5T1 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM Need to relocate	Hardin
	Galium corellii CLIFF BEDSTRAW	G2 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Val Verde, Coahuila, Mexico
X	Genistidium dumosum BRUSH-PEA	G1 S1C2	10	MEDIUM - HIGH	Brewster, Coahuila, Mexico
	Hedeoma pilosum OLD BLUE PENNYROYAL	GH SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster (H)

х	Matelea radiata	П	11	LOW	Brooks (H), Hidalgo (H), Starr (7)
	FALFURRIAS ANGLEPOD	G1S1 C2	,,,	Need to	15100K3 (11), 11022(go (13), 0224 (1)
	(MELKVINE)			relocate	
X	Matelea texensis TEXAS MILKVINE	G1 S1 C2	8	HIGH	Brewster
X	Mirabilis collina SANDHILL FOUR-O'CLOCK	G2Q82 C2	11	3B	Anderson. Austin (?), Cherokee (H), Lamar(?). Morris(?), Red River (?), San Augustine(?), Smith, Waller (?), Wood
х	Nolina arenicola SAND SACAHUISTA	G2Q S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Culberson, El Paso (?) and Hudspeth
	Oenothera pilosella ssp sessilis GRAND PRAIRIE EVENING PRIMROSE	G5T2 SH C2	na	Need to relocate	Galveston (H); AR, LA
X	Opuntia arenaria SAND PRICKLY-PEAR	G2 S2 C2	2	HIGH	El Paso, Hudspeth (H); NM; Chihuahua, Mexico
X	Opuntia aureispina GOLDEN-SPINE PRICKLY-PEAR	G1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster
х	Opuntia engelmannii var flexospina PEW-SPINE ENGELMANN'S PRICKLY-PEAR	G5T1 \$1 C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Starr, Webb (H), Zapata
x	Opuntia imbricata var argentea SILVER CHOLLA	G5T1 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM	Brewster
	Osmorhiza mexicana ssp bipatriata LIVERMORE SWEET-CICELY	G4T1 S1 C2	12	Need to	Jeff Davis; Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Mexico
x	Ostrya chisosensis BIG BEND HOP-HORNBEAM	G2S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster; northern Mexico
X	Oxypolis temata THREELEAF COWBANE	G37 S1 C2		MEDIUM	Hardin, Tyler (?); FL, GA, MS, NC, SC
X	Paronychia congesta BUSHY WHITLOW-WORT	G1 S1 C2	11	HIGH	Jim Hogg
	Paronychia maccartii MCCART'S WHITLOW-WORT	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Webb
X	Paronychia wilkinsonii WILKINSON'S WHITLOW- WORT	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Mexico
	Pediocactus papyracanthus PAPER-SPINED CACTUS	G2G3S1 C2	8	Need to relocate	Hudspeth; AZ, NM
x	Pediomelum humile RYDBERG'S SCURFPEA	G2 S1 C2	11	HIGH	Val Verde; Coahuila, Mexico
	Pediomelum pentaphyllum THREE-NERVE SCURFPEA	GISH C2	5	Need to relocate	Presidio (H); NM (H); Chibuahua, Mexico
х	Penstemon alamosensis ALAMO BEARD TONGUE	G2 S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	El Paso; NM
	Perityle bisetosa var bisetosa TWO-BRISTLE ROCK-DAISY	G2T1 81 C2	12	Need to relocate	Brewster, Pecos
	Perityle bisetosa var scalaris STAIRSTEP TWO-BRISTLE ROCK-DAISY	G2T1 S1 C2	12	LOW	Brewster

:

X	Perityle huecoensis HUECO ROCK-DAISY	G181 C2	5	HIGH	El Paso
	Perityle vitreomentana GLASS MOUNTAINS ROCK- DAISY	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster
	Perityle warnockii WARNOCK's RIVER ROCK- DAISY	G1S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Val Verde
	Phacelia pallida PALE PHACELIA	G2S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Chihuahua, Coahuila Mexico
X	Philadelphus emestii CANYON MOCK-ORANGE	G282 C2	8	MEDIUM	Blanco, Comal, Hays, Kendall, Travis
	Phyllanthus ericoides HEATHER LEAF-FLOWER	G2 S1 C2	11	row	Brewster, Terrell; Coahuila, Mexico
	Physostegia correllii CORRELL'S FALSE DRAGON- HEAD	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Bexar (H) Galveston, Montgomery (H), Travis, Val Verde, Zapata; LA; Coahuila, Durango, Nuevo Leon, and Sonora, Mexico
	Physostegia longisepala LONG-SEPALED FALSE DRAGON-HEAD	G2G3 S2 C2	na 	row	Hardin, Jasper, Newton, Orange, Tyler; LA
	Poa strictiramea DESERT MOUNTAINS BLUE GRASS	G3 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster; Chihuahua, Coahuila Durango, Nuevo Leon, Zacatecas, Mexico
х	Polemonium pauciflorum ssp hinckleyi HINCKLEY'S JACOB'S LADDER	G3 T1Q C2	Į2	нісн	Jeff Davis; AZ; Chihuahua Mexico
	Polygala maravillasensis MARAVILLAS MILKWORT	G2S1 C2	11	row	Brewster, Terrell, Coahuila, Mexico
X	Prenanthes barbata BARBED RATTLESNAKE-ROOT	G3S2 C2	na	LOW	Cass, Cherokee, Hardin, Jasper, Nacogdoches, Newton, Polk, Rusk, San Augustine, Shelby, AL, AR, GA, KY, LA, TN
	Proboscidea spicata MANY-FLOWERED UNICORN- PLANT	G1 S1 C2	1)	Need to relocate	Brewster, Jeff Davis, Presidio; Coahuila, Mexico
х	Psilactis heterocarpa WELDER MACHAERANTHERA	G2 \$2 C2		MEDIUM - LOW	Nueces, Kleberg, Refugio, San Patricio, and Victoria
	Quereus boyntonii BOYNTON'S OAK	GHQ SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Angelina (H), AL (H)
	Quercus graciliformis CHISOS OAK	G1 S1 C2	11	row	Brewster
	Quercus tardifolia LATELEAF OAK	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster
х	Rudbeckia scabrifolia BOG CONEFLOWER	G282 C2	2	MEDIUM - HIGH	Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine, Shelby, LA
х	Salvia penstemonoides BIG RED SAGE	G]G2 S1S2 C2	2	HIGH	Bandera, Bexar (H), Gillespie (H), Guadalupe (H), Kendall, Kerr, Real, Travis (I), Wilson (H)

	Scirpus hallií HALL'S BULRUSH	G2Q87 C2	па	Need to relocate	Texas (county unknown); AL, GA, IA, IL, IN, KY, MA, MI, MO, NE, SC, WI
	Scutellaria laevis SMOOTH STEM SKULLCAP	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Culberson, Hudspeth
	Scutellaria thieretii THIERET'S SKULLCAP	G2Q S1 C2	па	3B	Nueces; LA
	Sedum robertsianum ROBERTS' STONECROP	GIQ SI C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster
	Senna ripleyana RIPLEY'S SENNA	G2 SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Chihuahua Zacatecas, Mexico
	Sesuvium trianthemoides ROUGHSEED SEA-PURSLANE	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Kenedy
Х	Silene subciliata SCARLET CATCHFLY	G3 S3 C2	5	LOW	Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson (H), Liberty, Newton, Polk, Sabine, Shelby, Tyler; LA
Х	Streptanthus bracteatus BRACTED TWISTFLOWER	G2 S2 C2	2	нюн	Bandera, Caldwell (7), Comal, Medina, Real, Travis, Uvalde
X	Streptanthus cutleri CUTLER'S TWISTFLOWER	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster; Coahuila, Mexico
X	Streptanthus sparsiflorus SPARSELY-FLOWERED JEWELFLOWER	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIÚM	Culberson; NM
	Styrax youngiae YOUNG'S SNOWBELLS	G1 SH C2	1.1	Need to relocate	Jeff Davis (H); Coahuila and Nuevo Leon, Mexico
	Suaeda duripes HARDTOE SEEPWEED	GHQ SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Pecos (H) and/or Reeves (H)
	Symphoricarpos guadalupensis MCKITTRICK SNOWBERRY	G1 S1 C2	12	Need to relocate	Culberson
	Falinum rugospermum ROUGH-SEED FLAME FLOWER	G3G4 S1 C2	na	LOW	Anderson, Franklin, Houston, Limestone, Nacogdoches, Rusk, Smith, Upshur, and Wood; IA, IL, IN, KS, MN, NE, WI
X	Thalictrum arkansanum ARKANSAS MEADOW-RUE	G2Q 81 C2	U	HIGH	Bowie; Lamar, Red River, AR OK
х	Thalictrum texanum HOUSTON MEADOW-RÜE	G2Q S2 C2	8	HIGH	Brazos, Harris (H), Waller
х	Thelocactus bicolor var flavidispinus STRAW SPINE GLORY OF TEXAS	G4T2 82 C2	8	HIGH	Brewster Starr(?); Tamaulipas, Mexico
	Thelypodium tenue FRESNO CREEK THELYPODY	G1Q S1 C2	8	Need to relocate	Presidio
х	Tillandsia baileyi BAILEY'S BALLMOSS	G2 S2 C2	2	MEDIUM	Brocks (H), Cameron, Hidalgo, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Willacy; Tamaulipas, Mexico

х	Trillium pusilium var texanum TEXAS TRILLIUM	G3T2T3Q S2S3 C2	3	MEDIUM	Cass, Harrison, Houston (H), Nacogdoches, Panola (H), Rusk, Smith, and Wood (?), AR, LA
	Valerjanella texana EDWARDS PLATEAU CORNSALAD	G2 S2 C2	8	LOW	Burnet, Gillespie, Llano
х	Viola guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS VIOLET	Gł SI C2	5	MEDIUM	Culberson
X	Xyris drummondii DRUMMOND'S YELLOW-EYED GRASS	G3 S2 C2	na	LOW	Angelina, Jasper, Newton; AL, FL, GA, LA, MS
X	Xyris scabrifolia ROUGH-LEAF YELLOW-EYED GRASS	G2G3 S2 C2	ца	row	Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine; AL, FL, GA, LA, MS, NC
х	Zanthoxylum parvum SHINNERS' TICKLE-TONGUE	G1 St C2	IJ	HIGH	Brewster, Jeff Davis

.

,

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
REPTILES		<u>l</u>	
Cnemidophorus dixoni GRAY-CHECKERED WHIPTAU.	G3G4Q S3S4 C2		MEDIUM
Crotaphytus reticulatus RETICULATE COLLARED LIZARD	G3 S2 C2		MEDIUM-HIGH
Graptemys caglei CAGLES MAP TURTLE	G3 S2 C1	5	нюн
Kingsteren hittipes murtsyi CHIHUAHUAN MUD TURTLE	G3T3 S1 C2	нісн	HIGH .
Macroelemys temminekii ALLIGATOR SNAPPING TURTLE	G3G4 S3 C2		нісн
Majaciyemys terrapin tittoralis TEXAS DIAMONDBACK TERRAPIN	G\$13 S3 C2	жон	MEDIUM- HIGH
Nerodia clarkii GULF SALTMARSH SNAKE	G4Q 54 C2		нісн
Nerodia harreri harreri BRAZOS WATER SNAKE	G2T2 S2 C2	LOW	MEDIUM-LOW
Phrynosoma conutum TEXAS HORNED LIZARD	G5 S4 C2	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
Pituophis melanoleusus ruthveni LOUISIANA PINE SNAKE	G5T3 S2 C2		HJGH
Sceloporus arenicolus DUNES SAGEBRUSH LIZARD	G5T2 S2 C2		MEDIUM
Thamnophis sinalis annectens TEXAS GARTER SNAKE	G5T3 \$3 C2	мевіцім	Low

Appendix B:

MONITORING PLANS FOR TEN SPECIES OF

AMPHIBIANS

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USPWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
ANDHIBIANS	1		
Butycca neotenes TEXAS SALAMANDER	G1 S1 C1	MEDIUM	нісн
Eurycea robusta BLANCO BLIND SALAMANDER	Gi Si Ci	LOW	LOW
Eurycea sp 1 JOLLYVILLE PLATEAU SALAMANDER	Gi Si Ci	нісн	ні с н
Eurycea sp 2 SALADO SPRINGS SALAMANDER	G1 S1 C1	нісн	MEDIUM
Eurycea sp 5 GEORGETOWN SALAMANDER	G1 S1 C1	ніGH	нісн
Euryces sp 6 PEDERNALES RIVER SPRINGS SALAMANDER	G1 S1 C1		MEDIUM
Euryoea sp 7 EDWARDS PLATEAU SPRING SALAMANDER	G1G3Q 5183 C1		MEDIUM
Eurycca tridentifera COMAL BLIND SALAMANDER	G1 53 C1	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
Notophthalmus meridionalis BLACK-SPOTTED NEWT	G1 S1 C2		MEDIUM
Siren jatermedia pop 1 LESSER SIREN (RIO GRANDË POPULATION)	G?Q S? C2		MEDIUM

MONITORING PLAN FOR CANDIDATE SPECIES TEXAS

Scientific Name: Candidate Category: Eurycea neotenes C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas salamander

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

The Edwards Plateau - known from Bexar, and Kendall counties.

Known Occurrences:

Springs, spring-runs, and subterranean waters. Obligately aquatic, with a few transforming populations in the far western portion of the range.

Reasons for Concern:

Limited distribution in sensitive aquatic habitat. It is believed to have low survivorship of young, may be highly susceptible to fish predation,

the species does not occur in caves that support fish.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain monthly relative abundance measures through time-constraint

searches.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monthly

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Caves, springs and spring runs, sample a minimum of 10% of known

sites.

Methodology:

Time constraint searches, water quality measures, extensive field notes

Field Equipment Needed: small nets, boots, thermometer

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 1 - 2 Days/Month; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. Note that there may be a delayed reactions to the population due to various unknown influences that should also be taken into account when considering Red Flag conditions. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or

define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 'Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Dr. David Hillis, UT; Paul Chippindale, UTA

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the USFWS to monitor this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

MONITORING PLAN FOR CANDIDATE SPECIES TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Eurycea robusta

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Blanco blind salamander

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Range unknown. Habitat is unknown. Subterranean waters associated with the Austin Chalk, the species inhabits underground streams and

caves. Perhaps an abyssal species.

Known Occurrences:

Seen once in 1953. Known only from a fissure punched in the dry bed

of the Blanco River just north of the I-35 bridge crossing in Hays

County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

A narrow endemic with highly restricted range in sensitive aquatic habitat. Lowering of the water table, pollution? The current status is

unknown.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for relative abundance

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Blanco River: near type locality

Methodology:

Abundance and habitat quality. Check for effects of lowering water

table and pollution. Find more populations.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Dr. David Hillis, UT; Paul Chippindale, UTA

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the San Marcos River Foundation.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

MONITORING PLAN FOR CANDIDATE SPECIES TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Eurycea sp. 1

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Jollyville Plateau salamander

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Caves, springs and spring-runs associated with Bull, Cypress, and Long

Hollow Creeks, Travis and Walnut Creek and possibly Brushy Creek in

Williamson County, Texas

Known Occurrences:

Forty-six occurrences. Caves, springs and spring-runs associated with

Bull, Cypress, and Long Hollow Creeks, Travis County, Texas

Reasons for Concern:

The limited distribution of this species in sensitive aquatic habitat is the

primary reason for concern.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain monthly relative abundance measures through time-constraint

searches.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monthly

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Caves, springs and spring-runs associated with Bull, Cypress, and Long

Hollow Creeks, Travis County, Texas

Methodology:

Time-constrained searches of available habitat, note water quality and

habitat measurements

Field Equipment Needed: Boots, nets, thermometer

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days/Month; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. Note that there may be a delayed reactions to the population due to various unknown influences that should also be taken into account when considering Red Flag conditions. In the event of significant or

unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive

appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Mark Sanders Austin PARD; Dr. David Hillis, UT;

and Paul Chippindale, UTA

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan: Sur

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Eurycea sp. 2

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Salado Springs salamander

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

The Salado Springs system along Salado Creek, Bell County, Texas.

Known Occurrences:

One occurrence. This species is known from Salado Springs system along Salado Creek in surface springs and subterranean waters.

Reasons for Concern:

The limited distribution of this species in sensitive aquatic habitat is the

primary reason for concern.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain monthly relative abundance measures through time-constraint

searches.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monthly

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Salado Creek

Methodology:

Time-constrained sampling, water quality and habitat measures.

Field Equipment Needed: Boots, nets, thermometer

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 Day/Month; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. Note that there may be a delayed reactions to the population due to various unknown influences that should also be taken into account when considering Red Flag conditions. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

1990 minini

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Dr. David Hillis, UT; Paul Chippindale, UTA

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Eurycea sp. 5

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Georgetown salamander

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Ĺ

Surface springs and at least one cave in the San Gabriel River drainage

system in Williamson County, Texas. Also Berry Creek and Cowan

Creek.

Known Occurrences:

Eight occurrences. This species is known from the San Gabriel River

drainage system in Williamson County, Texas

Reasons for Concern:

The limited distribution of this species in sensitive aquatic habitat is the

primary reason for concern.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain monthly relative abundance measures through time-constraint

searches.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monthly

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

San Gabriel River drainage system in Williamson County, Texas

Methodology:

Time-constrained sampling, note water quality and habitat

measurements.

Field Equipment Needed: Boots, nets, thermometer.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days/Month; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. Note that there may be a delayed reactions to the population due to various unknown influences that should also be taken into account when considering Red Flag conditions. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bidg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Dr. David Hillis, UT; Paul Chippindale, UTA

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Eurycea sp. 6

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Pedernales River Springs salamander G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Gillespie and Travis Counties. The Pedernales River system

Known Occurrences:

Four occurrences. This species is known from Pedernales River Springs

system

Reasons for Concern:

The limited distribution of this species in sensitive aquatic habitat is the

primary reason for concern.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain monthly relative abundance measures through time-constraint

searches.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monthly

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pedernales River Springs: Hammet's Crossing Spring, Cottonwood

Spring: Trough Spring.

Methodology:

Time-constrained searches, note water quality and habitat

measurements

Field Equipment Needed: Boots, nets, thermometer

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days/Month; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. Note that there may be a delayed reactions to the population due to various unknown influences that should also be taken into account when considering Red Flag conditions. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design

or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Eurycea sp. 7

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Edwards Plateau Spring salamander

G/S Rank:

G1G3Q S1S3

Range:

The Edwards Plateau Spring system

Known Occurrences:

This species is known from Edwards Plateau Spring system.

Reasons for Concern:

The limited distribution of this species in sensitive aquatic habitat is the

primary reason for concern.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain monthly relative abundance measures through time-constraint

searches.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monthly

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Plateau Spring:

Methodology:

Time-constrained sampling, note water quality and habitat

measurements.

Field Equipment Needed: Boots, nets, water sampling equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days/Month; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. Note that there may be a delayed reactions to the population due to various unknown influences that should also be taken into account when considering Red Flag conditions. In the event of significant or

unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Dr. David Hillis; Paul Chippindale, UTA

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name: Eurycea tridentifera Candidate Category: C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name: Comal blind salamander G/S Rank: G1S1

Range: Endemic to the Cibolo Creek drainage system northwest of San

Antonio in Bexar, Comal, and Kendall counties.

Known Occurrences: Eight occurrences. Occurs in the Cibolo Creek drainage system, Bexar,

Comal, and Kendall counties, in slow to fast flowing subterranean waters. Southeast margin of Edwards Plateau of central Texas. Found in Honey Creek Cave and the nearby sinkhole caves on the flood plain of Cibolo Creek in Comal County and in Elm Springs Cave in Bexar County. The species is currently known from and restricted to the underground waters of limestone caves. The species occurs within the aphotic zones of shallow limestone caves with streams fed by phreatic

groundwater.

Reasons for Concern: The limited distribution of this species in sensitive aquatic habitat is the

primary reason for concern.

Monitoring Objective: Obtain monthly relative abundance measures through time-constraint

searches.

Priority: MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Monthly

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Cibolo Creek drainage system: Honey Creek Cave, Comal Co.

Methodology: Time-constrained searches. Note abundance, habitat quality,

demographic analysis, look at predation, diet, and water quality

requirements

Field Equipment Needed: Boots, nets, water quality monitoring equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days/Month; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. Note that there may be a delayed reactions to the population due to various unknown influences that should also be taken into account when considering Red Flag conditions. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Andy Price, TPWD; Andy Grubbs, Hays Consulting Services; Dr. David

Hillis, UT; Paul Chippindale, UTA.

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Notophthalmus meridionalis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

black-spotted newt

G/S Rank:

G1\$1

Range:

Found in the coastal plains of South Texas, beginning about halfway down the coast and extending south to the Mexican border (Garrett and Barker, 1987). The species is recorded from Hidalgo, Cameron, Kleberg, Duval, Willacv, Aransas, Kenedy, Nueces, Bexar, Victoria and San Patricio counties. Many

historic occurrences are no longer extant.

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-seven occurrences. Habitat is unknown for terrestrial adults. Aquatic forms require quiet water, temporary pools with vegetation or without predatory fish. Adults, juveniles, and larvae inhabit permanent and temporary ponds, roadside ditches, and quiet stream pools. Usually found among submerged vegetation (e.g. Chara). Found under rocks and other shelter when ponds dry up. Eggs probably laid on submerged vegetation. May be found in resacas & bodies of water with firm bottoms and little or no vegetation. The absence of predatory fish is probably important in the latter case. Best located in the early spring after rains.

Reasons for Concern:

The extensive habitat destruction and alteration in south Texas and northeast Mexico have had a severe impact on this species. The use of pesticides and herbicides throughout its range in Texas has probably had an adverse impact. Fresh water habitats of the kind used by the Black-spotted newt are very limited and threatened in south Texas.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain measure of relative abundance through surface samples noting

presence/absence.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Cameron County: Laguna Atascosa NWR

Methodology:

Surface samples, note presence/absence

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with staff from the TPWD and the USFWS to monitor this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Siren sp. 1

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

South Texas siren (large form)

G/S Rank:

G?O S?

Renge:

Taxonomic confusion makes clear delineation of this subspecies' range

difficult. South Texas counties clearly within the range include

Cameron, Hidalgo, Starr and Maverick. Dixon (1987) includes Dimmit.

Zavala, Duval, Jim Wells, and Refugio to Kenedy Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-nine occurrences. Permanent and semi-permanent bodies of water with relatively low salinity. Turbidity does not appear to be a limiting factor for the species and it can apparently occupy wetlands sympatrically with predatory fish if sufficient cover in the form of emergent vegetation is available. In the lower Rio Grande Valley, sirens prefer the headwaters of resacas over the lower reaches perhaps

because of changes in water quality in the lower reaches.

Reasons for Concern:

Wetland habitats of south Texas are largely being converted to other more profitable land uses. With the increase in agricultural activity in the Rio Grande Valley, increased pesticide use has followed. Return of

irrigation waters may negatively impact freshwater habitats by increasing salinity. Development along resaca margins may lead to loss of emergent vegetation and increased dredging. Decreased vegetation may lead to increased predation while dredging may deny the sirens a substrate for aestivation during dry periods. Loss of wetlands due to development is also a serious threat. Requirements of irrigation districts to reduce margin vegetation (to improve water distribution)

may decrease extent of suitable habitat.

Monitoring Objective:

If taxonomic entity deserves further evaluation, delimit sites where monitoring of populations is likely to provide substantial data and begin trapping. Suggested Method: Use minnow-traps and PIT tags to

determine demographic parameters.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, summer nights

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hidalgo County: Olmito Abandoned Hatchery (TPWD), Santa Ana NWR, LRGVNWR Villa Nueva Tract and Bentsen-Rio Grande State

Park. Check areas of virgin natural habitat where the species breeds.

Methodology:

Potential habitat needs to be inventoried using deep seines and/or passive baited or unbaited traps. When population(s) are located use minnow-traps and PIT tags to determine demographic parameters.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines, minnow-traps, PIT tags

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-5 Days;2 Staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Ho

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bidg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD;

Recommendations:

According to Andy Price there is possibly a new species in South Texas.

There needs to be a status survey to clarify the taxonomy and

distribution of all the species of sirens.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Appendix C:

MONITORING PLANS FOR TEN SPECIES OF

ARACHNIDS

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LEST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
ARACHNIDS			
Archeolarca guadalupensis GUADALUPE CAVE PSEUDOSCORPION	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	LOW
Cicurina bandida BANDIT CAVE SPEDER	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Cicurisa baroni ROBSER BARON CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	HIGH
Cicurina cueva A CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Cicurina madis MADLA'S CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	нісн
Cicurina venii VENI'S CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	нісн
Cicorina vesper VESPER CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	HIGH
Ckurina wartoni WARTON'S CAVE SPIDER	Gì Si Ci	2	HIGH
Neoleptonicta microps GOVERNMENT CANYON CAVE SPIDER	G1 S1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	нюн
Texcila cokendoipheri ROBBER BARON CAVE HARVETMAN	G1 S1 C2	**Status survey recently completed	нісн

Scientific Name:

Archeolarca guadalupensis

Candidate Category:

Listing Rank:

C2

Common Name:

Guadalupe Cave pseudoscorpion G/S Rank:

GIS1

Range:

Culberson County, Texas. This pseudoscorpion is an obligate cave-

dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from 7 specimens collected at the type locality of Lower Sloth Cave, Guadalupe Mountains National Park,

Culberson County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

This pseudoscorpion has a limited distribution and apparently is uncommon. The continued existence of this species and other cavedwelling species depends on the ecological stability of their cave environments. The main threat to this species is cave disturbance

and over-collecting by cave biologists.

Monitoring Objective:

Determine presence/absence of species, no collecting.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, to minimize impact to the species

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Lower Sloth Cave, Guadalupe Mountains

National Park

Methodology:

Site visit, noting presence/absences only no at-large collecting.

Field Equipment Needed: Caving equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3- 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality

15 June 1995 Revised Ontoler 1995

should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; James Reddell

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Guadalupe Mountains NP to monitor this

species. A status survey should be completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: No volunteers should be utilized in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Cicurina bandida

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Bandit Cave spider

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Travis, County. This spider is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This spider is known from one cave

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling

species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Determine presence/absence of species, no collecting. May want to

monitor for contaminants in the cave.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

. PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually for the species; Annually for contaminants, 4/year

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Travis County: Rollingwood, Bandit Cave

Methodology:

Note presence/absence only, no collecting

Field Equipment Needed: Caving equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. If contaminant monitoring is undertaken, a designated level of contamination should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicurina baroni

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Robber Baron Cave spider

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Bexar County, Texas. This spider is an obligate cave-dwelling

species.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Robber Baron Cave, Bexar County,

Texas

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling

species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline,

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years. Determine

presence/absence of species, no collecting

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Robber Baron Cave

Methodology:

Note presence/absence only, no collecting

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. If contaminant monitoring is undertaken, a designated level of contamination should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

ncouce to

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicurina cueva

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

a cave spider

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Travis County. This spider is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

Known from in one cave in Travis County.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline.

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years. Determine

presence/absence of species, no collecting. May want to monitor

the cave for contaminants.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, for species; Annually for contaminants, 4/year

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Travis County: Cave X

Methodology:

Note presence/absence only, not at-large collecting. Monitoring for

contaminants should be done annually on a quarterly basis.

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. If contaminant monitoring is undertaken, a designated level of contamination should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicurina madia

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Madla's Cave spider

G/S Rank:

G1\$1

Range:

Bexar County, Texas. This spider is an obligate cave-dwelling

species.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Madla's Cave, Bexar County, Texas

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling

species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline,

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years. Need access.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Madla's Cave

Methodology:

Note presence/absence, no at-large sampling

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 - 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

presence from one sampling period to the next may be

considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicurina venii

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Veni's Cave spider

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Bexar County, this spider is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This spider is known only from Braken Bat Cave, Bexar County.

Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling

species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline,

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years. Need access.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Braken Bat Cave

Methodology:

Note presence/absence only, no at-large collecting

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 - 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

presence from one sampling period to the next may be

considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicurina vespera

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Vesper Cave spider

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Bexar County, this spider is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This spider is known only from Government Canyon Bat Cave,

Bexar County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling

species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline.

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Government Canyon State Park, Government

Canyon Bat Cave

Methodology:

Note presence/absence only, no at-large sampling

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 - 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

15 Tem 1995 Berlind Catalon 1995

presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the site staff from TPWD to monitor this species. A

status survey should be completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: .

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicurina wartoni

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Warton's Cave spider

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Travis County, this spider is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This spider is known only from Pickle Pit, Travis County.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling species depends on the ecological stability of their cave environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road

construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline,

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years. Monitor cave

environment for any changes in vandalism or other human impacts.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Travis County: Pickle Pit

Methodology:

Note presence/absence only, no at-large collecting

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 - 2 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered

significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. If there is significant negative impact from human involvement notify the USFWS office immediately. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Neoleptoneta microps

Candidate Category:

Listing Rank:

C2

Common Name:

Government Canyon Cave spider G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Bexar County, this spider is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This spider is known only from Government Canyon Bat Cave,

Bexar County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling

species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline,

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Government Canyon State Park, Government

Canyon Bat Cave

Methodology:

Note Presence/absence only, no at-large sampling

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 - 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the site staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Texella cokendolpheri

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Robber Baron Cave harvestman G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Bexar County, this spider is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This spider is known only from Robber Baron Cave, Bexar County,

Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling

species depends on the ecological stability of their cave

environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and

cave vandalism also pose significant threats to the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline.

primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Robber Baron Cave

Methodology:

Note presence/absence, no at-large collecting, check other caves in

the area if possible.

Field Equipment Needed: Cave equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 - 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; James Cokendolpher

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. A status survey should be

completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize cave biologists to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Appendix D:

MONITORING PLANS FOR TWENTY-FIVE SPECIES OF

BIRDS

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
BIRDS	<u> </u>		
Accipitet gentilis NORTHERN GOSHAWK	G3 SA C2		LOW
Aimophila sestivalis BACHMAN'S SPARROW	G3 S3B C2		MEDIUM-HIGH
Aimophilis botterii texana TEXAS BOTTERI'S SPARROW	G4T4 S4B C2		MEDIUM
Ammodramus bairdin BAIRD'S SPARROW	G3 \$2 C2		MEDIUM
Ammodramus henslowii HENSLOW'S SPARROW	G4 \$2N,\$XB C2	•	медіцм
Amenionops ruftvirgarius auftvirgarius TEXAS (=SENNETTS) OLIVE SPARROW	G5T3 S3B C2	<u> </u>	LOW
Athene cunicularia hypugea WESTERN BURROWING OWE	G4TU \$3B C2		LOW
Byteo nitidus maximus NORTHERN GRAY HAWK	G3G4T3T4 \$2B C2		MEDIUM-HIGH
Buteo regalis FERRUGINOUS HAWX	G4 S3B.S4N C2		MEDIUM -
Charadrius alexandrinus SNOWY PLOVER	G4 S4B C2		<u> </u>
Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus WESTERN SNOWY PLOVER	G4T3 \$2B C2		MEDIUM-HIGH
Charadrius alexandrinus tehuitosatis SOUTHEASTERN SNOWY PLOVER	G4T3 \$2B C2	·	нісн
Charadrius montanus MOUNTAIN PLOVER	G3 S28 C1		нісн
Chlidonias niger BLACK TERN	G4'S4 C2		LOW
Dendrojca cerulea CERULEAN WARBLER	G4 \$3B C2		LOW-MEDIUM
Egretta rufescens REDDISH EGRET	G4 S4B C2	,	MEDIUM-HIGH
Geothlypis trichas insperata BROWNSVILLE COMMON YELLOWTHROAT	GST2 SIB C2		HIGH
leterus cuculiatus cuculiatus MEXICAN HOODED ORIOLE	GSTU S4B C2		LOW-MEDIUM
Icterus cucullatus sentieni SENNETT'S HOODED ORIOLE	G5TU \$4B C2		LOW-MEDIUM
Icierus graduncauda audubonii AUDUBON'S ORIOLE	G5T4 \$3B C2		LOW-MEDIUM
Lanius fudovicianus LOGGERHEAD SHRUKË	G4G3 \$4S5B C2		MEDIUM-LOW

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

Lanius Iudovicianus migrans MIGRANT LOGGERHEAD SHRIKE	G4G513T4 \$2 C2	MEDIUM-LOW
Lateralius jamaicansis BLACK RAİL	G4? S2B C2	меріим
Parula pitinyumi nigrifora TROPICAŁ PARULA	G5TU \$3B C2	FOM
Plegadis chihi WHITE-FACED IBIS	G5 S4B C2	MEDIUM

Scientific Name:

Accipiter gentilis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Northern goshawk

G/S Rank:

G3SA

Range:

Winter visitor to the Trans-Pecos and the Panhandle

Known Occurrences:

Rare winter visitor to the Trans-Pecos and the Panhandle, November to

March

Reasons for Concern:

It is probably adversely impacted by habitat reduction and destruction.

Monitoring Objective:

Review Audubon Christmas bird counts for presence of this species.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, November - March

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Trans-Pecos and Panhandle

Methodology:

A close review of Christmas bird counts need to be compiled for this species. If occurrences are noted, closer field investigations may be necessary. Also review Root, T. 1988. Atlas of wintering North American Birds: an analysis of

Christmas Bird Count data. University of Chicago Press. Chicago.

Field Equipment Needed:

Binoculars, spotting scope

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 week; 1 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management. The population may be responding to any changes in the prey base.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the USFWS.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the regions to assist in monitoring

this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Aimophila aestivalis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Bachman's sparrow

G/S Rank:

G3S3B

Range:

The species winters in eastern Texas and along the gulf-coast, and from southeastern North Carolina south to Florida along the Atlantic coast. It is a resident of Texas and breeds from mid-April to late July at sea level to 750 feet (Oberholser, 1974). It is common to rare and local in wooded eastern quarter of the state, west to Cooke County and south to Harris County. Recorded from Cooke, Jasper, Orange, Chambers, San Jacinto and Harris counties.

Residents who breed here probably migrate out.

Known Occurrences:

No recorded occurrences. The species inhabits dry open woods of pine or oak with a ground cover of grass or scrub palmetto. It prefers open, park-like stands of tall pines with grass, flowers and scattered oaks and a few bushes. Abandoned fields and open woodlands of oak or pine with an undergrowth of scrub palmetto are especially favorite haunts (Whetmore, 1959). Also breeds in regenerated pine plantations up to five years, although this is an ephemeral habitat.

Reasons for Concern:

This bird has a very limited Texas distribution. Although populations may be stable in Louisiana, Mississippi, and Arkansas, the species seems extirpated from Pennsylvania and Iliinois, and has declined severely in Tennessee. The remaining states in its distribution consider the species to be "endangered" or "rare". Three possible causes for decline are: interaction with other birds, brood parasitism, loss of breeding habitat, and competitive interactions with other species. In particular, urbanization, fire suppression, overgrazing, and commercial logging practices that promote dense woody vegetation at the expense of lush herbaceous ground cover appear to be causes for habitat loss for this species. Breeding Bird Surveys indicate 90% of recorded birds in only 3 states (FL, GA, LA); low population density. Extirpated as breeder in much of ne. U.S. (USFWS, 1987).

Monitoring Objective:

More accurate censuses, especially in red-cockaded woodpecker (RCW) stands. Relative abundance should be determined by playback. Habitat quality and incidence of nesting should be checked. Birds should also be monitored in winter to learn something about the winter ecology of the species.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Mid-April - July

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

East Texas, sites to be chosen

Methodology:

Select sites will be monitored for nesting activity, count nests and/or singing

males, may be able to coordinate with on-going research with the red-

cockaded woodpecker.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars, tape players, bird tapes, mist nets, bands

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 4 Weeks; 2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Will need a detailed study of the population dynamics of the species

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Aimophila botterii texana

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas Botteri's sparrow

G/S Rank:

G4T4S4B

Range:

Range in Texas includes the lower Gulf Coast. The species breeds in early April to mid-July from sea level to 40 feet and has been recorded in the past to be fairly common locally from Kenedy County to the mouth of the Rio Grande (Oberholser, 1974). It is only casually observed north to Corpus Christi (Oberholser, 1974) although breeding has been confirmed for San Patricio County. During the winter there are periodic sightings in Cameron County (Oberholser, 1974). This species is peripheral in the U.S., with a mainly Mexican distribution.

Known Occurrences:

Texas Botteri's Sparrow prefers coastal prairie habitats, savannahs and grasslands. This difficult to identify sparrow inhabits tall bunch grass within 20 miles of the Gulf of Mexico. Usually found in rank grass approximately one foot tall which grows between widely scattered mesquite and huisache brush. This sparrow favors salt-grass (Spartina) habitat with some yucca, prickly pear, acacia and mesquite (Terres, 1980).

Reasons for Concern:

The bird is extremely habitat specific. Its preferred habitat is subject to exploitation, destruction and alteration. Although much of it has been destroyed, there remains habitat of excellent quality on the southeastern most portion of the King Ranch (Oberholser, 1974). Almost nothing is known of its whereabouts in winter.

Monitoring Objective:

We need to find more populations. The birds are very hard to see and not easily identified when seen. A cryptic species, the male song is the best clue to identification.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, late April- May.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Laguna Atascosa NWR or King Ranch with permission.

Methodology:

Determine relative abundance through use of playback, census to be done when males are singing after spring rains. Also obtain habitat quality analysis.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars, tape players

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 1-2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations: Will need someone to positively identify this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Ammodramus bairdii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Baird's sparrow

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

In Texas this species has been encountered at scattered localities throughout the state. Nests in the northern Great Plains. Winters in northern Mexico.

Arizona, New Mexico, Texas.

Known Occurrences:

No recorded occurrences. Habitat includes grasslands, savanna areas, old

fields, moist areas with relatively lush ground cover.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has declined on its northern breeding grounds due to overgrazing

and conversion of prairie lands to farmlands and the use of pesticides.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor levels of pesticide use in occupied habitats. Compile Winter bird

counts to determine presence.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, spring

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Methodology:

Gather winter bird count information to determine presence. May follow-up

with site visits to determine extent of wintering population(s).

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1-2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Be sure not to confuse this species with the Savanna Sparrow

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Ammodramus henslowii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Henslow's sparrow

G/S Rank:

G4S2N, SXB

Range:

Piney woods and the gulf coast prairies and marshes. Henslow's sparrow is a winter resident of Texas -- in East Texas from the Red River to the Coast and west as far as the Hill Country and Rolling Plains, south to Nueces County in

non-breeding season.

Known Occurrences:

Breeding-lush, wet meadows; less numerous in marsh borders or dry fields. Wintering- favor moist, grassy spots under open pineywoods; also in broomsedge or other grasses, usually where moist. Perhaps more than most tall grass prairie species, this sparrow requires rank grasslands. Damp open meadows; grass stands and weedy places in humid open or semi-open country;

broomsedge fields and weedy patches.

Reasons for Concern:

Population decline, and ultimate extinction of the Texas race (taxonomy questionable), is consistent with the decline of the coastal prairie, a trend responsible for the demise of a number of species dependent on this ecosystem.

Monitoring Objective:

This species is reclusive. During the non-breeding season when the species is most likely to be found in Texas the species remains close to the ground and is reluctant to flush. The easily identified song is, of course, less frequently heard outside of the breeding season. Monitor the distribution and abundance of this species in relation to land use activities. Determine population trends by establishing known study sites and checking them on a regular basis.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

East Texas, sites to be selected

Methodology:

?? :

Field Equipment Needed:

Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758,

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

May be able to utilize Audubon volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Arremonops rufivirgatus rufivirgatus Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas Olive Sparrow

G/S Rank:

G5T3S3B

Range:

Texas and Mexico. The Olive Sparrow ranges from southern Sinaloa and southern Texas south on the coasts of Mexico to Chiapas and the Yucatan Peninsula. The species is also found on the Pacific slope of Costa Rica. The subspecies <u>rufivirgatus</u> is resident in southern Texas (Kinney, Atascosa, and Nueces counties) south to eastern Coahuila and central Tamaulipas. In Texas, it breeds early in March to late September from sea level to 948 feet. It has been reported from Trans Pecos, Uvalde, Atascosa counties, throughout much

of South Texas.

Known Occurrences:

Spends most of its time on or near the ground in dense thickets, thorn scrub, mesquite, riparian brush (Oberholser, 1974); prefers dense thickets in Rio Grande delta, and optimum habitat is a tangle of thorny shrubs, including mesquite, Texas ebony, anacua, huisache and retama (Oberholser, 1974). Further north it may be found in stream side growth of cane briars, willow, ash

and live oak.

Reasons for Concern:

There has been a decline in the numbers of this species since 1933 (Oberholser, 1974). Much of the 20 million acres constituting the sole U.S. range of this bird has been subject to brush removal (Oberholser, 1974). Almost 98% of the Rio Grande delta has been cleared of brush. Moreover, over browsing by goats and cattle render thickets unsuitable (Oberholser, 1974). The species is, however, capable of occupying a variety of brush habitats.

Monitoring Objective:

Determine relative abundance of this species, compile a general habitat analysis, and check for additional areas of suitable habitat. Although this species inhabits dense brush, it is typically not difficult to detect.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, March - June

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bentsen/Rio Grande SP, Falcon SP, Las Palomas WMA, Chaparral WMA,

Choke Canyon State Park, Laguna Atascosa NWR, Santa Ana NWR.

Methodology:

Determine relative abundance through use of playback tapes, compile a general

habitat analysis and check for additional areas of suitable habitat

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars, tape players,

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days/Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal

should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from Audubon to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Athene cunicularia hypugea

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Western burrowing owl

G/S Rank:

G4TUS3B

Range:

.Scattered throughout Texas except the Pineywoods. Prefers open, sparsely or

short vegetation.

Known Occurrences:

Brewster County. Rita Blanca National Grasslands.

Reasons for Concern:

Conversion of suitable habitat to agriculture fields, shooting

Monitoring Objective:

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Breeding season

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Rita Blanca National Grasslands, and Lake Meredith National Recreation Area.

prairie dog towns.

Methodology:

Identify sites and count active burrows, gather breeding bird survey and

Christmas Bird Count data.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service,

Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Kevin Mote and Craig Farquar, TPWD

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan;

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Buteo nitidus maximus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Northern gray hawk

G/S Rank:

G3G4T3T4 S2B

Range:

In Texas, the bird is a rare fall and winter visitor to Rio Grande delta, Bentson Rio Grande, Hidalgo County. It is a possible breeder here, as there are 3 records in Webb County. The bird is a casual wanderer to the central coast up to Corpus Christi. It is seen also in the Trans Pecos, Brewster and Jeff Davis counties. This species used to be more frequent and even nested in Texas in

the past, but now has become increasingly rare.

Known Occurrences:

In Texas, it prefers mature woodlands of river valleys and semi-arid mesquite and scrub grasslands in the southwestern portion of the state (Oberholser, 1974). Also to be found in cottonwood and willows from Webb to Cameron

counties in the Lower Rio Grande valley.

Reasons for Concern:

According to Glinski (1988) this species probably resided historically in greater numbers in the relatively pristine subtropical thornscrub environment of southern Texas. It was probably adversely impacted by habitat reduction and destruction. It is now very rarely seen in Texas. The future of the Gray Hawk in the American southwest may largely depend upon preserving the mature cottonwood woodlands along rivers which are rapidly disappearing. As of the mid-1980's, the U.S. nesting population was only about 50 pairs, making it one of the three rarest North American Hawks.

Monitoring Objective:

If found to be breeding in Webb County, monitor for breeding success. Review breeding bird surveys and Christmas bird counts for presence of this species. If possible, monitor pesticide contamination in potential prey and eggshells.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Winter

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be chosen dependent of location of species.

Methodology:

Webb County: Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Other sites will be monitored for presence. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this

species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3+? Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection,

provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Buteo regalis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Ferruginous hawk

G/S Rank:

G4S3B,S4N

Range:

Regularly winters on the Texas coastal barrier islands and grasslands of the Trans-Pecos. Formerly nested east to Wilbarger and Shackleford Counties, and likely nested (or may still nest) in the Trans-Pecos and Panhandle.

Known Occurrences:

Often nests where pinyon, juniper, and other tree species grade into more open

grassland,

Reasons for Concern:

Any reduction in availability of rodents and lagomorphs is likely to have an impact on this species. The species is also sensitive to human disturbance

during the nesting period.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor productivity of any Texas nesting attempts. Determine annual variability in abundance of nesting and wintering population. Monitor extent of shooting mortality in areas of greatest occurrence. Monitor populations of lagomorphs and prairie dogs within habitat to determine management needs.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Winter

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be determined once populations are located (Possibly Rita Blanca

National Grasslands)

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Wintering sites will be monitored for presence. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3+? Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant

October 1995 Revised 3/96

or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the different regions to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fail 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Charadrius alexandrinus nivosus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Western snowy plover

G/S Rank:

G4T3S2B

Range:

Breeding along the Texas coast was fairly common to uncommon from Galveston to the Rio Grande. Breeding, particularly along the upper coast, is thought to be much less common than previously suspected (T. Eubanks, personal communication). It is a rare and local breeder in and near the

panhandle. Both races winter primarily along the coast.

Known Occurrences:

Feeds on intertidal flats including mud, sand and algal flats. Also feeds on beaches. Roosts among beach wrack, among dunelets in washover passes, and among plants (Salicornia), ruts, and other microtopographic relief features on the bayside flats. May nest on beaches of Gulf or lakes, or on flats near

foraging areas or along streams.

Reasons for Concern:

Because most of our beaches are open to vehicular and pedestrian traffic, historic nesting areas of this species may be deleteriously impacted by disturbance, predation by unrestricted pets, or mortality from vehicular traffic. Loss of foraging habitat from development and channelization may also contribute to the decline of this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Once nesting distribution is determined, monitor sites to insure no loss of nesting habitat. Monitor wintering population in conjunction with other shorebird monitoring efforts.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Gaiveston Bay, San Luis Pass

Methodology:

Once breeding population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Wintering sites will be monitored for presence. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this

species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Craig Farquar, Lee Elliott, TPWD

Recommendations:

See Page, et al, 1995 Snowy Plover. Birds of North America, no. 154.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fali 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Charadrius alexandrinus tenuirostris Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Southeastern snowy plover

G/S Rank:

G4T3S2B

Range:

Known Occurrences:

Reasons for Concern:

Monitoring Objective:

Priority:

PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Methodology:

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Charadrius montanus

Candidate Category: C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Mountain Plover

G/S Rank:

G3S2B

Range:

Historically known to breed in Jeff Davis, Swisher, and Brewster Counties and probably nested in adjacent counties. One individual was sighted in Hartley Co. in June 1974, and a couple of breeding pairs are currently known from Jeff Davis Co.; known to winter along coastal and blackland prairies in plowed fields or disturbed, short-grass areas; probably migrate through Texas, utilizing

freshly plowed fields; also may breed, spend winter in Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Expansive tracts of arid, short-grass prairie.

Reasons for Concern:

Its number have decreased markedly due to range contraction and agricultural conversion of short grass prairie. Plains habitat being destroyed, with resulting decline in nesting habitat. Ecologically sensitive to farming on nesting habitat.

Monitoring Objective:

Annually document presence of Mountain Plovers and obtain population estimates using local Audubon members. On known wintering sites, attempt

to capture and band the flock to track long-term movements.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Winter

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be chosen

Methodology:

For breeding population(s), once located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Wintering sites will be monitored for presence. Attempt to complete a simulatneous count at all sites to estimate the wintering population. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this precise.

this species.

Field Equipment Needed:

Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3+? Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the different regions to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fali 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Chlidonias niger

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Black Term

G/S Rank:

G4S4

Range:

Common summer resident (but does not breed) along coast, where it is seen throughout much of the year. Transient in eastern half of state and infrequently observed further west. Breeds in the northern temperate areas of North

America (northern U. S. and Canada).

Known Occurrences:

Seen over coastal prairies and Guif waters, and around inland lakes, rivers and

streams.

Reasons for Concern:

Loss of nesting habitat in the upper mid-West has given cause for concern for the future well being of this species. Wetland loss and possibly exposure to agricultural chemicals are thought to be factors contributing to its decline.

Monitoring Objective:

Once wintering populations have been identified, monitoring protocols may be

needed to develop trend data.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located, monitor for presence during winter. Also

monitor winter food sources. A close review of winter bird counts need to be

compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 + Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize regional Audubon volunteers to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Dendroica cerulea

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Cerulean Warbler

G/S Rank:

G4S3B

Range:

Rare as a nesting species in NE Texas (records from Bowie, Dallas and Cooke

Counties). Uncommon as a migrant in east Texas and Texas coast.

Known Occurrences:

Nests in riverbank woodlands, bottomland hardwood forests, and swamps.

Reasons for Concern:

Destruction of bottomland hardwood forests coupled with a 4% decline in the

abundance of this species over the last 30 years.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor trends in annual productivity, and nest parasitism and nest predation rates. Monitor changes in the availability of bottomland hardwood forests, and

other wetland forest communities. Monitor use of coastal woodlands as

migration stop-over points by this species.

Priority:

LOW - MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Fall

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Northeast Texas, sites to be selected.

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success.

Note any nest parasitism and nest predation. Other breeding and wintering sites will be monitored for presence. A close review of breeding bird surveys and

winter bird counts need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed:

Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3+? Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection.

provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Egretta rufescens

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Reddish Egret

G/S Rank:

G4S4B

Range:

In Texas, the bird is resident along the coast (rare in winter on upper coast) including the Upper Texas Coast, the Coastal Bend and Lower Coast and slightly inland. Texas birds are somewhat migratory, and tend to move south

in the winter.

Known Occurrences:

The Reddish Egret inhabits shallow, open salt pans, mangrove swamps, coastal areas and tidal marshes. Sandy shoals, muddy banks, tidal flats, coastal marshes and narrow winding bays intermingled with mangrove islands represent optimal habitat. Bay systems are very important to this species. It prefers salt marshes to fresh. Only on rare occasions does the bird stray far from the immediate coastal areas—it prefers feeding in shallow saltwater areas rather than brackish or freshwater locations.

Reasons for Concern:

Recent trends in population status are somewhat erratic, and loss of foraging habitat and impacts to nesting islands threaten this species. The species prefers shallow, saltwater habitats and these habitats are subject to modification from effects associated with dredging activities. These effects range from increased turbidity, in the case of open-bay dredge disposal, to direct loss of shallow water habitat when such habitats are filled or channelized. Certain

development activities also lead to direct or indirect loss of important foraging habitat. Erosional forces lead to loss of islands needed by the species for nesting. Human disturbance of these islands, during the nesting season, may

also lead to nest failure and population decline.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor population levels through continued support of colonial waterbird

survey.

Priority:

MEDIUM TO HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring, Fall and Winter

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Follow the methodology of the colonial waterbird survey, compile results from

the survey, also compile breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts for this

species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3+? Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Geothlypis trichas insperata

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Brownsville Common Yellowthroat G/S Rank:

G5T2S1B

Range:

Texas and Mexico. The species as a whole is widespread; however, the subspecies insperata has a very restricted range. The Brownsville Common Yellowthroat was a resident in the Rio Grande delta region below Brownsville, Texas. It winters from south Texas to northern Veracruz. In Texas, the breeding range of insperata ranges in altitude from near sea level to 250 feet. Specimens have been collected from Cameron, Hidalgo and Starr counties. Although formerly considered to be fairly common, they are becoming increasing rare.

Known Occurrences:

Dense thickets and rank grass areas near ponds, marshes, and swamps. The species prefers cattail ponds, marshes and swamps. The species may nest on uplands or bottomlands, but usually in moist situations, preferring thickets on edges of woods, tangles of briars, marshes, swampy thickets, etc. Most common in damp resaca bottoms containing willows and giant needs.

Reasons for Concern:

According to Oberholser (1974), of the 4 breeding subspecies insperata has been rare or extinct since 1951, if not earlier. Population size now estimated to be 100-150 pairs. Elimination of periodic flooding of resacas through construction of Falcon and other dams and associated flood control levees has ted to loss of habitat. The gradual warming and drying of the Texas climate in the first half of the 20th century and the accelerating disturbance and destruction of the habitat may have been instrumental in reducing numbers (Oberholser, 1974). Increasing pollution of its breeding habitat plus augmentation in size of Bronzed Cowbird population also had adverse effects.

Monitoring Objective:

Find population and estimate numbers of individuals present. Check for evidence of reproductive behavior. Do habitat analysis. Monitor impacts of cowbird parasitism.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, April - May

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Cameron County: National Audubon Society, Sabal Palm Sanctuary, and Hidalgo County: Anzalduas County Park, south of Mission, Texas. Laguna

Atascosa NWR may also be a place to look for it.

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Note and monitor any cowbird parasitism. Compile a general habitat analysis. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5+ Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Evaluate the taxonomic status of this subspecies and clarify its distribution in

Texas

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Icterus cuculiatus cucullatus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Mexican Hooded Oriole

G/S Rank:

G5TUS4B

Range:

This subspecies occurs in Texas along the Mexican border chiefly in the Del Rio region. The bird breeds at an altitudinal range of from 700 to 1,300 feet and specimens have been recorded from Terrell County and Val Verde County. One specimen was recorded from Brewster County which is apparently outside the breeding range for this subspecies, as Icterus cucultatus nelsoni, the Arizona Hooded Oriole, is the subspecies commonly found in this region. In Del Rio where there are still few cowbirds and no spraying of herbicides or defoliants, Hoodeds still nest (Oberholser 1974). Hooded orioles nest at Kickapoo Caverns State Park which straddles the Edwards and Kinney county

line.

Known Occurrences:

This historically has always been a widely distributed and adaptable species attracted to both the thickets of semi-arid country and the heavy timber of river bottoms and other moist areas (Pough, 1949). It was commonly found about ranches and towns favoring cottonwoods and sycamores growing along the streams (Terres, 1980).

Reasons for Concern:

Anywhere there are cowbirds, bronzed or brown-headed, this oriole will suffer.

The Mexican subspecies is not in as much jeopardy as sennetti.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor status and distribution.

Priority:

LOW TO MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards County: Kickapoo Caverns State Park, Terrell County: Sites to

be selected: Val Verde County: sites to be selected

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Note any presence of cowbirds and any predation or parasitism. A close review of breeding bird surveys need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Bir

Binoculars 4 6 1

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days/Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name: Icterus cucullatus sennetti Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name: Sennett's Hooded Oriole G/S Rank: G5TUS4B

Range: Sennett's Hooded Oriole is resident in Texas from southern Texas south along

the Gulf Coastal Plain to southern Tamaulipas. It winters south to northern Guerrero and Morelos. Breeding in Texas occurs at sea level to 450 feet (Oberholser, 1974). Specimens collected northwest to Webb County, east to Kenedy County and south to Cameron counties (Oberholser, 1974), where it was known to be an uncommon to scarce breeding bird. Recent nesting records exist for Kenedy County (Arvin, pers. com., 1991). The subspecies winters from early October to mid-March and is scarce to casual in Rio Grande

delta. Winter specimens from Hidalgo, Cameron and Nueces counties

(Oberholser, 1974).

Known Occurrences: Riparian woodland, palm groves, mesquite, arid scrub, deciduous woodland,

around human habitation, city parks, suburbs. Also occurs in live oak

woodlands of Kenedy and surrounding counties.

Reasons for Concern: Habitat destruction and alteration combined with increased incidence of

cowbird parasitism have continued to plague this species.

Monitoring Objective: Do a population estimate, habitat analysis, check for cowbird parasitism, check

for reproductive activity.

Priority: LOW - MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Annually, March - May, Winter

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Cameron County: Sabai Palm Sanctuary, Laguna Atascosa National Wildlife

Refuge, King Ranch (Norias and Encino Divisions).

Methodology: Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success.

Note any cowbird parasitism or nest predation. Compile a general habitat analysis. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need

to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days/Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Icterus cucullatus audubonii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Audubon's Oriole

G/S Rank:

G5T4S3B

Range:

Texas and Mexico. Audubon's Oriole ranges from Jalisco, Guerrero, Nuevo Leon, and south-central Texas south to northwestern Guatemala. In the past it was locally fairly common, in some years, to scarce from Laredo, Live Oak County and Beeville south to the Rio Grande. Reported from Val Verde, Webb, Zapata, Starr, Hidalgo, Cameron, Kenedy, Kleberg, Brooks, Jim Hogg, Jim Wells, Duval, McMullen and Live Oak counties.

Known Occurrences:

This black and yellow oriole favors scrub, lowland thickets, mesquite, and pine-oak habitats. Tropical forest edges are sought out for nest sites south of the border. Prefers mesquite woods during the warmer months and may be found in evergreen trees, live oak, huisache and Texas ebony in the winter.

Reasons for Concern:

Great decline in population after the 1920's due to habitat destruction and alteration--reduction of the mesquite and ebony woodlands of the delta being cleared for truck farms and livestock. Massive reduction in habitat. Cattle and growing cattle food opened up the way for the cowbird, especially the Bronzed Cowbird. Pesticide use has had an unknown effect on the status of this

species.

Monitoring Objective:

It will be important to try to understand why much suitable habitat remains unoccupied. Find a population. Check relative abundance, habitat quality and land-use change, check for cowbird parasitism, check for reproductive activity.

Priority:

LOW - MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Late March - mid-July

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Suggested sites include: Santa Maria, Gabrielson, and Anzalduas Units of the Rio Grande Valley NWR, Santa Ana NWR, Laguna Atascosa NWR, Bentsen-Rio Grande State Park, Chaparral WMA, Las Palomas WMA, King Ranch, Salineno on the Rio Grande, La Copita Texas Agricultural Experiment Station,

Choke Canyon State Park, Falcon Dam, and Kingsville

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located and selected, monitor for breeding activity and success, note any cowbird parasitism. A close review of breeding bird surveys

and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days/Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Lanius ludovicianus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Loggerhead Shrike

G/S Rank:

G4G5 \$4\$5B

Range:

Known Occurrences:

Reasons for Concern:

Monitoring Objective:

Priority:

PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Methodology:

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Work with TPWD staff

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Lanius ludovicianus migrans Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Migrant Loggerhead Shrike

G/S Rank:

G4G5T3T4 S2

Range:

This sub-species is known to breed only in Northeast Texas. Breeds at an altitudinal range between 250-300 feet (Oberholser, 1974). Two specimens were collected in breeding season from Ellis and Smith counties (Oberholser,

1974).

Known Occurrences:

Open country - thinly wooded or scrubby land with clearings, meadows, pastures, old orchards and thickets along roadsides and hedge-rows; also found in altered habitats, such as cemeteries, rural parks and golf courses; power lines are choice perches, but a wide variety of trees, especially isolated snags are also used (Douglas, 1990). Nests are usually well-hidden in shrubs and

short trees with dense crowns (Hunter, 1990).

Reasons for Concern:

Declining almost everywhere (Yosef 1994), especially in the central U.S., despite a nesting success rate from 60 to 70%, which far exceeds that of most birds (Douglas, 1990). Many factors have been implicated, but precise reasons for the declines are not known, i.e., adverse alteration of summer and/or winter habitats, environmental contaminants, predation, human disturbance, interspecific competition, intraspecific competition between northern populations of Loggerheads and southern populations of Loggerheads

on the wintering grounds (USFWS, 1991).

Monitoring Objective:

The decline it has experienced suggest the need for statewide monitoring of the status of Lanius ludocicianus lucovicianus. In particular, we should be concerned about the distribution of shrikes in relation to various landuse practices. Several studies have suggested that the non-breeding grounds are of primary importance in studies designed to understand overall decline since breeding habitat carrying capacity seems generally unaffected. (Yosef and

Grubbs 1994).

Priority:

MEDIUM TO LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Winter

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Northeast Texas; Ellis County: sites to be selected; Smith County: sites to

be selected

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Other sites will be monitored for presence. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days/Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Work is needed to address the systematics of this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Laterallus jamaicensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Black Rail

G/S Rank:

G4?S2B

Range:

In Texas, a rare transient in eastern third of state, away from the coast.

Uncommon breeding resident along coast, more common on upper coast than

central or lower coast.

Known Occurrences:

Salt marsh (Spartina marsh touched only by the highest tide [Oberholser, 1974]) and occasionally along inland tidal creeks and marshes. This is a secretive species, reluctant to flush and most easily located by its distinctive

call which it normally makes at night.

Reasons for Concern:

Loss of wetland habitats to urbanization and industrialization and decline of water quality, especially along the upper coast, poses a serious threat to this marsh dependent species. Most aspects of biology of this species are

unknown.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify a few populations for annual monitoring to determine population trend. Gather data from all other existing data sources. Follow up on data gaps and refine distributional data. Data will provide improved habitat description for birds along the coast. Determine population tevels in areas where species is known to occur. Determine any affects on reproductive

biology from chemical agriculture.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Winter

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Suggested sites include: Murphree WMA, Anahuac NWR, Brazoria NWR,

Galveston Island, San Bernard NWR, Sea Rim SP, Guadalupe Delta WMA,

Aransas NWR)

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located, monitor for breeding activity and success. Other sites will be monitored for presence. A close review of breeding bird

surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed:

Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days/Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Parula pitiayumi nigrilora

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Tropical Parula

G/S Rank:

G5TUS3B

Range:

Texas and Mexico. The species ranges from eastern Sonora, southern Chihuahua, northern Coahuila, northern Nuevo Leon, and southern Texas south locally through Central America and South America to Peru, Bolivia, northern Argentina, Uruguay and southern Brazil. The bird has been recorded from Hidalgo, Kenedy, Cameron and Start Counties. The species withdraws from northern limits of its range in the winter. This bird is now extremely rare in the U.S. Prior to 1951, there were breeding records in the Rio Grande delta. There have been sightings in live oaks of King Ranch in Kenedy County.

Known Occurrences:

In Texas, the bird prefers thick woods of Texas ebony and anacua draped with epiphytic growth found near edges of lagoons or along dry river beds. It is a bird of the semi-tropical evergreen woodland in dense or open undergrowth, brush, and trees along edge of rivers and resacas. It prefers to stay in upper branches of trees. The best remaining delta habitat is in Hidalgo County. Also occurs in mature live oak woodlands,

Reasons for Concern:

It appears to be threatened by habitat destruction, leading to nest parasitism by cowbirds, and exposure to pesticides. Its nesting habitat has declined significantly in Texas.

Monitoring Objective:

It would be a good idea to institute a region wide cowbird trapping program (Arvin, Whitney, personal, communication, 1991). Population estimate during breeding season, habitat analysis, determine changes in land-use practices, and especially incidence of Bronzed Cowbird parasitism.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Late March through May

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Suggested sites include: Santa Ana NWR, Gabrielson Unit of the Rio Valley

NWR, Anzalduas Tract, Bentsen-Rio Grande State Park, King Ranch.

Methodology:

Once population(s) are located and selected, monitor for breeding activity and success. Note any evidence of cowbird parasitism. Other sites will be monitored for presence. A close review of breeding bird surveys need to be

compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days/Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Plegadis chihi

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

White-faced Ibis

G/S Rank:

G5S4B

Range:

Principal range, the coastal regions of Texas, southwest Louisiana, mainland Mexico, including Michoacan, Veracruz and south to Peru, Bolivia, south Brazil, Chile and Argentina. During the winter there is a partial southward withdrawal from Texas and Louisiana. The breeding range may be expanding eastward. At one time it bred inland in Texas, but now is confined to near

coast rookeries.

Known Occurrences:

In Texas, the species frequents freshwater marshes, sloughs and irrigated rice fields to salt marshes, but will also attend brackish and saltwater habitats. The bird is currently confined to near-coastal rookeries in so-called "hog-wallow prairies". It rarely roosts in trees as does the Glossy Ibis, preferring to roost on low platforms of dead reed stems and rush piles amid heavy cover of marsh or swamp (Eckert, 1981). Occasionally it will roost in plain sight on mud banks or on projecting land spits in lakes or streams (Eckert, 1981). A protected cattail lake is prime nesting spot.

Reasons for Concern:

Massive post-war pesticide application led to precipitous declines; the species appears to have recovered and stabilized only on upper coast. Declining in coastal rookeries throughout its range. Formerly more numerous. Pesticides and herbicides in rice fields impaired reproduction. Lethal concentrations of dieldrin found in nestlings. Draining of wetlands poses threat. Significant environmental deterioration poses a threat. Human disturbance on coastal rookery islands may disrupt nesting activity.

Monitoring Objective:

Determine relative abundance, habitat quality, and nesting success. Support

colonial waterbird survey.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Winter

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Eagle Lake (which is owned and operated by Lower Colorado River-

Authority), all other colonial waterbird colonies.

Methodology:

Compile the colonial waterbird survey information for this species. On select populations, monitor for breeding activity and success. Determine relative

abundance and compile general habitat quality information. A close review of breeding bird surveys and winter bird counts need to be compiled for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days/ Site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize Audubon volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Appendix E:

MONITORING PLANS FOR ELEVEN SPECIES OF

CRUSTACEANS

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCHNITPIC NAME	STATUS	USPWS LIST PRI	MONIT
CRUSTACEANS			
Gemmarus hyalleioided DIMINUTIVE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	нісн	нісн
Gammarus pecos PECOS AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	нісн	нісн
Palaemonetes autrorum TEXAS CAVE SHRIMP	G1 81 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Stygobromus balconius BALCONES CAVE AMPHEPOD	G1 S1 C2	LOW	нісн
Stygobromus bifurcatus BIFURCATED CAVE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	LOW	нтен
Stygobromus dejectus CASCADE CAVE AMPHEPOD	G1 S1 C2	LOW	нісн
Stygobromus (lagellatus EZELL'S CAVE AMPHIPOD	Ğ1 S1 C2	LOW	нісн
Stygobromus hadenoccus DEVIL'S SINKHOLE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	row	нісн
Stygobromus longipes LONG-LEGGED CAVE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	LOW	нісн
Stygobromus pecki PECK'S CAVE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 PE	2	нісн
Stygobromus reddelli REDDELL'S CAVE AMPHIPOD	G1 S1 C2	LOW	нісн

Scientific Name:

Gammanus hvalleloides

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Diminutive amphipod

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Jeff Davis County, Phantom Lake Cave Spring. This amphipod is associated with aquatic macrophytes (primarily *Chara*) in the springrun. Specific habitat requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Phantom Lake Cave Spring, Jeff Davis County, Texas. All occurrences of this species are in the developed waters of the Phantom Lake Spring outflow that lead through a cement-lined irrigation canal.

Reasons for Concern:

The restricted range of this species and the potential for loss or reduction of springflows due to excessive pumping of groundwater place this species at significant risk of extirpation.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: Phantom Lake Cave Spring

Methodology:

Surface sample using grab nets, Hess samplers or hand collecting,

Field Equipment Needed: Grab nets, hess nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

15 June 1995 - Revised October 1995

gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the U.S. Bureau of Reclamation (at

Phantom), TPWD and the USFWS. Little is known about its biology. Gammarus hyalelloides belongs to a species-complex in western Texas-eastern New Mexico that requires further study to discern the inter-specific differences among the numerous species of

this group that occur in the region.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in collecting

samples of this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Gammarus pecos

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Pecos amphipod

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Pecos County, Diamond Y Spring. Gammarus pecos is associated with mud substrates, woody debris, and aquatic macropytes in

Diamond Y Spring. However, its specific habitat requirements are

unknown.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Diamond Y Spring, Pecos County,

Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The habitats of this amphipod in the Leon Creek drainage are in an operational oil and gas field. Toxic run-off resulting from these operations represents a potentially serious threat to this species.

Also, groundwater depletion may diminish springflows.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD :

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos County: Diamond Y Springs

Methodology:

Surface sample using grab nets, Hess samplers or hand collecting.

Field Equipment Needed: Grab nets, hess nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the Nature Conservancy to work on this monitoring. Gammans pecos belongs to a species-complex in western Texas-eastern New Mexico that requires further study to discern the inter-specific differences among the numerous species of this group that occur in the region.

Potential use of Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the Nature Conservancy to assist in

collecting this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Palaemonetes antrorum

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas cave shrimp

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Hays County. Subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer are the only known habitat for this species, but nothing is known about its

specific habitat requirements.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Ezell's Cave in San Marcos, Hays

County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards

Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area. Monitor water quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hays County: Edwards Aquifer

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s) as well as using drift nets over the

spring orifice(s) noting presence/absence. The population dynamics

will be very difficult to quantify for this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled

population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the city of San Marcos to monitor this

species and the general water quality

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from San Marcos River Foundation to assist in collecting this species. P. holthusi also occurs in the aquifer

and difficult to distinguish.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus balconis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Balcones cave amphipod

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Edwards Aquifer, nothing is known about its specific habitat

requirements.

Known Occurrences:

Subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer are the only known

habitat for this species.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards

Aguifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated

sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water

quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer:

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s) as appropriate, as well as using

drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very

hard to quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled

population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD. Only two people able to ID this

species, John Holsinger, who is retired, and Scott Harden, who

would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus bifurcatus

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Bifurcated cave amphipod

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Edwards Aquifer, nothing is known about its specific habitat

requirements.

Known Occurrences:

Subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer are the only known

habitat for this species.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards

Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated

sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water

quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer:

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s), as appropriate, as well as using

drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very

hard to quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled

population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the city to assist in collecting samples.

Only two people able to ID this species, John Holsinger, who is

retired, and Scott Harden, who would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

į

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus deiectus

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Cascade cave amphipod

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Edwards Aquifer, nothing is known about its specific habitat

requirements.

Known Occurrences:

Subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer are the only known

habitat for this species.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards

Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated

sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water

quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer:

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s), as appropriate, as well as using

drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very

hard to quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. Only two people able to ID this

species, John Holsinger, who is retired, and Scott Harden, who

would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus flagellatus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Ezell's Cave amphipod

G/S Rank:

GISI

Range:

Hays County, subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer are the only known habitat for this species, but nothing is known about its specific

habitat requirements.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from the Artesian Well at the Southwest Texas State University Aquatic Station, Ezell's Cave, Rattlesnake Cave, and San Marcos Springs, Hays County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards Aguifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hays County: Ezell's Cave, Rattlesnake Cave and San Marcos Springs

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s), as appropriate, as well as using drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very hard to

quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered,

a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the city to assist in collecting samples. Only two people able to ID this species, John Holsinger, who is retired, and

Scott Harden, who would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

÷

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus hadenoecus

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Devil's sinkhole amphipod

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Edwards County, subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer are the only known habitat for this species, but nothing is known about

its specific habitat requirements.

Known Occurrences:

This endemic amphipod occurs only at Devil's Sinkhole, Edwards

County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated

sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water

quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards County: Devil's Sinkhole

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s), as appropriate, as well as using

drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very

hard to quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. Only two people able to ID this

species, John Holsinger, who is retired, and Scott Harden, who

would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus longipes

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Long-legged cave amphipod

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Edwards Aquifer, Texas, subterranean waters of the Edwards

Aquifer are the only known habitat for this species, but nothing is

known about its specific habitat requirements.

Known Occurrences:

This endemic amphipod occurs in the Edwards Aquifer.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards

Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated

sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water

quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer:

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s), as appropriate, as well as using

drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very

hard to quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD. Only two people able to ID this

species, John Holsinger, who is retired, and Scott Harden, who

would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus pecki

Candidate Category:

C₁

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Peck's cave amphipod

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Edwards Aquifer, Texas, subterranean waters of the Edwards

Aquifer are the only known habitat for this species, but nothing is

known about its specific habitat requirements.

Known Occurrences:

This endemic amphipod occurs in the Edwards Aquifer.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards

Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated

sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water

quality,

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer:

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s), as appropriate, as well as using

drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very

hard to quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD. Only two people able to ID this

species, John Holsinger, who is retired, and Scott Harden, who

would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Stygobromus reddelli

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Reddell's cave amphipod

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Edwards Aquifer, Texas, subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer are the only known habitat for this species, but nothing is

known about its specific habitat requirements.

Known Occurrences:

This endemic amphipod occurs in the Edwards Aquifer.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are dewatering of the Edwards Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from non-point

sources.

Monitoring Objective:

If at all possible, collect at-large samples within a designated

sampling area to determine presence within an area. Monitor water

quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer:

Methodology:

At-large collecting in the cave(s), as appropriate, as well as using

drift nets over the spring orifices noting presence/absence. Very

hard to quantify these species.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels, isopropyl alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: . 1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from the sampled population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ruth Stanford, USFWS; Scott Harden; John

Holsinger

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD. Only two people able to ID this

species, John Holsinger, who is retired, and Scott Harden, who

would probably ID on contract.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Appendix F:

MONITORING PLANS FOR TWENTY SPECIES OF

FISH

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCIENTEFIC NAME	STATUS	USPWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
PISHES			
Campostoma omatum MEXICAN STONEROLLER	G3 S1 C2	ЮGH	LOW
Cycloptus elongatus BLUE SUCKER	G3 S3 C2		LOW
Cyprinella proterpins PROSPERPINE SHINER	G3 S2 C2	н ібн	row
Cyprinodon eximins CONCHOS PUPFISH	G4 S1 C2	ніGH	MEDIUM
Cyprinodon pecosensis PECOS PUPFISH	G1 S1 C1		нісн
Diooda diaboli DEVIL'S RIVER MINNOW	G2 S1 C1	2	нісн
Etheostoma grahami RIO GRANDE DARTER	G3 S2 C2	новн	LOW
Gambusia senilis BLOTCHED GAMBUSIA	G4 SX C2	ЮGH	LOW
Hybognathus plactus PLAINS MINNOW	GS SH C2		LOW
letalurus iupus HEADWATER CATFISH	G3 S2 C2	нісн	MEDIUM
ktalurus sp 1 CHIHUAHUA CATFISH	G1G2 \$1\$2 C2	нісн	?
Macethybopeia aestivalis tetranemus ARKANSAS RIVER SPECKLED CHUB	CSTS SS C2		row
Micropterus treculi GUADALUPE BASS	G3 S3 C2	MEDIUM	row
Notrogis buccula SMALLEYE SHINER	G2 S2 C2	MEDIUM	HIGH
Notropis chihushua CHIHUAHUA SHINER	G3 \$2 C2	несн	10W
Notropis jemezanus RIO GRANDE SHINER	G3 S3_C2		10w
Notropia oxythynchus SHARPNOSE SHINER	G3 S3 Ç2	MEDIUM	нісн
Polyodon spathula PADDLEFISH	G4 S3 C2		LOW
Satan conystomus WIDEMOUTH BLINDCAT	G1 S1 C2	нисн	MEDIUM

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

Troglogianis pattersoni TOOTHLESS BLINDCAT	G1 \$1 C2	нісн	MEDIUM

Scientific Name:

Campostoma ornatum

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Mexican stoneroller

G/S Rank:

G3S1

Range:

Occurs in tributaries of the Rio Grande in the Big Bend region of

Texas, west to Rio Sonora, Sonora, and south to Rio Aguanaval,

Zacatecas in Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

This Chihuahuan Desert region fish occurs primarily in clear, fast riffles, chutes and pools in small to medium-sized creeks with gravel or

sand bottoms.

Reasons for Concern:

Wide population fluctuations, restricted range, small number of known occurrences, channelization, reservoir construction or any other activity which modifies habitat. This species appears to have exacting habitat requirements. Introduction of exotic competitors and water diversions

have been a problem.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine relative abundance within an area. The distribution of this species in Texas should be further defined. Specific habitat requirements should

be determined.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, spring or summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Tornillo Creek; Terlingua Creek and Cienega Creek

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Steve Platania, UNM; Bob Edwards, UT-Pan Am

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cycleptus elongatus

Candidate Category:

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Blue Sucker

G/S Rank:

G4S3

C2

Range:

Broadly distributed in large rivers throughout the Mississippi basin. Occurs sparingly in the major rivers of Texas southward to the Rio Grande. Large rivers are the preferred habitat. The Blue sucker prefers channels and flowing pools with a moderate current but apparently will do well in at least some artificial impoundments.

Preferred substrates usually consists of exposed bed-rock in combination with hard clay, sand and gravel. This species is not tolerant of highly

turbid conditions.

Known Occurrences:

The blue sucker is limited in our area to the largest rivers and lower parts of their major tributaries, from the Rio Grande in Mexico, Texas, and New Mexico, Red River in east Texas from the Piney Woods

region to the Gulf Coast Marshes and Prairies.

Reasons for Concern:

Dams may contribute to the decline of the species by preventing spawning migrations and inundating spawning areas. This species also

may be sensitive to pollution and siltation.

Monitoring Objective:

Sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine relative

abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Rio Grande River system; Red River system

Methodology:

Sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine relative

abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Gill nets, electro-shocking

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days each river system; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Bob Edwards, UT-Pan Am; Randy Moss, River Studies Group

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from various "friends" river groups.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

(

Scientific Name:

Cvorinella proserpina

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Proserpine Shiner

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

Devils and lower Pecos rivers, and Las Moras, Pinto, and San Felipe Creeks. The proserpine shiner prefers clear streams and occupies habitats varying from pools to swift channels and riffles.

Known Occurrences:

This species is only known from the Devils and lower Pecos rivers, and Las Moras, Pinto, and San Felipe Creeks. This shiner also occurs in Mexico.

Reasons for Concern:

The limited distribution of this species is the primary reason for concern. Water development projects may represent a threat, but it appears to be ecologically plastic and fairly tolerant of a variety of extreme conditions.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Devils and Lower Pecos Rivers

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Steve Platania, UNM; Bob Edwards, UT-Pan Am

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from area River Foundations (if available) to

assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cyprinodon eximus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Conchos Pupfish

G/S Rank:

G4S1

Range:

The Conchos pupfish is typically found in sloughs, backwaters and margins of larger streams, channels of creeks (in Mexico) and mouths of creeks which are tributary to larger rivers. It is rarely found in headsprings, though it appears to prefer clear flowing waters.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known from the Devils River, Alamito Creek, and associated tributaries. Also, this pupfish is found in the Rio Conchos

and Rio Sauz basins in Mexico.

Reasons for Concern:

Small populations, declining stream flow, pollution,

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality. Taxonomy

needs to be clarified.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Devils River; Alamito Creek

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Tony Echelle, OSU.

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Cyprinodon pecosensis

Candidate Category:

Listing Rank:

C1

G/S Rank: Peços Pupfish

G1S1

Range:

This species was historically restricted to the Pecos River drainage of Texas and New Mexico. Saline waters of the Pecos River (historically) and cienegas are the preferred habitat type. This Chihuahuan Desert region fish occurs primarily in clear, fast riffles, chutes and pools in small to medium-sized creeks with gravel or sand bottoms (Lee et al., 1980). It prefers seasonal, tributary creeks at depths of 10 cm to 1

meter.

Known Occurrences:

The only known genetically pure population remaining in Texas occurs

in Salt Creek, a tributary of the Pecos River.

Reasons for Concern:

Wide population fluctuations, restricted range, small number of known occurrences, channelization, reservoir construction or any other activity which causes a depletion of water supply. This species of fish appears

to have exacting habitat requirements. Introduction of exotic

competitors and water diversions have been a problem. It is considered

to be wiped out by hybridization in Texas.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Monitoring should include checking the spread of the sheepshead

minnow.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Three times per year

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos River, Salt Creek, access needed

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Tony Echelle, OSU

Recommendations:

Work with the landowner to monitor the population in Salt Creek.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Dionda diaboli

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Devils River minnow

G/S Rank:

G2S1

Range:

Restricted to the Devils River, San Felipe Creed and Sycamore Creek in Val Verde County. A historical population once occurred in Las Moras Creek, Kinney County, but it has since been extirpated.

Known Occurrences:

This minnow only inhabits spring-runs having very high water quality.

Reasons for Concern:

Limited range, decline of water flows, reservoir construction and pollution impact this species. The population in San Felipe Creek is threatened by urbanization as the entire creek is within housing areas thus posing an immediate threat there. Las Moras flows through Fort Clark guest ranch. Recreational use of the headsprings and dewatering of the creek are thought to be causes for extirpation of the species from

this location.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Devils River

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Recommendations:

Work with the TNC to monitor the population in Devils River.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Etheostoma grahami

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Río Grande Darter

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

Pecos River, Rio Grande (between Pecos River and Sycamore Creek), Devils River, Dolan Creek, San Felipe Creek and Howard Springs (Val Verde County). In the state of Nuevo Leon, Mexico, it occurs in the Rio Salado and Rio San Juan drainages. This species prefers the

free-flowing portions of streams.

Known Occurrences:

Free-flowing portions of the lower Pecos River, Rio Grande (between Pecos River and Sycamore Creek), Devils River, Dolan Creek, San

Felipe Creek and Howard Springs (Val Verde County).

Reasons for Concern:

Reservoir construction, declining stream flow, pollution, and reduction, or elimination of water flow are the primary threats. Their extremely limited range and low population estimates make this species especially

vulnerable to local reductions in water flow.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Val Verde County: Devils River, Dolan Creek, San Felipe Creek and

Howard Springs; lower Pecos River, Rio Grande (between Pecos River

and Sycamore Creek).

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality,

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

Control 1985

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Steve Platania, UNM; Bob Edwards, UT-Pan Am

Recommendations: Work with staff from the TPWD and the USFWS and The Nature

Conservancy

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Gambusia senilis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Blotched gambusia

G/S Rank:

G4SX

Range:

A population of this species once occurred in the Devils River, but was extirpated by the construction of Amistad reservoir. Populations are

known to occur in Mexico in the Rio Conchos and tributaries.

Known Occurrences:

Mexico in the Rio Conchos and tributaries. Streams are the preferred habitat. The blotched gambusia is usually collected in quiet, formerly weed-choked surface waters, although it appears to be tolerant of wide variations in temperature, chemical conditions, water flow, and clarity.

Reasons for Concern:

Reservoir construction and exotic competition. The blotched gambusia has been extirpated from Texas. However, it apparently still occurs in

Mexico in the Rio Conchos Basin.

Monitoring Objective:

Once reintroduced, surface sample within a designated sampling grid to determine relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Devils River

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 3- Days; 2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from Mexico.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Hybognathus placitus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Plains minnow

G/S Rank:

G5S4

Range:

Colorado, Brazos and Red rivers.

Known Occurrences:

Known from the Colorado, Brazos and Red rivers.

Reasons for Concern:

Unknown

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Colorado, Brazos, and Red rivers.

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711

Constant 1998

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Ictalurus lupus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Headwater catfish

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

Pecos and Rio Grande basins of Texas and New Mexico. Preferred habitats are small streams, but specific habitat requirements are

unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The headwater catfish is now known from the Pecos and Rio Grande basins of Texas and New Mexico. Historical records show this species was once distributed in streams throughout much of central Texas, but

it has been extirpated from most of its range.

Reasons for Concern:

Wide population fluctuations, restricted range, small number of known occurrences, channelization, reservoir construction or any other activity which modifies habitat. This species appears to have exacting habitat requirements. Introduction of exotic competitors and water diversions

have been a problem.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos and Rio Grande Rivers

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality,

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Robert Rush Miller, UHMZ

Recommendations:

Work with the staff TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Ictalurus sp 1

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Chihuahua catfish

G/S Rank: G1G2S1\$2

Range:

Rio Grande and Rio Conchos basins

Known Occurrences:

In Texas, Rio Grande and Big Aguia Creek (Davis Mountains)

Reasons for Concern:

Extirpation likely due to dewatering and stocking of channel catfish.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

occurrence(s) within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Rio Grande Basin

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grids to determine

occurrence(s) within an area.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711

Contract 1985

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Recommendations:

Work with the staff TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Macrhybopsis aestivalis tetranemus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Arkansas River speckled chub

G/S Rank:

G5T5S5

Range:

This chub is distributed in Texas from the Red River southward to the Brazos River basin. Streams are the preferred habitat, but specific

habitat requirements for this species are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

Red River southward to the Brazos River basin.

Reasons for Concern:

Present or threatened destruction, modification or curtailment of its

habitat.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Red River southward to the Brazos River basin

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality,

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management,

Contract 1995

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Bob Edwards, UT- Pan Am

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Micropterus treculi

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Guadalupe bass

G/S Rank:

G3S3

Range:

Widely distributed in streams throughout the Edwards Plateau. The fish was introduced into the Nueces River. Abundance diminishes as

these streams cross the coastal plain.

Known Occurrences:

The Guadalupe bass prefers lotic habitats associated with large rocks, cypress roots, etc. It inhabits shallow, swift waters, often occurring in riffles or at the head of pools. The fish is usually found in waters with annual thermal fluctuations of 4-35 degrees C and not in thermally

stable waters.

Reasons for Concern:

Genetic swamping from hybridization with smallmouth bass (M. dolomieui), water impoundment leading to a decrease in stream flows, habitat modification due to development, pollution, and deterioration of water quality.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Streams in the Edwards Plateau

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine relative abundance within an area. Also monitor habitat quality and

genetic integrity.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Notropis buccula

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

smalleye shiner

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

Historically, it occurred throughout the Brazos River drainage, but the historic range has now been reduced by two-thirds. The species was introduced to the adjacent Colorado River drainage. Texas counties with historical records include Kent, Knox, Taylor, Bosque, Mclennan,

Falls, Brazos, Palo Pinto and Burleson.

Known Occurrences:

In Texas, this species now is known only from the Brazos River drainage. The Brazos River and its tributaries are the primary habitat, but specific habitat requirements for this species are unknown. The smalleye shiner prefers the turbid waters of broad, sandy channels of the main stream, over a bottom consisting principally of shifting sand.

Reasons for Concern:

There has been a significant decline in range of this species. There are several dams proposed on the Brazos and its tributaries which may adversely impact the remaining populations of this species. Smalleye shiners are intolerant of stream changes downstream from dams.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brazos River

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; TPWD River Studies

Group

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Notropis chihuahua

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Chihuahua shiner

G/S Rank:

G3\$2

Range:

The Chihuahua shiner occurs in small tributaries of the Rio Grande in the Big Bend area. It also is known from the Rio Conchos, Mexico. Clear, cool streams are the preferred habitat of the Chihuahua shiner where it is often found in pools with slight current, or riffles over a gravel or sand bottom where there is vegetation. Vegetation, if present,

is usually Potamogeton or Chara.

Known Occurrences:

Know from small tributaries of the Rio Grande in the Big Bend area.

It also is known from the Rio Conchos, Mexico.

Reasons for Concern:

Dewatering of streams and introductions of exotic species present the

most serious threats to this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Rio Grande River and tributaries in Big Bend Region

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

(July 1921

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Steve Platania, UNM

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Notropis iemezanus

Rio Grande shiner

Candidate Category:

C2

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G3S3

Range:

Historically, this species occurred throughout the Rio Grande basin. The present distribution is highly fragmented throughout the basin.

Known Occurrences:

This shiner inhabits large, open, weed-less rivers or in large creeks with

substrates of rubble, gravel and sand, often overlain with silt.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat alterations may have significantly reduced the abundance of this

species.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Rio Grande Basin

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Steve Platania, UNM

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Notropis oxyrhynchus

Candidate Category

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

sharpnose shiner

G/S Rank;

G3S3

Range:

This species is known only from the Brazos River drainage. It appears to be generally distributed throughout the main river. The species was apparently introduced into the adjacent Colorado River drainage. Occurrences have been recorded from Knox, Foard, Palo Pinto and Baylor counties, but the historic range since has been reduced by two-

thirds.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from the Brazos River drainage. The specific habitat requirements of the sharpnose shiner are unknown. Its preferred habitat is a large turbid river with bottom consisting of a combination of sand, gravel and clay-mud.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a fairly narrow range.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brazos River

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality,

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Clark Hubbs, UT;

Bob Edwards, UT-Pan Am

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Polyodon spathula

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

paddlefish

G/S Rank:

G4S3

Range:

Paddlefish have been reported from AL, AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, KY, LA, MN, MO, MS, MT, ND, NE, OH, OK, PA, SD, TN, TX, WI, In Texas,

this species is found primarily in the large rivers of East Texas, including Red River tributaries, Sulphur River, Big Cypress Bayou, Sabine River, Neches/Angelina River, Trinity River, and San Jacinto

River.

Known Occurrences:

Red River tributaries, Sulphur River, Big Cypress Bayou, Sabine River, Neches/Angelina River, Trinity River, and San Jacinto River. The primary habitat type is large slow-flowing rivers, but some populations have been reported from impoundments. Spawning occurs on clean

gravel bars.

Reasons for Concern:

Impoundment, siltation and destruction of gravel bars impact this

species.

Monitoring Objective:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Red River tributaries, Sulphur River, Big Cypress Bayou, Sabine River.

Neches/Angelina River, Trinity River, and San Jacinto Rivers

Methodology:

Surface sampling within a designated sampling grid to determine

relative abundance within an area. Monitor habitat quality.

Field Equipment Needed: Seines

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 4 - 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

October 1995

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, Ronnie Pittman, TPWD

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Satan eurystomus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

widemouth blindcat

G/S Rank:

GIS1

Range:

Subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer, but specific habitat requirements are unknown. However, a water temperature of 27° C may be critical for this subterranean aquatic species. Wells with a temperature of 240 C just north of Bexar County have not yielded

specimens.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from the subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer, Bexar County, Central Texas. All known specimens of this species are from five artesian wells penetrating the San Antonio pool of the Edwards Aquifer, at depths of 305 to 582 meters in and

near the city of San Antonio.

Reasons for Concern:

The restricted range of this species, dewatering of the aquifer, deteriorating water quality, and pollution threaten the continued

survival of this species...

Monitoring Objective:

Due to the difficulties of sampling the habitat of this species monitoring may not be practical. Populations are presumed to be stable as long as the quality and quantity of the Edwards Aquifer are not compromised.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer

Methodology:

Monitor water quality and quantity

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

1995 سنتمان

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Glen Longley,

EARDC

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Trogloglanis pattersoni

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

toothless blindcat

G/S Rank:

GIS1

Range:

Subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer, but specific habitat requirements are unknown. However, a water temperature of 27° C may be critical for this subterranean aquatic species. Wells with a temperature of 240 C just north of Bexar County have not yielded

specimens.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from the subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer. Bexar County, Central Texas. All known specimens of this species are from five artesian wells penetrating the San Antonio pool of the Edwards Aquifer at depths of 305 to 582 meters in and near

the city of San Antonio.

Reasons for Concern:

The restricted range of this species, dewatering of the aquifer, deteriorating water quality, and pollution threaten the continued

survival of this species...

Monitoring Objective:

Due to the difficulties of sampling the habitat of this species monitoring may not be practical. Populations are presumed to be stable as long as the quality and quantity of the Edwards Aquifer are not compromised.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

NA

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards Aquifer

Methodology:

Monitor water quality and quantity

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

1985

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, Gary Garrett, Andy Price, TPWD; Glen Longley,

EARDC

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer/Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Appendix G:

MONITORING PLANS FOR THIRTY-ONE SPECIES OF

INSECTS

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCIENTURC NAME	STATUS	USPWS. LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
PRECIS	;		·
Adhemarius blanchardorum BLANCHARDS' SPHINX MOTH	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	HBGH
Anomala tibializ TIBIAL SCARAB BEETLE	GH SH C2	MEDIUM	HIGH
Agria balmorbea BALMORHEA DAMSELFLY	G2G3 S2 C2		₩
Acaphomyia texanus TEXAS ASAPHOMYIAN TABANID FLY	GH SH C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Austrotinodes up 1 TEXAS AUSTROTINODES CADDISFLY	G2 S2 C2	LOW	LOW
Batrisodes venyivi HELOTES MOLD BEETLE	G1 S1 C2	**Status Survey recently completed	нісн
Chimarra holzenthali HOLZENTHAL'S PHILOPOTAMID CADDISFLY	G1 S1 C2		LO₩
Cicindela cazieri CAZIER'S TIGER BEETLE	G1 S1 C2	нібн	нісн
Cicindela chlorocephala smythi SMYTH'S TIGER BEETLE	GHTH SH C2	нісн	HIGH
Cicindela nevadica olmosa LOS OLMOS TIGER BEETLE	G5T2 S1S2 C2		LOW
Geindela nigrococrules subtropics SUBTOPICAL BLUE-BLACK TIGER BEETLE	GST2 SH C2	нтен	LOW
Cicindela obsoleta neojuvenilis NEOJUVENILE TIGER BEETLE	GST1 SH C2	нIGH	LOW
Cicindela politula barbarannae BARBARA ANN'S TIGER BEBTLE	GST1 S1 C2	нісн	FOM
Cicindela politula petrophila GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS TIGER BEETLE	G5T2 \$1 C2	ндсн	LOW
Deronectes neomexicana BONITA DIVING BEETLE	G1 S1 C2		LO₩
Eximacris superbum SUPERB GRASSHOPPER	GH SH 2	MEDIUM	HIGH

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

Haideoporus tezanus EDWARDS AQUIFER WATER BEBILB	G1 S1 C2	LOW	нюн
Haliphot pitens DISTUNCT CRAWLING WATER BEETLE	GH SH C2	ĹOW	HIGH
Hetereimis comulencis COMAL SPRINGS RIFFLE BEETLE	G1 S1 PE	2	MEDIUM
Limpedius texanus TEXAS MINUTE MOSS BRETLE	GH SH C2	MEDIUM	LOW
Lordithon niger BLACK LORDITHON ROVE BEETLE	GH SH C2		нісн
Macromia wabashensis WABASH BELTED SKIMMER DRAGONFLY	G3Q SRF C2		HIGH
Oxyethim florida FLORIDA OXYETHIRAN MIRO CADDISFLY	G? \$? C2		LOW
Protoptile area SAN MARCOS SADDLE-CASE CADDISPLY	G1 S1 C2	MEDIŲM	tow
Protoptile belmorbes HALMORHEA SADDLE-CASE CADDISPLY	G2 S1 C2		HIGH
Rhadine infernatis A GROUND BEETLE	G1 S1 C2	**Status Survey recently completed	нісн
Schinia (isdiana PHLOX MOTH	GU SH C2		LOW
Somatochlom margarita BIG THICKET EMERALD DRAGONFLY	G1G3 S153 C2	LOW	row
Stallingsia macuksus MACULATED MANFREDA SKIPFER BUFTERFLY	G2 S2 C2	MEDIUM	нд G H
Stygoparaus comalensis COMAL SPRINGS DRYOPID BEETLE	G1 \$1 PB	1	MEDIUM
Tacnioptoryx starki LEON RIVER WINTER STONEFLY	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
	<u></u>		

Scientific Name:

Adhemarius blanchardorum

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Blanchard's sphinx moth

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Brewster County, Texas. Adults of this species have been collected

using UV-light. Larvae and larval food plants have not been

determined.

Known Occurrences:

This species has been collected only from Big Bend National Park,

Panther Pass and Green Gulch, Chisos Mountains, Brewster County,

Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

This species apparently is rare and has a highly restricted range in Texas. Such restrictions make this species vulnerable to extirpation

following habitat loss.

Monitoring Objective:

Determine host plant and learn more about this species habitat

requirements.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Bi - Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park (BIBE)

Methodology:

Determine what the host plant is and determine if larvae is feeding on

same, not known if they have a one year life cycle. May be able to

determine the relative abundance of the adults.

Field Equipment Needed: General entomological collecting equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3- 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the general

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park, (BIBE) to monitor

this species. D. Bowles knows of someone from Colorado who is

working on this species, need to get the name from D.B.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Trustworthy volunteers could be utilized to monitor host plant and/or

look for occurrences of host plant throughout the Park.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Anomala tibialis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

tibial scarab

G/S Rank:

GHSH

Range:

This species is endemic to the Texas Gulf Coast, but the specific distribution is unknown. The preferred habitat for this beetle is presumed to be sandy areas behind dunes where it burrows under

clumps of grass and other vegetation.

Known Occurrences:

This species is endemic to the Texas Gulf Coast.

Reasons for Concern:

Members of this species inhabit a small geographical range and are considered to be rare. As such, they are vulnerable to extirpation from

various disturbances.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Texas Gulf Coast

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Field Equipment Needed: Sieves, vials, forceps, alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified.

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ed Reilly, Texas A&M; Paul Skelly, Florida

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from NPS and Texas A&M Entomology

Department.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and/or NPS to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Argia balmorhea

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Balmorhea damselfly

G/S Rank:

G2G3S2

Капде:

Reeves County, Texas and southward into Nuevo Leon, Mexico. It is

now believed to have a much wider distribution.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known from San Soloman Springs and associated irrigation canals in Reeves County, Texas and southward into Nuevo Leon, Mexico. The primary habitat is spring-runs, and small streams having high water quality. Streams tend to be rocky surrounded by arid countryside. However, specific habitat requirements are unknown.

Reasons for Concern:

Anthropogenic disturbances to known habitats, especially excessive groundwater pumping may place this species in jeopardy of being

extirpated.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Reeves County: San Solomon Springs

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Field Equipment Needed: Nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 - 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

This species will likely be down listed to a 3C.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

No need to monitor at this time.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name: Asaphomyia texanus Candidate Category: C.

Listing Rank:

Common Name: Texas asaphomyian tabanid fly G/S Rank: GHSH

Range: Armstrong, Colorado, Goliad and Victoria County. The specific habitat

type for this species is unknown, but most of the collection locations thus known are sandy areas (old dunes) among oak islands. Larvae of this species are probably terrestrial, and the adults probably feed on nectar rather than blood. Adults are about the size of a deer fly.

Emergence likely is in May. The larvae of a related species that occurs

in Florida also inhabits sandy areas of old dunes.

Known Occurrences: The type locality for this species is 1 mi. north of Weser off Highway

183, Goliad County, Texas. It also has been collected near Columbus in Colorado County, near Kenedy in Armstrong County, and in Victoria

County. It was last collected in the 1960's. It is apparently very

common in Mexico.

Reasons for Concern: This species has a limited distribution and populations apparently are

small. As a result, this horse fly is vulnerable to extirpation from development and other assorted land management practices.

development and other assorted land management practices.

Monitoring Objective: At-large collecting within designated sampling areas to determine

presence within an area.

Priority: HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Annually

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Armstrong, Colorado, Goliad and Victoria County: Sites to be selected

Methodology: At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area, sweep flowers and vegetation using insect nets.

Field Equipment Needed: Aerial Nets, Vials

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 - 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Jim Goodwin, Texas A&M

Recommendations:

A status survey should be completed for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

It is not a good species for volunteers to work on.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name: Austrotinodes texensis Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name: Texas austrotinodes caddisfly G/S Rank: G1S1

Range: This species has been collected from several streams and spring-runs of the

southern Edwards Plateau region of Texas.

Known Occurrences: Edwards Plateau Streams. Streams having high water quality are the

habitat for the larvae. Larvae are thought to burrow into the substrate of

stream pools, but this has not been confirmed.

Reasons for Concern: Although fairly widespread in streams and spring-runs of the Edwards

Plateau, this species is rare and as such is at risk of extirpation from

decreased water quality and quantity.

Monitoring Objective: Known populations of this species should be periodically monitored for

signs of decline.

Priority: MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN.

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Edwards Plateau Region; sites to be selected

Methodology: At-large collecting within designated sampling areas to determine presence

within an area. Monitor water quality.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline

is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet

Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ollie Flint, Smithsonian

Recommendations:

This species should be down listed to 3C

Potential use of

Volunteers:

No monitoring necessary at this time.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

15 June 1995 Revised October 1995

Scientific Name:

Batrisodes venvivi

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Helotes mold beetle

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Bexar County, this beetle is an obligate cave-dwelling species.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Helotes Hilltop Cave and Christmas

Cave in Bexar County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling species depends on the ecological stability of their cave environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and cave vandalism also pose significant threats to

the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Existing populations of this species should be monitored for signs of

decline, primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Helotes Hilltop Cave and Christmas Cave

Methodology:

At-large collecting within designated sampling areas to determine

presence within an area.

Field Equipment Needed: Vials, forceps, caving equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

LS June 1995 Berlini Oneller 1985 population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Access may be an issue in monitoring this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Not a good species for volunteers to assist with.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

15 June 1995 - Marriani Charles 1995

Scientific Name:

Cheumatopsyche flinti

Candidate Category:

3C

= C. comis

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Flint's net-spinning caddisfly

G/S Rank:

G3S3

Range:

Bandera, Hays, Uvalde and Val Verde Counties. The larvae of this species prefers riffle areas of high quality streams and spring-runs, but

specific habitat requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The type locality for this species is San Felipe Springs, Del Rio, Val Verde County. Additional collections have been made from the San Marcos River (Hays County), Medina River (Bandera County), and Sabinal River (Uvalde County), suggesting that this caddisfly has a broad distribution. This species appears to be restricted to streams and

spring-runs of the eastern half of the Edwards Plateau.

Reasons for Concern:

Any detrimental impacts to stream quality and quantity including nonpoint pollution, excessive groundwater pumping, siltation, and other anthropogenic disturbances would have a negative effect on

Cheumatopsyche flinti and aquatic insects in general.

Monitoring Objective:

Recent collections have shown this species to have a much broader distribution than previously thought. Additional survey work on caddisflies could show definitively that most populations of this species are stable. No monitoring is necessary at this time.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bandera County: Hays County:

Uvalde County:

Val Verde

County:

Methodology:

Field Equipment Needed:

15 June 1995 - Bredeni Ostalari 1995

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations: This species is now 3C, no need to monitor.

Potential use of

Volunteers: No need to monitor this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Chimarra holzenthali

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Holzenthal's philopotamid caddisfly

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Anderson County; Louisiana. The general larval habitat is springs and

small streams having high water quality, but specific habitat

requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The type locality for this caddisfly is Schoolhouse Spring, Jackson Parish, Louisiana. The only Texas record is from a small stream near Salmon in Anderson County from specimens collected in 1975.

Reasons for Concern:

The highly restricted distribution of this species suggests that it could be

easily extirpated due to anthropogenic disturbances.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Anderson County: Salmon

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area using uv-light traps for the adults

Field Equipment Needed: Uv-light traps, vials, labels, alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Fing Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Volunteers possibly able to assist in obtaining samples of this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicindela cazieri

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Cazier's tiger beetle

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Starr County, this is a terrestrial beetle, but its specific habitat

requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The type and only known locality for this species is near Rio Grande

City, Starr County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

This beetle was last collected in 1985, suggesting it to be quite rare.

Accordingly, it may be vulnerable to loss of habitat from development

and other land management practices.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Starr County:

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area using nets, aerial and sweep

Field Equipment Needed: Nets, aerial and sweep

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

 monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Volunteers not recommended for assisting with tiger beetles.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicindela chlorocephala smythi

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Smyth's tiger beetle

G/S Rank:

GHTHSH

Range:

This terrestrial species apparently prefers coastal areas, but specific

habitat requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The distribution of this species in Texas is uncertain. However, some experts feel it most likely occurs along coastal areas from Brownsville.

Texas to Veracruz, Mexico.

Reasons for Concern:

This species is thought to be extinct.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Coastal areas from Brownsville south

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area using sweep nets.

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep Nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Volunteers not recommended to assist with tiger beetles

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Li June 2995 Stevensk Oracles 1995

Scientific Name:

Cicindela nevadica olmosa

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Los Olmos tiger beetle

G/S Rank:

G5T2S1S2

Range:

Kenedy County; New Mexico. This is a terrestrial species, but its

specific habitat requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from near Los Olmos, Kenedy County, Texas, and from near Tularosa and Organ, New Mexico. Such a broadly discontinuous distribution suggests that this species may occur

in the interceding areas as well.

Reasons for Concern:

The restricted distribution of this species in Texas and its apparent

rarity suggests that it may be vulnerable to extirpation.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Kenedy County: Los Olmos

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area. In addition, the taxonomy of this species

needs to be resolved.

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

LF June 1997

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Volunteers are not recommended to work with tiger beetles.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicindela nigrocoerulea subtropica

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

subtropical blue-black tiger beetle

G/S Rank:

G5T2SH

Range:

Hidalgo County; Coahuila, Mexico. This is a terrestrial species, that

probably prefers dry, open areas. However, specific habitat

requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Anzalduas Park, Hildago County, Texas, and from Coahuila, Mexico. Other reports have suggested that

this species also may occur in the Big Bend area of Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

This species is quite rare and has a restricted distribution making it

vulnerable to extirpation.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hildago County: Anzalduas Park

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area. In addition, the taxonomic issues need to be

resolved.

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Not recommended for tiger beetles.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

15 June 1995 Reviewd Outsteen 1992

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Cicindela obsoleta neoinvenilis

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

neojuvenile tiger beetle

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G5T1SH

Range:

This species has been reported to occur in New Mexico, Mexico, and western and southern Texas. This is a terrestrial species that prefers dry prairie among clumps of bunch grass, mesquite-covered land, and grassy meadows and hillsides. Related other subspecies have been collected elsewhere from near springs and streams while others prefer

areas only wetted by rainfall.

Known Occurrences:

This species has been reported to occur in New Mexico, Mexico, and

western and southern Texas. The distribution of this particular

subspecies in Texas is unclear.

Reasons for Concern:

This subspecies is very rare and may be vulnerable to extirpation. It

may be extinct.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Western and southern Texas

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area. In addition, the taxonomic issue needs to be

resolved.

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Not recommended for tiger beetles.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicindela politula barbarannae

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Barbara Ann's tiger beetle

G/S Rank:

G5T1S1

Range:

Hudspeth County; Mexico. This subspecies prefers dry, open areas on large exposed ledges of limestone above 5,000 feet. Specimens have

been collected only in September.

Known Occurrences:

The type and only known locality of this subspecies is in the Hueco

Mountains, Hudspeth County, Texas. It also may occur in Mexico.

Reasons for Concern:

Over-collecting from commercial trade may be jeopardizing this beetle.

Another factor making this beetle vulnerable is its apparent small

natural distribution and low population size.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hudspeth County:

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area. In addition, the taxonomy needs to be

resolved

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Not recommended for tiger beetles.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cicindela politula petrophila

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Guadalupe Mountains tiger beetle

G/S Rank:

G5T2S1

Range:

Culberson County; New Mexico. This subspecies appears to prefer limestone outcrops at elevations of approximately 1670 m to over 2470 m. An increase in elevation appears to be associated with concomitant darkening of color as specimens from the higher elevations tend to be blue and/or dark green, while those occurring at lower elevations are

described as lighter and cupreous in color.

Known Occurrences:

This subspecies is known only from the type locality of Guadalupe Mountains in Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Culberson County, Texas, and Eddy County, New Mexico. It occurs throughout much of

the Guadalupe Mountains National Park.

Reasons for Concern:

Over-collecting by the commercial trade industry may be jeopardizing this beetle. Another factor making these beetles vulnerable is their

apparent small natural distribution and low numbers.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County:

Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine presence within an area. In addition, the taxonomy needs to be

resolved.

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Not recommended for tiger beetles.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Deronectes neomexicana

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Bonita diving beetle

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Brewster County; Lincoln County, New Mexico. The specific habitat of

this aquatic beetle is unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The only known collection records for this species are from 20 mi. south of Alpine, Brewster County, Texas [probably Calamity Creek at Hwy, 118 bridge], and from Bonita Creek, Lincoln County, New

Mexico.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a restricted distribution and is uncommon suggesting

that it may be at risk for extirpation.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Calamity Creek, 20 mi south of Alpine at Hwy 118

bridge.

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence/absence within an area using kick nets.

Field Equipment Needed: Kick nets, vials, labels, forceps, alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Fing Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

15 June 1995 Berlind Catalog 1986 significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Jim Ricarson, Sul Ross

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from BBRSNA if possible, to assist in monitoring

this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name: Eximacris superbum Candidate Category:

Canudate Category; Listing Rank: C2

Common Name:

superb grasshopper

G/S Rank:

GHSH

Range:

Willacy County. Collection data for the only two known specimens of this grasshopper shows that they were associated with low oak shoots

near oak thickets in a region of loose sand.

Known Occurrences: Known only from near "Katherine" (no such town shown on available

maps of county), Willacy County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern: This species is known only from two adult males collected in 1937

suggesting it may be quite rare. Any development and other land management practices in Willacy County that destroys the habitat of

this species may impact its existence.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually during August - September, initially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Willacy County: along highway-right-of-ways with appropriate habitat.

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine presence within an area using a sweep net along roadsides, dependent on what is found, may want to set up transects and sample along them.

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep nets, vials, labels, insect pins, storage boxes

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report s

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

lf June 1995 - Herbert Ontales 1990

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Haideoporus texanus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Edwards Aquifer diving beetle

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Hays and Comal Counties. This species is restricted to the

subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer in Hays and Comal counties. Texas, but specific habitat requirements remain unknown.

Known Occurrences:

This species occurs in subterranean waters of the Edwards Aquifer.

Reasons for Concern:

This diving beetle has an extremely limited range. It is probably sensitive to any deterioration in water quality or the influx of toxicants into the aquifer. Excessive groundwater pumping is a major threat to

this species' habitat.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hays County: Edwards Aquifer; Comal County: Edwards Aquifer

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area using drift nets to collect at spring orifices.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets, vials, labels

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work,

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In

the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in collecting this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Li Jane 1925 - Market Constant 198

Scientific Name:

Haliplus nitens

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

disjunct crawling water beetle

G/S Rank:

GHSH

Range:

The Texas record may be in error.

Known Occurrences:

Reasons for Concern:

Monitoring Objective:

None at this time

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually,

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Methodology:

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Sharon Jasper, A&M

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Heterelmis comalensis

Candidate Category:

PE

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Comal Springs riffle beetle

G/S Rank:

GIS1

Range:

Comal and Hays County. This species seems to prefer riffle areas near the head of Comal Springs, but specific habitat requirements have vet

to be determined.

Known Occurrences:

Known from the upper spring-runs of Comal Springs, Comal County. A single specimen was collected at Spring Lake, San Marcos Springs, Hays

County.

Reasons for Concern:

The existence of this species is in immediate jeopardy due to the potential loss of flow at Comal Springs resulting from over pumping of

the Edwards Aquifer.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Comal County: Comal Springs; Hays County: Spring Lake, San

Marcos Springs

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area by taking benthic samples and using kick nets.

Monitor surface flow and aquifer level as well.

Field Equipment Needed: Kick nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1-2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

1995 سنڌ کا Berkel Coder 1985 extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and the Parks and Recreation staff from the city of New Braunfels and San Marcos to assist in

collecting this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

والمستواسات المداري

Scientific Name:

Limnebius texanus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas minute moss beetle

G/S Rank: 🕟

GHSH

Range:

Culberson and Jeff Davis Counties. Specific habitat requirements of this aquatic species are unknown, but it probably prefers seeps and

springs.

Known Occurrences:

The type locality of this species is 2.5 mi. E. of Nickel Creek Station, Culberson County. Additional specimens were collected from Limpia Creek Canyon, Jeff Davis County. The only known specimens of this

beetle were collected in September 1952.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a highly restricted range making it vulnerable to extirpation. Also, groundwater resources are in great demand in western Texas which could result in elimination of this species habitat.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, initially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: 2.5 mi. E. of Nickel Creek Station; Jeff Davis

County: Limpia Creek Canyon

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine presence within an area. Look for specimens among moss and algae.

will need expert for identification.

Field Equipment Needed: Vials, labels

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Very hard to collect

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Not a good project for volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Lordithon niger

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Black lordithon rove beetle

G/S Rank:

GHSH

Range:

Dallas County. Other collections are known from MO, AR, CT, DC,

GA, IL, KS, KY, MI, NY, NC, OH, PA, VA, WV, and Canada.

Known Occurrences:

Dallas County. This is a terrestrial species, but specific habitat

requirements are unknown. Other members of the genus primarily are

found on fleshy fungi,

Reasons for Concern:

Most experts on staphylinids agree that this species is becoming

increasingly rare throughout its range. The reasons for this are unclear,

but elsewhere this species has been associated with virgin deciduous

forests which are rapidly disappearing.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Dallas County: check woodlots; Anderson County: check woodlots,

Lennox Woods.

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area. Locate fungi and look for the presence/ absence of the beetle. When located, have the fungi identified.

Field Equipment Needed: Vials

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

L3 June 1995 Resided October 1985 from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Steve Ash, University of Kansas; Richard

Lescher (knows fungi)

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TNC

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD/TNC to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

S James 1995 - Standard Controller 3

Scientific Name:

Macromia wabashensis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Wabash belted skimmer

G/S Rank:

G3OSRF

Range:

McLennan County. This species has been reported from Ohio and Indiana. This is an aquatic species, but the specific habitat type, if in Texas, is unknown. According to David Bowles, this species does not

occur in Texas.

Known Occurrences:

There is one occurrence recorded for Texas (McLennan County), but this record likely is in error given the other distributional records for

the species.

Reasons for Concern:

Some experts believe that the record for this species in Texas is in error. It probably is <u>M. taeniolata</u>. Others have suggested that it may be a hybrid of that species and <u>M. pacifica</u>. Reasons for concern are

unknown

Monitoring Objective:

No need to monitor at this time.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

NA

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

McLennan County:

Methodology:

NA

Field Equipment Needed: NA

retu Equipment recticus 1174

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: NA

Reporting Procedure:

NA

Red Flag Conditions:

No need to monitor in Texas.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

No need to monitor

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Oxvethira florida

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Florida oxyethiran microcaddisfly G/S Rank:

G?S?

Range:

The type and only known locality for this species is Miami, Dade

County, Florida. This species probably does not occur in Texas.

Known Occurrences:

This species probably does not occur in Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

Unknown

Monitoring Objective:

No need to monitor.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

NA

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD ·

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

NA

Methodology:

NA

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

Field Equipment Needed: NA

•

NA

Reporting Procedure:

No report necessary

Red Flag Conditions:

None, does not occur in Texas

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

15 Jun 1915 - Berlind Onder 1910

Recommendations:

Potential use of Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Protoptila arca

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

San Marcos saddle-case caddisfly G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Hays County. The San Marcos River habitat is a thermally stable. oxygen-saturated, swift-flowing stream. Larvae of P. arca appear to prefer rock substrate and woody debris on which they graze. Fine

gravel and sand is required for constructing the larval case.

Known Occurrences:

This species is restricted to the upper San Marcos River, Hays County

and is fairly common.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a highly restricted range. Recreational activities through disturbance of the substrate and siltation, non-point pollution, and groundwater depletion that will diminish spring flow may have

negative impacts on this species

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hays County: San Marcos River

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

relative abundance within an area.

Field Equipment Needed: Nets, vials

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 Day: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

ᅜᆖᄧ 1990 سلمان ال gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Recruit members from the River Foundation to monitor this species

and the water quality.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Li Jano (986 - Revisad October 199

Scientific Name:

Rhadine infernalis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

a ground beetle

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

All known members of the genus Rhadine are obligate cave-dwelling

species.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known from several caves in Bexar County, Texas, including Headquarters Cave, Madla's Cave, John Wagner Ranch Cave #3. Charcoal Creek Coon Cave, Christmas Cave, Isopit, Game Pasture Cave #1, Kamikazi Cricket Cave, King Toad Cave, Logan's Cave, Mattke Cave, Robber's Cave, Scorpion Cave, and Three-fingers Cave.

Reasons for Concern:

The continued existence of this species and other cave-dwelling species depends on the ecological stability of their cave environments. Threats to this stability include destruction and/or deterioration of habitat by commercial, residential, and road construction, filling of caves, loss of permeable cover, potential contamination from effluent, sewer leaks, non-point run-off, and pesticides. Predation and competition by red imported fire ants and cave vandalism also pose significant threats to

the cave fauna.

Monitoring Objective:

Populations of this species should be monitored for signs of decline. primarily from fire ants, at least every 2 years. At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine presence within an

area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: sites to be selected, access will be an issue.

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Field Equipment Needed: caving equipment, vials

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; James Reddell; Don Chandler

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize caving volunteers that are familiar with karst

invertebrates.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

ţ

Scientific Name:

Schinia indiana

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

phlox moth

G/S Rank:

GUSH

Range:

The larval food plant elsewhere in this species range is *Phlox pilosa*. The larval food plant of this species likely will dictate its distribution.

Known Occurrences:

The distribution of this species in Texas is unknown. It also has been found in MI, MN, WI, AR, IL, IN, NC, NE. According to Roy Kendall,

this species does not occur in Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The apparent rarity of this species, especially in Texas, suggests that it

is at risk of being extirpated.

Monitoring Objective:

Need to locate the host plant of this species then look for occurrences of this species. The distribution of Phlox pilosa is in the eastern part of

Texas to the southwest including the Edwards Plateau.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Site(s) to be located.

Methodology:

Locate host plant and sample for larvae.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

Once population(s) found, gather baseline information. This species may or may not need close monitoring. If so, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

LS June 1993 Broked Cotalior 1995

Scientific Name:

Somatochlora margarita

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Big Thicket emerald dragonfly

G/S Rank:

G1G3S1S3

Капде:

San Augustine and San Jacinto Counties. Small, clear, sandy-bottomed

spring-runs and streams are the preferred habitat of this species. However, the specific larval habitat requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The type locality for this species is Big Creek, Sam Houston National

Forest, County, Texas. It also is known from Sandy Creek, San

Augustine County. The potential range of this species may encompass

more than 10,000 square miles and four National Forests in

Southeastern Texas

Reasons for Concern:

This dragonfly has a limited distribution and a restricted habitat.

Excessive clearcutting and other anthropogenic disturbances within its

range may have an adverse impact on this species.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

San Jacinto County: Sam Houston National Forest; San Augustine

County:

Methodology:

Visual observation of the large dragonfly within a designated sampling

area, if possible, locate larvae and describe.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; A status survey was completed in 1989.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Stallingsia maculosus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

maculated manfreda skipper

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Bexar, Hidalgo, Karnes, Kinney, Nueces, Starr and Wilson counties, and from Nuevo Leon, Mexico. The habitat of this species consists of semi-arid areas, in association with its larval food plant Manfreda maculosa. Collections have been made in April, July through

September, and November through December.

Known Occurrences:

The type locality of this species is near Kingsville, Kleberg County, Texas. It also is known from Bexar, Hidalgo, Karnes, Kinney, Nucces,

Starr and Wilson counties, and from Nuevo Leon, Mexico.

Reasons for Concern:

Although this skipper is known from several locations, some have been

destroyed through miscellaneous land development practices.

However, during the 1950's populations were considered healthy. The

larval food plant never seems to occur in large colonies.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, April, July - September

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Hildago County:

Karnes County: Kinney

County: Sites to be selected

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine presence within an area. These are day active, may be able to quantify

habitat and count the number of visits to the host plant over a

designated period of time.

Field Equipment Needed: Sweep nets, vials, labels

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species an locating host plants.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Stygoparnus comalensis

Candidate Category:

PΕ

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Comal springs dryopid beetle

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Comal Springs

Known Occurrences:

Edwards Aquifer

Reasons for Concern:

Water draw-down

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually,

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Comal Spring

Methodology:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area using drift nets.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 - 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Volunteers not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Taenioptervx starki

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Leon River winter stonefly G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Coryell and Hamilton Counties. The most likely habitat for this species

in the Leon River is riffle areas, but specific habitat requirements are

Listing Rank:

unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The only known population of this species occurs in the Leon River in

Coryell and Hamilton Counties.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a highly restricted distribution making it vulnerable to

extirpation from anthropogenic disturbances.

Monitoring Objective:

At-large collecting within a designated sampling area to determine

presence within an area.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Coryell County: Leon River: Hamilton County: Leon River

Methodology:

At-large collecting of adults within a designated sampling area to

determine presence within an area. Collect larvae with kick-nets and

Hess samplers.

Field Equipment Needed: Kick nets, Hess samplers, vials, labels, alcohol

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more

extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information

gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In

the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Ken Stewart, University of North Texas; Riley

Nelson, UT

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

U han 1995 - Arriani Caister 1990

Appendix H:

MONITORING PLANS FOR THIRTY-FIVE SPECIES OF

MAMMALS

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
IAMMALS		·	<u> </u>
itarina hylophaga plumbea ARANSAS SHORT-TAILED SHREW	GSTIQ ST C2		MEDIUM
Theoronycteris mexicana LONG-TONGUED BAT	G3G4 S1 C2	l	MEDIUM
Conspanies Ineconomies Lexenses GULF GOAST HOG-NOSED SKUNK	G5T4? \$2 C3		MEDIUM-HIGH
Conceptus mesoleucus izimalestes BIG THICKET HOG NOSED SKUNK	G5T2 SI C2	MEDIUM	LOW
Corynorhinus (~Plecous) rafinesquit EASTERN BIG-EARED BAT	G4 S3 C2		MEDIUM
Cynomys Iudocicianus arizonensis ARIZONA BLACK-TAILED PRAIRIE DOG	GST3 S3 C2		LOW
Dipodomys elazor TEXAS KANGAROO RAT	G2 S2 C≥	FOM	нібн
Euderma maculatum SPOTTED BAT	G4 S2 C2		MEDIUM-LOW
Eumope perotis californicus CALIFORNIA MASTIFF BAT	G5T7 S3 C2		MEDIUM
Geomys arenarius DESERT POCKET GOPHER	G3 S2 C2		MEDIUM
Geomys personatus maritimus MARITIME POCKET GOPHER	G4T2 \$2 C2		мерійм
Geomy's personatus strenkeri CARRIZO SPRINGS POCKET GOPHER	G4T1 S1 C2		MEDIUM
Geomys texensis bakeri FRIO POCKET GOPHER	G3T2 S2 C2	меор:(ш	MEDIUM
Myotis pasaroriparius SOUTHEASTERN MYOTIS	G4 \$3 C2		MEDIUM
Myotis ciliolabrum WESTERN SMAŁL-PÓOTED MYOTIS	G5 \$3 C2	<u> </u>	MEDIUM
Myoris evoûs LONG-EARED MYOTIS	GS SX C2		LOW
Myotis lucifugus occultus OCCULT OR ARIZONA LITTLE BROWN MYOTIS	GST3T4 SA C2		LOW
Myous thysanodes FRINGED MYOTIS	G5 S3 C2		LOW
Myotis velifet CAVE MYOTIS	G5 S4 C2		LOW
Myotis volans LONG-LEGGED MYOTIS	G5 54 C2		LOW
Myoris yumanensis YUMA MYOTIS	G5 S4 C2		Low

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

		L.
G5T3? S2 C2		LOW
G5T2 \$2 C2	LO₩	MEDIUM-HIGH
GSTIQ S1 C2	меріим	LOW
GS \$3 C2		LOW
G5T5 S3 C2		MEDIUM
G5T3 \$3 C2	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
G3 S2S3 C2	LOW	MEDIUM
G572 S2 C2	<u> </u>	MEDIÚM
G5T2 S2 C2	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
G5Ŧ2 \$2 C2	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
G5 54 C1	<u> </u>	нібн
GSTS S4 CI		MEDIUM
G5T4T5 S3? C1		HIGH
	G5T2 \$2 C2 G5T3 \$3 C2 G5T3 \$3 C2 G5T3 \$3 C2 G5T3 \$3 C2 G5T3 \$2 C2 G5T2 \$2 C2 G5T2 \$2 C2 G5T2 \$2 C2	G5T2 \$2 C2 LOW G5T1Q \$1 C2 MEDIUM G5 \$3 C2 G5T3 \$3 C2 MEDIUM G3 \$2\$3 C2 LOW G5T2 \$2 C2 MEDIUM G5T2 \$2 C2 MEDIUM G5T2 \$2 C2 MEDIUM G5T2 \$2 C2 MEDIUM G5T2 \$4 C1

Scientific Name:

Blarina brevicauda plumbea

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Aransas short-tailed shrew

G/S Rank:

G5T3 S3

Range:

Aransas County, (Aransas National Wildlife Refuge (ANWR)).

Known Occurrences:

Occurs in grassy vegetation near post oak trees.

Reasons for Concern:

Small size and isolated nature of populations; unknown potential impact of various management plans proposed for oak mottes at the refuge such as

burning, clearing and grazing.

Monitoring Objective:

Once a population is documented, periodically survey for presence and

estimate population trend.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, March

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/ANWR

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Aransas County: Aransas National Wildlife Refuge

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 2 m intervals and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one trap set and left over night). May need to switch to

pitfall traps, provide each trap with cotton or wool to limit mortality.

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, bait (sardines), flagging, gloves, cotton or wool.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner; Lee Elliott, TPWD; George Baumgardner, TAMU

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the USFWS and TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Choeronycteris mexicana

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Mexican long-tongued bat

G/S Rank:

G2S1

Range:

Hidalgo County, (Santa Ana National Wildlife Refuge)

Known Occurrences:

Known only from Lower Rio Grande Valley, documented from Hidalgo County (Santa Ana National Wildlife Refuge), single record. Neotropical nectivorous species roosting in caves, mines, and large crevices found in deep

canyons along the Rio Grande

Reasons for Concern:

Caves in Mexico where this bat spends most of its time are subject to

dynamiting.

Monitoring Objective:

Locate and visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and

population estimate/trends.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, May - July

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hidalgo County: Santa Ana National Wildlife Refuge

Methodology:

Locate and visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and

population estimate/trends. Visit twice a month for one year or during the

summer months

Field Equipment Needed:

Binoculars, data sheets, may need to mist net for positive identification,

flashlights with a red filter.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days/Mo; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection.

provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Enlist monitoring assistance from the staff from Santa Ana National Wildlife

Refuge.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the Valley

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Conepatus leuconotus texensis

Candidate Category: C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Gulf Coast hog-nosed skunk G/S Rank:

G5T?S?

Range:

Aransas, Brooks, Cameron, Dewitt, Karnes, Kleberg, Nueces, San Patricio,

and Webb Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Known from nine counties, thorn woodland and riparian forest of rolling hills;

also mesquite-brushland with semi-open grasslands.

Reasons for Concern:

Although no threats are specifically known at this time, the coastal plain of south Texas has and will continue to be subject to habitat modification as a

result of urban development, water use and agriculture.

Monitoring Objective:

Once populations are located, determine population estimate. Taxonomy also

needs to be resolved.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring, Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Gulf coast counties

Methodology:

Notify ADC and Predator Control offices and local fur trappers in each of the

counties to determine population locations. Once populations are located and

verified, monitor by spot lighting and track plates.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD; Jerry Dragoo, TAMU;

Rodney Honeycutt

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Santa Ana NWR.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Conepatus mesoleucus telmalestes

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Big Thicket hog-nosed skunk

G/S Rank:

G5T2 S1

Range:

East Texas - Hardin, Liberty, San Jacinto, Harris, Waller and Montgomery

Counties; probably extinct

Known Occurrences:

Little is known about the habitat of this subspecies, but *C. mesoleucus* is found in rocky draws and canyons typical of the Edwards Plateau and Trans-Pecos

Reasons for Concern:

Farming and urbanization have altered and reduced habitat, while hunting and trapping for pelts may have contributed to the decline. Many authorities are of

the opinion that this taxon is extinct

Monitoring Objective:

Map site location(s) if other individuals are captured and reported. Taxonomy

needs to be resolved.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

East Texas, sites to be selected

Methodology:

Notify ADC and Predator Control offices and local fur trappers in each of the

counties to determine population locations. Once populations are located and

verified, monitor by spot lighting and track plates.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1-2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Eiliott, TPWD; Jerry Dragoo, TAMU

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Corynorhinus rafinesquii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Rafinesque's big-eared bat

G/S Rank:

G4S3

Range:

Hardin, (Harrison?), Jasper, Liberty, Marion, Montgomery, Nacogdoches,

Newton, Polk and Sabine Counties

Known Occurrences:

Two known localities, Jasper and Liberty Counties. Historically, lowland pine

and hardwood forests with large hollow trees.

Reasons for Concern:

Degradation of roosting and feeding sites by commercial logging practices;

habitat destruction in the form of clearing forests and adverse timber

management practices in the piney wood habitat of east Texas; pesticides may

also represent a threat to this insectivorous bat.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends; Contact East Texas Public Health facilities for information on

locations of bats submitted for rabies testing.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

East Texas: Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends; Contact East Texas Public Health facilities for information on

locations of bats submitted for rabies testing.

Field Equipment Needed:

Binoculars, mist nets, gloves, may need to net for positive

identification.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1-2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant

or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Résource Specialists:

Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cynomys ludovicianus arizonensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Arizona black-tailed prairie dog

G/S Rank:

G5T3S3

Range:

Brewster, Culberson, El Paso, Hudspeth, Pecos, Presidio, Reeves and Terrell

Counties

Known Occurrences:

This species is known from Short grasslands.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat alteration, including turning native prairie into cropland, pasture improvement and urban development and concerted elimination efforts

Monitoring Objective:

Identify populations for periodic population estimates.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring, Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Select sites in West Texas

Methodology:

Designate select populations to keep track of over time

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars, spotting scope

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1- 2 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Dipodomys elator

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas kangaroo rat

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

North central Texas, Childress, Cottle, Hardeman, Wichita and Wilbarger

Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Forty-two known occurrences North central Texas; historically may have included 14 Texas and 3 Oklahoma counties, but presently are known from only Cottle (1985), Childress (1987), Hardeman (1990), Wichita (1990), and Wilbarger Counties (1990) of Texas. They occur on sandy loam surface soils containing some clay and which supports short grasses (buffalo grass) and

small to medium sized mesquite.

Reasons for Concern:

Destruction of mesquite-grassland; endemic subspecies restricted to a five

county area and may be confined to a limited geologic substrate.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify a subset of the kangaroo rat population (largest, smallest, easterly, westerly) to establish annual population trends using consistent methodologies; Investigate a technique that would relate population size with number of burrows/other variable; Visit each of the known populations periodically to

monitor changes in activity.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually. 2 spotlight surveys at each site during each of the 4 seasons

or 3 consecutive trap nights during each of the four seasons

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD-Need access

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Private land, need access

Methodology:

One of two levels of monitoring could be initiated based on funding and personnel availability. Level 1 addressing population trends, establish transect lines to be surveyed along roads on moonless nights. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of krats observed per distance traveled (a trap night is one trap set and left over night). Level 2 addresses demographic trends and is the preferable method, but requires private land access. Four grids measuring at least two hectares each would be established in prime habitat on the property. Traps will be placed in each grid at 20 m intervals and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. Kangaroo rats will be trapped, identified, then

permanently marked with microchip transponders. Data collected will include weight, age, and reproductive condition. Population densities can be estimated using a mark/recapture population model which may also provide survivorship and reproductive estimates. Level 2 will be initiated based on availability of funding to obtain the more expensive equipment.

Field Equipment:

Level 1: Spotlight, car with odometer.

Level 2: Sherman live-traps (400), mixed seed bait, capture bag, gloves. identification field guides, flagging, microchip transponders, transponder

receiver, weighing scales, ruler/calipers

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 people for 3 nights/season per study area.

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department by August 1st of each year. The report will include data from that year, and

previous years to denote population trends.

Red Flag Conditions:

Data will be collected for 4 years to obtain an average abundance index. In subsequent years, a 50% decrease in the average annual population index (Level 1) or density (Level 2) for 2 consecutive years will be considered significant. If Level 2 monitoring has been conducted, the demographic data will also be used to assess the significance of the decline. If the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Endangered Resources Branch, Texas Parks and Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Rd., Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bob Martin, McMurry University;

Recommendations

Research Needs may include: Determine minimum viable population; Determine whether detrimental competition occurs between D. elator, D. ordii, or other sympatric rodent; Determine the effects of different grazing regimes on kangaroo rat populations; Determine the effects of pesticides on kangaroo rat populations; Determine how man-made alterations (dirt roads, fence lines, firebreaks) influence burrow construction and movement patterns.

Potential use of Volunteers:

Because identifying rodent species with similar morphology will require extensive training, it would be best to use of volunteers who are willing to commit themselves to a minimum of one year. However, short term volunteers could help experienced staff/volunteers on a limited basis by recording data or opening and checking traps, which would reduce overall field time.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Euderma maculatum

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

spotted bat

G/S Rank:

G4S2

Range:

Trans-Pecos region of Texas

Known Occurrences:

Known to be in Big Bend National Park, location not mapped. Habitat

includes Ponderosa pine forests to desert scrub; habitat requirement appears to be limited to presence of broken canyon country or cliffs for roosting sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Threats have not been specifically identified though a lack of study and inability

of biologists to observe the bats contribute to the reasons for belief of the

species rarity

Monitoring Objective:

Visit historical and current roost sites periodically to determine presence and

population estimate/trend.

Priority:

(

MEDIUM - LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring, early summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Big Bend National Park

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

West Texas, broken canyons and cliffs

determine appropriate management.

Methodology:

Visit historical and current roost sites periodically to determine presence and

population estimate/trend.

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, binoculars, night vision devices, photo equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Work with TPWD staff in west Texas to locate additional new roost sites.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring and looking

for additional site of this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Eumops perotis californicus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

greater western mastiff bat

G/S Rank

G5T1S3

Range:

Brewster, Presidio and Val Verde Counties; maybe along Rio Grande Canyon

Known Occurrences:

0 known occurrences. Habitat includes arid canyons; roosts in crevices in rock walls of desert canyons, old buildings, hollow trees; roost site must have clearance for a 3m

fall by exiting bats.

Reasons for Concern:

Extent of decline and specific causes have not been determined; Tipton, 1987,

suggests the possibility that pesticide use and habitat loss are responsible.

Monitoring Objective:

Locate and visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring, early summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

West Texas, sites to be selected.

Methodology:

Locate and visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars, mist nets, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 - 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Eiliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with staff from TPWD to locate potential roost sites.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Geomys arenarius

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

desert pocket gopher

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

El Paso and Hudspeth Counties

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Habitat includes cottonwood-willow association along the Rio Grande; common along irrigation ditches in the sandy river bottom area; they apparently cannot tolerate the clavey or gravelly soils characteristic

of the other Geomys species.

Reasons for Concern:

Small isolated population vulnerable to land use changes

Monitoring Objective:

Identify largest populations for monitoring population trends periodically,

Develop a method of estimating population density and trends. Taxonomy

needs to be clarified.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, June - August

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

El Paso County

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 m intervals or as the mounds may indicate activity and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. It may be necessary to also try running the traps during the day. Individuals will be trapped, identified, measured, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one trap set and left

over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Gopher live traps, bucket, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

4 Days; 2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Geomys personatus maritimus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

maritime pocket gopher

G/S Rank:

G4T2S2

Range:

Nueces County

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Habitat includes sandy soils which are sufficiently moist to permit burrowing, it may inhabit isolated aeolian or alluvial sands along south Texas streams and rivers such as the Nueces and the Rio Grande in the

sand sheet belt of Kenedy and Brooks counties

Reasons for Concern:

Next to nothing is known about the Texas maritime pocket gopher.

Urbanization of the greater Corpus Christi metropolitan area would be a

palpable threat to the only known locality of this taxon.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify largest populations for monitoring population trends periodically; Develop a method of estimating population density and trends. Taxonomy

needs to be clarified.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring, early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Nucces County

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 m intervals or as the mounds may indicate activity and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. It may be necessary to also try running the traps during the day. Individuals will be trapped, identified, measured, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one trap set and left

over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Gopher live traps, bucket, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

4 Days; 2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD to assist in trapping these gophers.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Geomys personatus streckeri Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Carrizo Springs pocket gopher

G/S Rank:

G4T1S1

Range:

Dimmit County

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Habitat includes deep sandy soils, evidently absent from the silt loams of the flood plains of the Rio Grande or gravelly/stoney/ clayey soils (Davis 1974); uses roadsides. Pocket gopher activity apparent along roadside in areas of Antosa-Bobillo soil association in Dimmit County.

Reasons for Concern:

Next to nothing is known about the status of the Carrizo Springs pocket gopher and potential threats to its survival have not been determined. Another rare endemic whose life history, population dynamics and biology are poorly known. Much of the appropriate habitat for this species has been converted to agricultural land use. Because the species has been relegated to highway rights-of-ways, mortality from vehicular traffic is probably common. Species is considered destructive and control measures are often deemed necessary

Monitoring Objective:

Identify largest populations for monitoring population trends periodically: Develop a method of estimating population density and trends. Taxonomy needs to be clarified.

· Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring early summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Dimmit County

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 m intervals or as the mounds may indicate activity and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. It may be necessary to also try running the traps during the day. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one trap set and left

over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Gopher live traps, bucket, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

4 Days; 2 Staff

Reporting Procedure;

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Geomys texensis bakeri

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Frio pocket gopher

G/S Rank:

G3T2S2

Range:

Uvalde, Medina and Zavala Counties

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Habitat includes well drained soil consisting of sandy surface layers with loam extending to as deep as 2m. (Atco Soil Association)

Reasons for Concern:

Small isolated population vulnerable to land use changes

Monitoring Objective:

Identify largest populations for monitoring population trends periodically: Develop a method of estimating population density and trends. Taxonomy

needs to be clarified.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring, early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Uvalde County: sites to be selected: Medina County: sites to be selected:

Zavala County: sites to be selected.

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 m intervals or as the mounds may indicate activity and opened 1.5 hrs. before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. It may be necessary to also try running the traps during the day. Individuals will be trapped, identified, measured, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one trap set and left

over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Gopher live traps, bucket, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

4 Days; 2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Lee Elliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Myotis austroriparius

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

southeastern myotis

G/S Rank:

G4S3

Range:

Bowie, Hardin, Liberty, Newton, Panola and Tyler Counties (Orange, Harris,

Montgomery Counties have Public Health records, but identification not

confirmed)

Known Occurrences:

Known from six sites. Habitat includes historically, lowland pine and hardwood forests with large hollow trees; associated with ecological

communities near water.

Reasons for Concern:

Impacted by logging of bottomland hardwoods and by destruction of major cave roosting sites. This species is apparently declining over other parts of its

range.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population estimate/trends; Contact East Texas Public Health facilities for information on

locations of bats submitted for rabies testing.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring and early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

East Texas, sites to be selected

Methodology:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population estimate/trends; Contact East Texas Public Health facilities for information on

locations of bats submitted for rabies testing.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars, mist nets, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD and the USFS to assist in monitoring.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Myotis ciliolabrum

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

western small-footed myotis

G/S Rank:

G4S3

Range:

Trans Pecos region, county records include: Armstrong, Brewster, Culberson,

El Paso, Jeff Davis, Presidio, and Randall

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Habitat includes deserts, semi-deserts and mountains.

roosting in crevices and cracks

Reasons for Concern:

Little is known about this species, impacts of water degradation and pesticide

use would have an impact on this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends; Contact East Texas Public Health facilities for information on

locations of bats submitted for rabies testing.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, late Spring, early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

West Texas, sites to be selected.

Methodology:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends; Contact East Texas Public Health facilities for information on

locations of bats submitted for rabies testing.

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, Binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Days/Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Myotis lucifugus occultus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

occult or Arizona little brown myotis

G/S Rank: G5T3T4 SA

Range:

Species is known from only one specimen from Hudspeth County: species

considered migrant/accidental

Known Occurrences:

Known from one site.

Reasons for Concern:

There have been no recent records of the presence of these bats in Texas

Monitoring Objective:

Visit historical and current roost sites periodically to determine presence and

population estimate/trends.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hudspeth County

Methodology:

Visit historical and current roost sites periodically to determine presence and

population estimate/trends.

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work,

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Myotis evotis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

long-eared myotis

G/S Rank:

G5SX

Range:

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Little is known regarding this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annualiy

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Methodology:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3- 5 Days/Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline. TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD to monitor this species

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Myotis thysanodes

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

fringed myotis

G/S Rank:

G5S3

Range:

Trans-Pecos region, Brewster, Crosby, Culberson, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff.

Davis, Presidio Counties

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Ressons for Concern:

This cave dwelling species would be subject to cave and other roost site >

disturbances.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, late Spring, early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD-

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

West Texas, sites to be selected

Methodology:

Visit known sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends.

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species. Volunteers:

Combine searching for West Texas bat species under one effort.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Myotis velifer

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

cave myotis

G/S Rank:

GSS4

Range:

Occurs over most of western Texas, South Texas, eastern portions of the

panhandle and north-central Texas

Known Occurrences:

Known from three sites. It is a colonial, cave dwelling bat, occasionally found

roosting with other species of bats

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to cave and roosting disturbances.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends.

Priority:

1

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, late Spring, early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD,

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Volunteers:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Myotis volans

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank: .

Common Name:

long-legged myotis

G/S Rank:

G5S4

Range:

Brewster, Culberson, Jeff Davis, Knox, and Presidio Counties

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Found primarily in the Trans-Pecos region in high, open

woods and mountainous terrain. They prefer cliff crevices, hollow trees and

buildings over caves.

Reasons for Concern:

Little is known about this species in Texas

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, late Spring, early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends.

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work,

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service.

Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Andy Price

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fa

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Myotis yumanensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Yuma myotis

G/S Rank:

G5S4

Range:

Occurs in southern Trans-Pecos ant the Rio Grande Valley. County records

include Brewster, El Paso, Jeff Davis, Pecos, Presidio, Starr and Val Verde

Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Prefers lowland habitats, roosting in caves, abandoned

mine tunnels and buildings

Reasons for Concern:

Little is known about this species of bat.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends

Priority:

1

LOW PRIORITY .

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, late Spring, early Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Visit known roost sites periodically to determine presence and population

estimate/trends

Field Equipment Needed: Mist nets, gloves, binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 - 7 Days/Nights/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD and Big Bend National Park to monitor

this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Coordinate with other bat survey work in the regions.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Ondatra zibethicus ripensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Pecos River muskrat

G/S Rank:

G5T3? S2S3?

Range:

Found along the Pecos River and its tributaries. County records include El

Paso, Hudspeth, Pecos, Reeves and Val Verde Counties

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction, pesticide run-off from agriculture practices all impact this

species as well as changes in desert riparian systems.

Monitoring Objective:

None at this time, need to relocate sites

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually in late autumn to winter (Sept - March)

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos River

Methodology:

Once a population is located, count mounds and or live trap and tag for mark

and recapture population estimates.

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, binoculars

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Days/2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection. provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service. Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Danny Sweptston, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Oryzomys couesi aquaticus

Caudidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Coues' rice rat

G/S Rank:

G5T3? S2

Range:

Coastal South Texas; recorded from Cameron, Hidalgo, Kenedy, Starr and

Willacy Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites. Prefers cattail-bulrush marshes and aquatic, grassy zones

near resacas.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction perhaps due to localized overgrazing, conversion to

agriculture, urbanization and channelization of existing water courses.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify largest populations for monitoring population trends periodically;

Develop a method of estimating population density and trends.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hidalgo County:

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 2 - 4 m intervals and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap

nights (a trap night is one trap set and left over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, buckets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data

collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Lee Elliott, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the TPWD personnel from Valley.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fali 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Peromyscus truei comanche

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Palo Duro mouse

G/S Rank:

G5T3 S2

Range:

Armstrong, Briscoe, and Randall Counties. Escarpment of the Liano

Estacado, rocky slopes with juniper, brush and short grasses

Known Occurrences:

Known from Palo Duro and Caprock Canyon State Parks; Tule, South Ceta, Palo Duro, and Los Lingos Canyons, private property near the towns of

Claude, Canyon, Wayside, Tulia, Silverton, and Quitaque.

Reasons for Concern:

The Palo Duro mouse is an endemic that is restricted to a particular vegetation

type that may be subject to human alteration.

Monitoring Objective:

Map the preferred habitat (using GIS methods) and identify populations and

methods for a long-term periodical monitoring program, noting population

trends and demography

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially-three consecutive trap nights during each of four seasons

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Briscoe County: Caprock Canyons State Park; Randall County: Palo Duro State Park. There are several areas within both parks that contain potential

habitat

Methodology:

Four grids measuring at least one hectare each will be permanently established in prime habitat in each state park (e.g. a total of 8 grids). Traps will be placed in each grid at 10 m intervals and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. One of two levels of monitoring could be initiated. Level 1 addresses population trends, individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one trap set and left over night). Level 2 addresses demographic trends where individuals trapped will be permanently marked with microchip transponders, and data collected will include weight, age, and reproductive condition. Population densities can be estimated using a mark/recapture population model which may also provide survivorship and reproductive estimates. Level 2 will be initiated based on availability of funding to obtain the more expensive equipment.

Field Equipment:

Level 1: Sherman live-traps (400 for each park), mixed seed bait, capture bag, gloves, identification field guides,

flagging

Level 2: Same as Level 1 but also including microchip transponders, transponder receiver, weighing scales, ruler/calipers

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 nights/season; 2 staff for each Park

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days

upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

Data will be collected for 4 years to obtain an average abundance index. In subsequent years, a 50% decrease in the average annual population index (Level 1) or density (Level 2) for 2 consecutive years will be considered significant. If Level 2 monitoring has been conducted, the demographic data will also be used to assess the significance of the decline. If the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Clyde Jones, Texas Tech University; Richard Manning - Southwest Texas State

University

Recommendations

Potential use

1

of Volunteers:

Because identifying rodent species with similar morphology will require extensive

training, it would be best to use of volunteers who are willing to commit

themselves to a minimum of one year. However, short term volunteers could help experienced staff/volunteers on a limited bases by opening and checking traps.

which would reduce overall field time.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fali 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Scalopus aquaticus texanus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Presidio mole

G/S Rank:

GST1Q S1

Range:

Presidio County, found in moist loamy or sandy soils; maybe the alluvial soils

associated with the Rio Grande or at high elevations

Known Occurrences:

Known from one site.

Reasons for Concern:

The Presidio mole apparently has a narrowly restricted range in Texas, its biology, ecology and natural history are poorly known and specific potential

threats to its survival have not been precisely identified.

Monitoring Objective:

Map site location if other individuals are captured and reported.

Priority:

ď

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Presidio County:

Methodology:

Map site location if other individuals are captured and reported.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations: Work with the regional personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Sigmodon ochrognathus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

vellow-nosed cotton rat

G/S Rank:

G5S3

Range:

Brewster, Jeff Davis and Presidio counties; mostly captured at BBNP in the Chisos (Laguna Meadows). Found on dry rocky slopes of oak-pinyon-junipers and highland meadows of the desert southwest at elevations ranging from

1500-2500 meters.

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Restricted range makes this species vulnerable to changing land use practices.

especially overgrazing.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify two or three populations in Big Bend National Park and periodically

estimate population size to determine trends.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park

Methodology:

Identify two or three populations in Big Bend National Park and periodically estimate population size to determine trends. Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 m intervals and opened 1.5 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one

trap set and left over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, buckets, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations: Work with the personnel from Big Bend National Park to ensure continuous

monitoring of this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Spilogale putorius interrupta

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Plains spotted skunk

G/S Rank:

G5T5 S3

Range:

East of the Balcones Escarpment and westward through north-central Texas to the Panhandle as far south as Garza County. Found in wooded areas and tallgrass prairies, preferring rocky canyons and outcrops when such sites are

available

Known Occurrences:

Known from three sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Direct and indirect pesticide poisoning; loss of habitat due to changing farming practices; competition from other insectivores (armadillos, striped skunks); predation from increasing populations of predators (great horned

owls, coyotes, bobcats).

Monitoring Objective:

Identify populations in different regions of its range and develop methods for

monitoring.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Identify populations in different regions of its range and develop methods for

monitoring.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service

should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744, and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Homer, TPWD; Jerry Dragoo, TAMU

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from the Wildlife Division within TPWD to monitor

this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Sylvilagus fioridanus robustus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Davis Mountains cottontail

G/S Rank:

G5T3 S3

Range:

West Texas including Culberson, Brewster, Jeff Davis, Pecos, Presidio, and Terrell Counties. Occurs in pinyon-oak-juniper and pine-fir associations from

1400-2400m elevation.

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Restricted range makes this species vulnerable to changing land use practices. Although historically populations were probably never very large, some grazing and brush clearing practices in the area may contribute to its rarity

Monitoring Objective:

Identify populations within Guadalupe Mountain National Park, Big Bend

National Park and Davis Mountains State Park to determine periodic

population estimates and trends. Verify taxonomy.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, late spring, early summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park; Culberson County: Guadalupe

Mountain National Park, Jeff Davis County: Davis Mountains State Park

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 5 m intervals and opened 2 hrs before sunset and checked 1 hr after sunrise the next morning. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a

trap night is one trap set and left over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, bags, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days at each site/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from

one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations: Work with the personnel from TPWD and the National Park system to monitor

the different populations of this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Tamias canipes

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

gray-footed chipmunk

G/S Rank:

G3S2S3

Range:

Culberson County; Sierra Diablo and Guadalupe Mountains. Found at high elevations (1800-2500m), forest-dwelling occurring in dense stands of mixed timber and on brushy hillsides with rock crevices or downed logs along forest

edges.

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Restricted range and ecological requirements make this species vulnerable to

land use changes and overgrazing.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify populations within Guadalupe Mountain National Park and determine

periodic population estimates and trends.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Guadalupe Mountains National Park and the Sierra

Diablo Wildlife Management Area

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid

at 3 - 5 m intervals and run during the day. Individuals will be trapped.

identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures

per 100 trap nights (a trap night is one trap set and left over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, buckets, bags, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive

1075 Revised 3/96

appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD and the National Park Service to

monitor this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Thomomys bottae guadalupensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Guadalupe southern pocket gopher

G/S Rank:

G5T2 S2

Range:

Culberson County. Found at 1,400-2,500m elevations in shallow, rocky soil of

the Guadalupe Mtns, often associated with lechuguilla, its preferred food plant.

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

This pocket gopher is dependent on its preferred food of Agave lechuguilla and is thus would be sensitive to the adverse effects of overgrazing, conversion of rangeland to improved pastures and agriculture and to trapping and

poisoning control efforts.

Monitoring Objective:

Periodically monitor population trends within Guadalupe National Park. Develop a method of estimating population density and trends. Verify

taxonomy.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 - 5 m intervals. It may be necessary to try running the traps at night as well as during the day. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a

trap night is one trap set and left over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, buckets, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service

should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Homer, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD and the National Park system to monitor

this species...

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Thomomys bottae limpiae

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Limpia southern pocket gopher

G/S Rank:

G5T2 S2

Range:

Jeff Davis County. Found at 5000 feet and above in juniper and yellow-pine belts of the Davis Mountains, in the transition zone, and in at least the upper

edge of the Sonoran desert region

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Endemic with a narrowly restricted range that is not under any form of special protection, of possible competition with the Yellow-faced pocket gopher (Cratogeomys castanops); changes in plant community conditions may have occurred that would be more favorable to the Yellow-faced pocket gopher.

1.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify largest populations for monitoring population trends periodically.

Develop a method of estimating population density and trends.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 - 5 m intervals. It may be necessary to try running the traps at night as well as during the day. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a

trap night is one trap set and left over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, buckets, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Homer, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from the regional TPWD office.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Thomomys bottae texensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Limpia Creek pocket gopher G/S Rank:

G5T2 S2

Range:

Jeff Davis County. Found at 5000 feet and above in juniper and yellow-pine belts of the Davis Mountains, in the transition zone, and in at least the upper

edge of the Sonoran desert region

Known Occurrences:

Known from 0 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Endemic with a narrowly restricted range that is not under any form of special protection; of possible competition with the yellow-faced pocket gopher (Cratogeomys castanops); grazing levels, may have caused changes in the environment leading to plant community conditions which may be more

favorable to the yellow-faced pocket gopher.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify largest populations for monitoring population trends periodically. Develop a method of estimating population density and trends. Verify

taxonomy.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season;

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County:

Methodology:

Set up a grid trapping system with live traps. Traps will be placed in each grid at 3 - 5 m intervals. It may be necessary to try running the traps at night as well as during the day. Individuals will be trapped, identified, then promptly released at the site of capture. Data collected will be a population index of relative abundance consisting of the number of captures per 100 trap nights (a

trap night is one trap set and left over night).

Field Equipment Needed: Live traps, buckets, gloves

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 - 5 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from

one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank

Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with TPWD personnel from the region to monitor the gophers.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Vulpes velox

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

swift fox

G/S Rank:

G5 S4

Range:

Western 1/3 of state, east to Menard County. Found in open deserts or

grasslands; sparsely vegetated habitats.

Known Occurrences:

Known from 45 sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Population numbers have declined due to predator control efforts including trapping, poisoning and shooting aimed principally at other targets such as coyotes and wolves. Though their fur pelts are not highly prized, declines

may also be due to adverse land use practices.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify and map areas with existing populations and periodically estimate

numbers.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan: 1

Site Description:

Sites to be selected

Methodology:

Through spot-light census, estimate the population numbers.

Field Equipment Needed: Spot-lights

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

10 - 20 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service

should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or

define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, Peggy Horner, Kevin Mote, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from the Animal Damage Control to help gather

information and data.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Vulpes velox macrotis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

kit fox

G/S Rank:

G5T5 S4

Range:

Western 1/3 of state, east to Menard County. Found in open deserts or

grasslands; sparsely vegetated habitats.

Known Occurrences:

Known from XX sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Population numbers have declined due to predator control efforts including trapping, poisoning and shooting aimed principally at other targets such as coyotes and wolves. Though their fur pelts are not highly prized, declines may

also be due to adverse land use practices.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify and map areas with existing populations and periodically estimate

numbers.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Methodology:

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Vulpes velox velox

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

swift fox

G/S Rank:

G5T5T4 S3?

Range:

Western 1/3 of state, east to Menard County. Found in open deserts or

grasslands; sparsely vegetated habitats.

Known Occurrences:

Known from XX sites.

Reasons for Concern:

Population numbers have declined due to predator control efforts including trapping, poisoning and shooting aimed principally at other targets such as coyotes and wolves. Though their fur pelts are not highly prized, declines

may also be due to adverse land use practices.

Monitoring Objective:

Identify and map areas with existing populations and periodically estimate

numbers.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Methodology:

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60

days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one sampling year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service

should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or

define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD;

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Fall 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Appendix I:

MONITORING PLANS FOR EIGHTEEN SPECIES OF

MOLLUSKS

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USPWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
MOLLUSKS			
Ashmunella pasonis PRANKLIN MOUNTAIN WOOD SNAIL	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Assimines peros PECOS ASSIMINEA SNAIL	G2 S1 C1		MEDIUM
Cochliopa texana PHANTOM CAVE SNAIL	G1 \$1 C2	несн	нісн
Disconaias salinsensis SALINA MUCKET	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Euchemotrema cheatumi PALMETFO PILL SNAIL	G1 S1 C2		нісн
Fontelicella davisi DAVIS SPRING SNAIL	G1 Si C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Fontelicella metcalfi METCALF SPRING SNAIL	G1 S1 C2	нісн	нтен
Phreatodrobia imitata MIMIC CAVE SNAIL	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Połygyra hippocrepis HORSESHOE LIPTOOTH	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нібі
Popezaiss popei TEXAS HORNSHELL	G2 S2 C2		нісн
Potamilus amphichaenus TEXAS HEELSPLITTER	G1 \$1 C2	нісн	ЮGH
Quincuncina mitchelli FALSE SPIKE MUSSEL	G2 S2 C2	MEDIUM	НІСН
Sonorella metcalfi FRANKLIN MOUNTAIN TALUS SNAIL	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	ніск
Truncilla cogneta MEXICAN FAWNSFOOT MUSSEL	G1 S1 C2	MEDIUM	нісн
Tryonia adamantina DIAMOND Y SPRING SNAIL	Gi Si Ci	2	нісн
Tryonia brunei BRUNE SPRING SNAIL	G1 S1 C2	нісн	невн
Tryonia cheatumî PHANTOM LAKE TRYONIA	G1 S1 C2	ицси	HIGH
Tryonia stocktonensis GONZALES SPRING SNAIL	G1 S1 C1	2	нісн

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Scientific Name:

Pecos assiminea snail

Assiminea pecos

G/S Rank:

G2S1

Range:

Pecos County, Texas, Diamond Y Spring, and Chaves County, New Mexico, also Coahuila, Mexico. It is found at the damp margins of the Diamond Y Draw for about 1 mile downstream from the

Diamond Y Spring. This species is most consistently found on moist

earth or under organic debris beside seepage or spring brooks beneath salt grass or sedges. They are never found beside standing

water and only occasionally on exposed surfaces.

Known Occurrences:

This semi-aquatic snail is known only from, Diamond Y Spring, Pecos County Texas; Chaves County, New Mexico; and Coahuila, Mexico. It is found at the damp margins of the Diamond Y Draw for about 1 mile downstream from the Diamond Y Spring.

Reasons for Concern:

Restricted habitat, small population sizes and, reduced spring-flow. Habitats in the Leon Creek drainage are in an operational oil and gas field. Toxic run-off resulting from these operations represents a potentially serious threat to this species. Over pumping of groundwater resources resulting in diminished spring-flows are a

significant threat to this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Existing populations should be monitored at least every 2 years to

see if populations are declining, or should be monitored

immediately following any significant environmental disturbances

such as petroleum spills in Diamond Y Spring.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, anytime of the year

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos County: Diamond Y Spring

Methodology:

At-large collecting, may be able to do relative abundance and/or presence/absence. Ideally, re-sample Richard Fullington's sample reaches. Note dampness and flow. If there is a petro spill, monitor

immediately.

Field Equipment Needed: Rubber boots, sampling vials, labels, forceps, alcohol, hand-

held sieve

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2-3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Nature Conservancy to monitor this

species and the two Tryonia species (T. adamantina and T.

stocktonensis)

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TNC to assist in monitoring this

species (It will not be possible to utilize them in monitoring the

Tryonias, they are too minute).

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Disconaias salinasensis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Salina mucket mussel

G/S Rank:

· G1S1

Range:

Val Verde County, Texas, in the Del Rio area. This freshwater

mussel is known from the Rio Grande system and southward into

adjacent Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Living specimens were collected from the Rio Grande near Del Rio

in 1972. However, specific habitat characteristics are unknown.

Reasons for Concern:

Water quality degradation and other anthropogenic disturbances to

the Rio Grande and its tributaries are undoubtedly having a

negative impact on this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for species abundance once a status survey has been

completed.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Val Verde County: Del Rio area

Methodology:

Use of divers sampling the mud banks using Hookah tubes. Heart

of the Hills "Mussel team" already monitoring this species.

Field Equipment Needed: Diving equipment, hookah tubes, sampling bags

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any

population from one year to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; Bob Howells, Heart of the Hills Research

Station

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Heart of the Hills to continue this

monitoring.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

15 has 1995 | Berkel Colorer 1999

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Euchemotrema cheatumi

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Palmetto pill snail

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Gonzales County, Texas, Palmetto State Park,

Known Occurrences:

This snail is known only from the palmetto forest near the old CCC water tower at Palmetto State Park, Gonzales County, Texas. This is a terrestrial species that prefers damp areas among palmetto

fronds.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a limited range and small population size making it

vulnerable to extirpation from anthropogenic disturbances.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for the presence and absence of this species.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Bi- to Triennially, to minimize impact to this species

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Gonzales County: Palmetto State Park

Methodology:

A combination of at-large collecting and possibly establish line transects with 20 meter-square sample plots randomly distributed along the line transect, may not need to collect, merely note presence/absence. Monitor for any exotics that may be introduced.

Field Equipment Needed: Tape measures, rebar, flagging, square meter pvc

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 1 Day; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event

of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the State Park to assist monitoring this

species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

A good project for State Park volunteers to assist in monitoring this

species, very easy to identify after minimal training.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Fontelicella davisi

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Davis County springsnail

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

This species is associated with perennial springs and spring-runs stemming from the Trinity Aquifer. It seems to prefer a pool-falls sequence tumbling among boulders with a soft mud over gravel bottom. This species is found among vegetation, often associated

with Pisidium casertanum.

Known Occurrences:

This hydrobioid snail is known only from tributary of Limpia Creek, and a spring near Spring Mountain, Jeff Davis County, Texas. It is

located on private property, access is needed.

Reasons for Concern:

Reductions in quantity and quality of habitat due to depleted

groundwater resources and the restricted range of this species make

it vulnerable to extirpation.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for presence and absence of this species. Access is needed.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: Limpia Creek

Methodology:

On private property, access will be difficult to obtain. Note

presence/absence. Monitor habitat integrity.

Field Equipment Needed: Rubber boots

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2-3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level.

Li Jan. 1995 Berlini Grader 1985

more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD to monitor this species

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly enlist the landowner to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Fontelicella metcalfi

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Presidio County spring snail

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

This species inhabits the outflow of Naegele Spring in fine mud

among dense beds of watercress. It often is associated with

Pisidium casertanum and Physella mexicana.

Known Occurrences:

This snail is known only from Naegele Springs, 5.3 miles north

northwest of Ruidosa, Presidio County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a highly restricted distribution making it particularly

vulnerable to extirpation.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for presence and absence of this species. Monitor overall

water quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Presidio County: Naegele Springs

Methodology:

Monitor water and habitat quality, watch for exotics. Note

presence/absence

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level, more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from

one sampling period to the next may be considered

15 June 1995 - Review Granter 1995

significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD to monitor this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Phreatodrobia imitata

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Mimic cavesnail

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Bexar County. This snail is restricted to subterranean and

immediate surface waters of the Edwards Aquifer. Specific habitat

requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

This species is known only from Verstraeten Well and O. R.

Mitchell Well stemming from the Edwards Aquifer in the Van Ormy

Section of Bexar County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are the de-watering of the

Edwards Aquifer and possible contamination of groundwater from

non-point sources.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor well discharge, note presence and absence during different

flow regimes.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bexar County: Edwards Aquifer

Methodology:

Monitor well discharge, note presence/absence during different flow

regimes. Sample for species at other springs.

Field Equipment Needed: Ultra-fine drift nets, vials, labels, alcohol, forceps

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 1 - 2 Days; 1 - 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level,

more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline

15 June 1995 Berlind, Outdoor 1995 information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Bexar County to monitor this species. This species is very tiny, will need an ultra fine drift net to sample.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Volunteers are not likely able to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Polygyra hippocrepsis

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Horseshoe liptooth

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Comal County, in the vicinity of New Braunfels, Comal County, Texas. The specific habitat requirements of this terrestrial snail are unknown. However, some specimens have been collected under

rotting logs and bark.

Known Occurrences:

This snail is known only from two habitats in the vicinity of New Braunfels, Comal County, Texas. One location is at Landa Park near the springs and the other is approximately 5 mi north of this

location.

Reasons for Concern:

This species has a highly restricted distribution and it is considered

to be extremely rare.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for relative abundance along transect lines within an

established sampling plot.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually/fall, after rains

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Comal County: New Braunfels

Methodology:

Possibly set-up a permanent line transect, from that randomly select

line intersects and sample for relative abundance along those lines.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tape, compass, random numbers table, metal tags,

pin flags

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 Day; 1 - 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in either of the two populations from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg. Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Jane Deisler-Seno, Corpus Christi Museum

of Science & History

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the City of New Braunfels to monitor this

species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Popenaias popei

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas hornshell mussel

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Eddy County, New Mexico, Val Verde County, Texas, and Mexico. The Rio Grande and its tributaries are the general habitat for this species, but specific habitat requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences: '

This species occurs no further north than the Rio Grande drainage. It appears to be rare and restricted to the upper portions of the Rio Grande drainage in Texas and Mexico from the Pecos River to Falcon Breaks. Populations in the New Mexico portion of the Rio Grande may be extinct. In the late 1980s, fresh looking shells were found in the Black River, Eddy County, New Mexico. This species is quite rare in the lower Rio Grande. Modern records of living specimens of this species in the Rio Grande are restricted to reaches below Falcon Dam. Specimens collected from near the Brownsville area are in collections of the Corpus Christi Museum.

Reasons for Concern:

the Rio Grande and its tributaries are undoubtedly having a negative impact on this species. A population at Fort Clark Springs, Las Moras Creek, near Brackettville, Kinney County, has disappeared due to the removal of aquatic vegetation. The native bivalve fauna of the lower portion of the Rio Grande have generally been affected by river impoundment, agricultural redistribution of water and water pollution. Use of propiconazole, a fungicide may have serious impacts on this species.

Water quality degradation and other anthropogenic disturbances to

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for presence and absence of this species. Monitor overall

water quality.

Priority:

1

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually,

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Val Verde County: along the Rio Grande

13 June 1995 - Review Outputs 1995

Methodology:

Follow the methodology of the mussel team

Field Equipment Needed: Scuba gear, collecting equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Jane Deisler-Seno, Corpus Christi Museum

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Potamilus amphichaenus

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Texas heelsplitter mussel

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Sabine River Drainage. Large rivers of the Gulf Coastal Plain of Texas and Louisiana are the only known habitats for this species,

but specific habitat requirements are unknown.

Known Occurrences:

The Texas heelsplitter appears to occur in Texas only in the Sabine River drainage, although there are unverified reports of this taxon in

the Brazos River. It also has been collected from western Louisiana. Only two living specimens of this species have been

found in the past 15 years.

Reasons for Concern:

General degradation of water quality in known habitats likely is

having a negative effect on this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Determine the presence/absence of this species along sample areas.

Monitor water quality and surrounding habitat quality.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sabine River Drainage

Methodology:

Monitor for presence/absence, water quality and surrounding

habitat quality. The taxonomy needs to be verified.

Field Equipment Needed: Diving equipment,

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1-2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

15 June 1995 Revised October 1995

presence from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD to monitor this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Quincuncina mitchelli

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

False spike mussel

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Historic records for this species include several river systems in Central Texas. However, the specific distribution is unknown.

Known Occurrences:

Streams in central Texas are the preferred habitat, but specific

habitat requirements are unknown.

Reasons for Concern:

De-watering of regional aquifers threaten stream flows, and other

anthropogenic disturbances place this species at risk of being

extirpated.

Monitoring Objective:

Visit historic locations and search for the species, once found monitor for presence and absence. There are some taxonomic uncertainties associated with this species, including its relationship

to several other taxa, that must be resolved.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY - Need to relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Central Texas Rivers

Methodology:

Search for this species at historic locations, it may be extinct

already. If found, note presence and absence,

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2-3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted

presence from one sampling period to the next may be

15 3---- 1905 Regional Contrainer \$5005 considered significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD to look for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

13 June 1995 - Bardanii Chalder, (1995

į

Scientific Name:

Truncilla cognata

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Mexican fawnsfoot mussel

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

The Mexican fawnsfoot mussel belongs to the Rio Grande

biogeographical subprovince and occurs no further north than the

Rio Grande drainage. The species also occurs in Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Streams are the preferred habitat, but specific habitat requirements

are unknown.

Reasons for Concern:

This endemic fresh water bivalve appears to be very rare and has a

restricted distribution. Numerous anthropogenic disturbances to its

habitats place it at risk of being extirpated.

Monitoring Objective:

Monitor for population stability according to the protocols of the

Mussel Team.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Streams in the Rio Grande Drainage

Methodology:

The massel team is currently monitoring this species. Monitor

according to the methodology of the Mussel Team.

Field Equipment Needed: Scuba equipment

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in any

of the populations from one sampling period to the next may be considered significant dependent on the species. In the

15 June 1995 Revised Outster 1995

event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Bowles, TPWD; Bob Howells, Heart of the Hills

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD to monitor this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Trvonia adamantina

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Diamond Y Spring snail

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Pecos County, Texas. This species prefers localized seepage with no surface-water connection to the main stream. The characteristic habitat is muddy areas among sedges and cattails in more rapidly

moving segments of the creek.

Known Occurrences:

This snail is found only known from the head of Diamond Y Spring downstream for about 1 mile, in Diamond Y Draw, in the lowest course of the Leon Creek tributary., Pecos County, Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are its restricted habitat, and small population size. The Leon Creek drainage is in an operational oil and gas field. Toxic run-off resulting from these operations represents a potentially serious threat to the biota of Diamond Y Spring. Dam building, stream alteration and the stocking of exotic fishes also may have detrimental effects.

Monitoring Objective:

Existing populations should be monitored at least every 2 years to see if populations are declining, or should be monitored immediately following any significant environmental disturbances such as petroleum spills in Diamond Y Spring. Monitor for any changes in habitat quality,

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos County: Diamond Y Spring

Methodology:

Monitor spring flow, ensuring no catastrophes, take core samples

every two years.

Field Equipment Needed: Core sampler

Berind, Colore 1995 15 Jan 1995

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level,

more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from

one sampling period to the next may be considered

significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

> Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; A status survey was completed for this

species in 1991; Richard Thorington.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Nature Conservancy to monitor water

quality and this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Not possible to utilize volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Tryonia stocktonensis

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Gonzales Spring snail

G/S Rank:

G1\$1

Range:

Pecos County. This species is most abundant in the soft mud along

the spring's margin. Only one other species of snail, Physella

mexicana, was found to be in association with the Gonzales Spring

snail.

Known Occurrences:

This snail is restricted to a single spring whose outflow is about 90 feet long, approximately 2 miles downstream from where <u>Tryonia</u>

adamantina is found in the Diamond Y Spring drainage.

Reasons for Concern:

The primary threats to this species are its restricted habitat, and small population size. Also, the Leon Creek drainage is in an operational oil and gas field. Toxic run-off resulting from these activities represent a potentially serious threat to the biota of Diamond Y Spring. Dam building, stream alteration and the stocking of exotic fishes also may have detrimental effects. Essentially the same concerns as those for the Diamond Y Spring

snail.

Monitoring Objective:

Existing populations should be monitored at least every 2 years to

see if populations are declining, or should be monitored

immediately following any significant environmental disturbances

such as petroleum spills in Diamond Y Spring,

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially,

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos County: Diamond Y Spring

Methodology:

Monitor water flow, note presence/absence of this species

Field Equipment Needed:

15 June 1995 - Bredeni Ostalar 1995

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2-3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: If the aquifer and/or spring-flow falls to a designated level,

more extensive monitoring should occur. After baseline information gathered, a decrease in the noted presence from

one sampling period to the next may be considered

significant. A closer look at the habitat quality should be addressed. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Bowles, TPWD; A status survey was completed in 1991

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TNC to assist in monitoring this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and TNC to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Appendix J:

MONITORING PLANS FOR ONE HUNDRED AND SIX SPECIES OF

PLANTS

*LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONTFORING PLANS * X = Plans have been completed

FLANS DONR	SOPRIFIC NAME	SPECUS	LIST PRI	PRESERVE	COMMEN OF OCCUPRIENCE
х	PIANIS Adeissathes crassifolis TEXAS TRUMPETS	0325 CZ	. 8	MEDIUM	Kinney, Maverick, Val Verde; Conhulla, Mer
	Agalinio muriculata AURICULATE PALSE POXGLOVE	G2SX C2	2	Other Region	Terrant (X-presumed extirpated); Al., AR. IA, II., IN, KS, MD, MI, MN, MO, MS, NJ, OH, OK, PA, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV
X	Agave glomeraliflora CHISOS AGAVE	G2Q S 2 C2	11	TOM	Browster, Culberson, Hudspeth; Controlla, Mex
	Agrimonia incina INCISED GROOVEBUR	G381 C2	204	TOM	Angelina, Jasper, Sabine; AL, FL, GA, MS, NC, SC
X	Amsonia tharpii THARP'S BLUE-STAR	G1S1 C2	11	HIGH	Pecos, NM
	Andrachne arida TRANS-PECOS MAIDENBUSH	G1S1 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Presidio, Brewster; Chihuahua and Coahuila, Mexico
X	Anemone edwardsiana yar. petraca EDGE PALLS ANEMONE	G3T1 \$1 C2	12	MEDIUM	Bandera, Kendali
X	Aquilegia chrysantha var hinckleyana HINCKLEY'S COLUMBINE	G4T1S1 C2	6 .	нтен.	Presidio
x	Aquilegia kongissima LONG SPUR COLUMBINE	G3S2 C2	\$1	row	Brewster, Jeff, Davis, Presidio, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuovo Leon, Mexico
X	Arenaria livermorensis LIVERMORE SANDWORT	G151 C2	5	MEDIUM	Jeff Davis
X	Argythsmnia aphoroides HELL COUNTRY WILD MERCURY	G252 C2	11	MEDIUM	Bianco, Comai, Gillespic, Hays (H), Kendall (H), Kerr, Menard, Mills (H), Tom Green, Uvalde
х	Asclepias prostrata PROSTRATE MILKWEED	G1S1 C2	- 8	10W	Starr, Zapata; Tamaulipas Mexico
	Aster lacvis var guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS ASTER	CST2QS1 C2	9	LOW	Cultierson City; NM
x	Aster poniceus sep elliottii var scabricaulis ROUGH-STEM ASTER	G5T1S1 Č1	3	MEDIUM	Anderson, Cherokee, Smith, Van Zandt, Wood
X	Astragalus mollissimus var marcidus WITHERED WOOLLY LOCO	G5T2S2 C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Dallam, Jeff Davis (H), Fresidio
x	Batesimalva violacea PURPLE GAY-MALLOW	G2 \$1 C2	8	MEDIUM	Brewster, Coahuila and Nuevo Leon, Mexico
X	Boorhavia mathisiana MATHIS SPIDERLING	G2 S1 C2	5	нісн	Live Oak, San Patricio; San Luis Potosi and Tamaulipas, Mexico
х	Honamia ovalifolia BIGPOD BONAMIA	G1S1 C2	В	HIGH	Brewster County; Coshuils, Mexico
x	Brickellia brachyphylia var hinekieyi HINCKLEY'S BRICKPLLBUSH	GST2 S2 C2	11	LOW	Brewster (H) and Jeff Davis
х	Brickellia brachyphylia var terlinguensis TERLINGUA BRICKELLBUSH	GSTH SH C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brewster (H) Hudepeth (H)
x	Brickellia viejensis SIERRA VIEJA BRICKELLBUSH	G1G2 S1S2 C2	11	LOW	Presidio
x	Brongniartia minutifolia LITTLB-LEAP BRONGNIARTIA	G2 S1 C2	13	MEDIÚM	Brewster County, Chihuahua, Mexico

-	Considerate Ameliana	1 1	-8	MEDIUM	Company (ID) Bell and (ID) Vinne
X	Caesalpinia brachyearpa BROADPOD RUSHPEA	G2 S2 C2		MEDICAL	Crockett (H), Edwards (H), Kinney, Liano (H), Sutton
	Carea hydina TISSUE SEDGE	G5Q 84 C2		LOW taxonomy %	Bowie, Brazoria, Cass, Dallas (H), Denton, Houston, Lamar, Liberty, Madison, Morris, Polk, Red River, and Walker, AR, MS and OK
X	Castilleja ciliata FRINGED PAINTBRUSH	GiQ Si C2	11	MEDIUM	Jeff Divis
X	Castilleja elongata TALL PAINTBRUSH	G1Q S1 C2	5	HIGH	Browster
	Cereus greagii var greggii DESERT NIGHT-BLOOMING CEREUS	G3T2S2 C2	9	Need to relocate	Brewster, El Paso, Hudspeth (H), Jeff Davis, Pecos (H), Presidio, Terrelli (H); AZ, NM; Chihushua, Coshulla, Durango, Zacatecas, Mexico
X	Chaetopappa hersheyi MAT LEASTDAISY	G2 S2 C2	11	row	Culberson, Hudspeth; NM
х	Chamacayon chaetocalyx var triligolata THREE-TONGUE SPURGE	GST1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Randall (?); Coahuila Mexico
X	Chamsesyce golondrina SWALLOW SPURGE	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Browster, Hudspeth, Presidio Counties; Chihushua and Coahuila, Mexico
	Chenopodium cycloides SANDHILL GOOSEFOOT	G4 S3 C2		LOW	Andrews, Crane, Culberson, El Paso, Jeff Davis, Jones, Kent, Loving, Ward, Winkler, CO, KS, and NM
X	Chloris tesensis TEXAS WINDMILL-GRASS	G2 \$2 C2	8	HIGH	Brazoria, Brazos (H) Chambers, Galveston, Harris, Hidalgo (?), Nucces, and Refugio
Х	Chrysothamnus nauscosus esp termisis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS RABBITBRUSH	G5772 S1 C2	12	MEDRIM	Culberson County, NM
	Cicome multiculis MANYSTEM SPIDERFLOWER	G3 S1 C2	Дå	Need to relocate	Presidio County; AZ, CO, NM, WY; Chihuahua, Durango, Jalisco, Michoaran, Mexico
X	Colubrina stricta COMAL, SNAKEWOOD	G2 S1 C2	. 11	нісн	Comal (?), El Paso, Uvalde; Coahuila and Nuevo Leon Mexico
x	Cosdelia booken var edwardsiana EDWARDS PLATEAU CAPUL NEGRO	GST1Q C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Biwards
X	Corcopsis intermedia GOLDEN WAVE TICKSEED	G3S3 C2	04	LOW Need to relocate	Anderson, Cars, Cherokee, Franklin, Freestone, Harris, Harrison, Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches (?), Trinity, Upshur, Wood (H); LA
X	Coryphantha albicolumnaria WHITE COLUMN	G2 S2 C2	2	TOM	Brewster, Pecos, Presidio; Chihuahua, Mexico
Х	Cosyphantha chaffeyi CHAFFEY'S CORY CACFUS	G2 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewiter; Coahuila, San Luis Potosi, Zacateras Mexico
х	Coryphantha daryacentha ver dasyacantha DENSE CORY CACTUS	G3T3 S2 C2	12	MEDIUM	Brewster, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, Pecos; NM(?); Chihuahua, Mexico
Х	Coryphantha duncanii DUNCAN'S CORY CACTUS	G3 S1 C2	11,	MEDIUM	Brewster, Presidio, NM
X	Coryphantha hesteri HESTER'S CORY CACTUS	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Brewster, Pecos, Terrell
	Coryphantha sukuta var nickeleiae NICKEL'S CORY CACTUS	G4172 SH C2	12	Need to relocate	Webb (H); Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, Mexico

(

{

v	Power and the second			MEDIUM	landomo Chamboo Booston
^	Crinegia wirneri WARNER'S HAWTHORN	G2O S2 C2	11	Need to	Anderson, Cherokee, Preestone,
	WARREN'S HAWIHORY	02/32/02		relocate	Franklin, Houston, Morris, Panola, Smith (H), Upshur, Walker, Wood
	Control of the suit of the sui	+ +			
X	Croton aiabamensis var texessis TEXABAMA CROTON	G3T1S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	Hell, Coryell, Travis
	Concuts attenuate MARSHELDER DODDER	G2 S2 C2	. 5	LOW	Cameron (H) Jackson (H) Liberty (H) Rains and Van Zandt; KS, OK
	Cyperus ceptulantinus GIANT SHARPSTEM UMBREILIA SEDGE	G2Q SH X2	na	Need to rejocate	Texas (H; county unknown); LA
х	Cyperus grayicides MORLENBROCK'S UMBRELLA SEDGE	G3G4 S3 C2	ná	LOW	Anderson, Angelina, Burleson, Colorado, Pranklin, Freestonc, Hardin, Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches, Newton, Robertson, Rusk, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Tyler, Upshur, Van Zandi, Wood; AR II., I.A, MO
X	Cyperus oberosus DUNE UMBRELLA SEDGE	G2 S2 C2	5	нісн	Andrews, Ward, Winkier
X	Cypripedium kentuckiense SOUTHERN LADY'S-SLIPPER	G3 S1 C2	60	High	Cass (?) Harrison, Nacogdoches, Newton (X), Sabine, and San Augustine; AL, AR, KY, LA, MS, OK, TN
X	Dalea bartonii COX'S DALEA	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Breweter
X	Dalea revertionii COMANCHE PEAK PRAIRIE- CLOVER	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Hood (X), Parker, Wise
х	Dalea sabinalis SABINAL PRAIRIE-CLOVER	G1 \$1 C2	8	LOW Need to relocate	Banders (H), Uvakie (H), and Val Verde
	Desmodium findheimeri LINDHEIMER'S TICKSEED	G4 \$1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Comal (?); Conhuita, Nuevo Leon, San Luis Potosi, Tamaulipas Mexico
X	Draba standicyi STANDLEY'S DRABA	G3 S1 C2	7	MEDIUM - LOW	Jeff Davis; AZ, NM; Conhuila, Mexico
Х	Echeandia (Anthericum) chandleri LILA DE LOS LLANOS	G3Se C2	8	TOM TOM	Cameron, Kleberg, Nueces; Coahuila, Mexico (?)
	Echinocereus chloranthus var neocapillus GOLDEN-SPINB HEDGEHOG CACTUS	G4T1 S1 C2	9	No Access	Browster, Presidio
X	Echinoczreus papillosus var angusticeps SMALL PAPILLOSUS	G3T1 C2	3	HIGH Need to relocate	Hidalgo (H), Jim Hogg (?), Starr
	Eleocharis brachycarpa SHORT-PRUTTED SPIKESEDGE	G1 SH C2		Need to relocate	South coastal Texas (H); (county unknown); Tamaulipes, Mexico
Х	Eleocharis cylindrics CYLINDER SPIKESEDGE	G1 S1 C2	2	LOW Need to relocate	Lubbock (H), Presidio
	Eleocharis wolfii WOLP'S SPEKESEDGE	G4GS S1 C2		Low	Jefferson; AL, CO, IA, IL, IN, ES, LA, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, OK, TN, WI; Alberta and Saskatchewan, Canada
Х	Erigeron mimegletes SONORA PLEABANE	G2 S2 C2	8 .	MEDIUM	Browster (H), Crockett (H) Edwards (H), Kerr, Real, Schleicher, Sutton, Uvalde, Vel Verde (H); Coahuila, Mexico
X	Eriocavion koemickianum SMALL-HEADED PIPEWORT	G2G3 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM - HIGH	Anderson, Brazos, Limestone, Leon (?), Tyler (H); AR, GA, OK

:

(

v	The same of the standard of th		- 44	LOW	Proceedings of the second
X	Eriogonum suffruticosum BUSHY WILD BUCKWHEAT	G2 S2 C2	11	IXVW	Brewster, Pecos, Presidio
X	Bacobaria guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS PINCUSHION CACTUS	G1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Culberson; NM
×	Postuca ligulata GUADALUPE PESCUE	G1 S1 C1	-8	нюн	Brewster, Culberson; Coshvila, Mexico
:	Porsellesia tenensis TEXAS GREASE BUSH	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Uvaide and Val Verde (H)
X	Fryxellia pygmaea SMALL FRYXELL WORT	G1 SH C2	10	Need to relocate	west Texas (H; county unknown);Coahulls, Mexico
X	Gaillardia aestivalis var winkleri WHITE PIREWHEEL	GST1 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM Need to relocate	Hardin
x	Gelium corellii CLIFF BEDSTRAW	G2 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Val Verde; Coahuila, Mexico
Х	Genistidium dumorum BRUSH-PEA	G1 S1C2	10	MEDIUM - HIGH	Browster, Conhulla, Mexico
	Hedcoma pilosem OLD BLUE PENNYROYAL	GH SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Browster (H)
	Hedyotis butterwickiae MARY'S BLUET	G1 S1 C2	. 11	Need to relocate	Brewster
Х	Helianthus paradoxus PUZZLE SUNFLOWER	G1S1 C1	2	нісн	Peoos, Reeves; NM
х	Helianthus praecon usp hirtus DIMMIT SUNFLOWER	GST1OS1 C2	•	нидн	Dimmit and Zapata (M)
X	Hexalectris nitida GLASS MOUNTAIN CORAL-ROOT	ය ස ය	11	row	Bandera, Brewster, Comal, Coryell, Dallas, Hays, Kendall, Peccs (H), Taylor, Travis; NM Coshulla, Mexico
х	Hexalectris revoluta CHISOS CORAL-ROOT	G1 S1 C2	31	LOW	Brewster, Culberson; Nuevo Leon, San Luis Potosi, Mexico
x	Hezaketris warsockii WARNOCK'S CORAL-ROOT	63 23 C3	?	LOW	Browster, Dallas, Gillespie, Hays, Jeff Davis (H), Taylor, Terrell; AZ, NM
x	Hibiscus dasyculys NECHES RIVER ROSE-MALLOW	G1 S1 C2	2	нісн	Cherokee, Harrison, Houston, Trinity
Х	Isocres lithophila ROCK QUILLWORT	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Burnet, Liano, Mason
X .	Justicia rugyonii RUNYON'S WATER-WILLOW	G2S2 C2	. 8	LOW	Brazoria (?), Cameron, Goliad (?), Hidalgo; Tamaulipas, Mexico
x	Justicia wrightii WRIGHT'S WATER-WILLOW	G2 S2 C2	\$	Need to relocate	Brewster (H) Perce, Val Verde; NM (?)
x	Kalktroemia perennans PERENNIAL CALTROP	Gi Si C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Prosidio, Val Verde
x	Lachnocaulon digynum TINY BOG BUTTONS	G3 S1 C2	na.	MEDIUM	Jasper, Newton; AL, PL, LA, MS
Х	Lesvenworthia texana TEXAS GOLDEN GLADE CRESS	G1 \$1 C2	. 2	нісн	Nacogdoches (I), Sabine, San Augustine
	Lechéa mentalis CHISOS PINWEED	G1Q S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Coahulla, Mexico
	Leitneria floridana CORKWOOD	G3G4 S1 C2		LOW	Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Jefferson; AL, AR, FL, GA, LA, MO
х	Lepidospartum burgessii GYPSUM SCALEBROOM	G2 S1 C2	. 8	MEDIUM	Hudspeth; NM

ŗ

:

:

X	Lesquerella thamnophila		2	HIGH	Starr, Zapata
L	ZAPATA BLADDERPOD	G1 S1 C2			
Х	Liatris tenuis SLENDER GAY-FEATHER	G2G3 S2S3 C2	8	MEDIUM	Angelina, Hardin, Jasper, Newton, Orange, Sabine, San Augustine, Tyler, LA (?)
X	Lycium teannum TEXAS WOLF-BERRY	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth
X	Machacramiticus aures HOUSTON MACHAERANTHERA	G2 S2 C2	2	нісн	Galveston, Harris
X	Manfreda longiflora ST. JOSEPH'S STAFF	G2 S2 C2	5	MEDIUM	Camezon (H), Hidaigo, Starr; Tamaulipas, Mexico
X	Matrika radiata FALFURRIAS ANGLEPOD (MILKVINE)	G1S1 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brooks (H), Hidalgo (H), Starr (?)
X	Matrica tesensis TEXAS MILKVINE	G1 S1 C2	8	HIGH	Brewster
X	Mirabilis collina SANDHILL FOUR-O'CLOCK	G2QS2 C2	11	3B	Anderson. Austin (?), Cherokee (H), Lamar(?). Morris(?), Red River (?), San Augustine(?), Smith, Waller (?), Wood
X	Notina arenicola SAND SACAHUISTA	G2Q S2 C2	i1 	MEDIUM	Culberson, El Paso (?) and Hudspeth
	Oenothera pilosella ssp sessilis GRAND PRAIRIE EVENING PRIMROSE	GST2 SH C2	na	Need to rejocate	Galveston (H); AR, LA
X	Opunia arenaria SAND PRICKLY-PEAR	G2 S2 C2	2	нібн	El Paso, Hudspeth (H); NM; Chihuahus, Mexico
X	Opuntia aurtiupina GOLDEN-SPINE PRICKLY-PEAR	G1 S1 C2	11	МЕДІЛМ	Brewster
X	Opuntia engelmannii var flexospina PEW-SPINE ENGELMANN'S PRICKLY-PEAR	G5T1 S1 C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Starr, Webb (H), Zapata
X	Opuntia imbricata var argentea SULVER CHOLLA	GST1 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM	Bicmster
X	Osmorhiza mericana asp bipatriata LIVERMORE SWEET-CICELY	G4T1 S1 C2	12	Need to relocate	Jeff Davis; Coahuila, Nocvo Leon, Mexico
X	Ostrya chisosensis BIG BEND HOP-HORNBEAM	G2S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Browster, northern Mexico
х	Oxypolis ternata THREELEAP COWBANE	G3? \$1 C2		MEDEUM	Hardin, Tyler (?); FL, GA, MS, NC, SC
X	Paronychia congesta BUSHY WHITLOW-WORT	G1 \$1 C2	i 1	нісн	in Hogg
	Paronychia maccartii MCCART'S WHITLOW-WORT	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Webb
X	Peronychia wilkinsonii WILKINSON'S WHITLOW- WORT	G2 S7 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Chihvahua, Coahuila, Mexico
	Pediocectus papyracinthus PAPER-SPINED CACTUS	G2G3S1 C2	8	Need to relocate	Hudspeth; AZ, NM
X	Pediomelum humile RYDBERG'S SCURFPEA	G2 S1 C2	11	нісн	Val Verde; Coahuila, Mexico
	Pediomehim pentaphyllum THREE-NÊRVE SCURFPEA	G1SH C2	5	Need to relocate	Presidio (H); NM (H); Chihushua, Mexico
Х	Penstemon slamosensis ALAMO BEARD TONGUE	G2 S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	El Paso; NM

{

	American Mineral Mineral	· i	12	Need to	Description Brance
x	Pentyle bisetosa var bisetosa TWO-BRISTLE ROCK-DAISY	GZT1 S1 C2	12	relocate	Brewster, Pecos
	Perityle binetona var acalaris STAIRSTEP TWO-BRISTLE ROCK- DAISY	G2T1 St C2	12	TOM	Brewster
X	Perityle huecoccuis HUECO ROCK-DAISY	GISI C2	5	HIGH	EG Paso
X	Perityle vitreomontana GLASS MOUNTAINS ROCK-DAISY	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster
	Perityle warnockii WARNOCK's RIVER ROCK-DAISY	G1\$1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Vel Verde
	Phacelia pallida PALE PHACELIA	G2S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Chihushus, Coshuila Mexico
x	Philadelphus emestii CANYON MOCK-ORANGE	G2S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Blanco, Comal, Hays, Kendall, Travis
x	Phyllanthus cricoides HEATHER LEAP-FLOWER	G2 S1 C2	j 1	LOW	Brewster, Terrell; Coshulla, Mexico
	Physostegia correllii CORRELL'S FALSE DRAGON-HEAD	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Bexar (H) Galveston, Montgomery (H), Travis, Vai Verde, Zapata; LA; Conhuita, Durango, Nuevo Leon, and Sonora, Mexico
X	Physostegia longisepala LONG-SEPALED FALSE DRAGON- HEAD	දෙදය ක ය	O.A.	LOW	Hardin, Jasper, Newton, Orange, Tyler, LA
	Pos strictizames DESERT MOUNTAINS BLUE GRASS	G3 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Browster, Chihuzhur, Coahuila Durango, Nuevo Leon, Zacatecas, Mexico
X	Polemonium pauciflorum sep hinckleyi HINCKLEY'S JACOB'S LADDER	G3 T1Q C2	12	нісн	Jeff Davis; AZ, Chihuahna Mexico
	Polygaia manaviliasensis MARAVELLAS MILKWORT	G2S1 C2	11	TOM	Browster, Terreil; Coahuila, Mexico
х	Presenthes barbata BARBED RATTLESNAKE-ROOT	G382 C2	na na	TOM	Cass, Cherokee, Hardin, Jasper, Nacogdoches, Newton, Polk, Rusk, San Augustine, Shelby, AL, AR, GA, KY, LA, TN
X	Proboscidea spicata MANY-PLOWERED UNICORN- PLANT	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Jeff Davis, Presidio; Conhuita, Mexico
х	Prilactis beterocups WELDER MACHAERANTHERA	G2 S2 C2		MEDIUM -	Nueces, Kleberg, Refugio, San Patricio, and Victoria
	Quereus boyntonii BOYNTON'S OAK	GHQ SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Angelina (H); AL (H)
x	Quercus graciliformis CHISOS OAK	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster
	Querous tardifolia LATELEAF OAK	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster
х	Rudbeckia scabrifolia BOG CONEFLOWER	G2S2 C2	2	MEDIUM - HIGH	Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine, : Shelby, LA
X	Salvia penatemonoides BIG RED SAGE	G1G2 S1S2 C2	2	HÌCH	Bandera, Bezar (H), Gillespie (H), Guadalupe (H), Kendall, Kerr, Real, Travis (I), Wilson (H)
	Scirpus ballii HALL'S BULRUSH	GSOSS CS	TAA .	Need to relocate	Texas (county unknown); AL, GA, IA, IL, IN, KY, MA, MI, MO, NE, SC, WI

(

T	Soutellaria Jacvis	1	1.1		C. D
	SMOOTH STEM SKULLCAP	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Culberson, Hudspeth
	Scutellaria thierezii THIERET'S SKULLCAP	G2Q S1 C2	59	3B	Nucces; LA
:	Sedum robertaintum ROBERTS' STONECROP	G1Q S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster
	Scana ripleyana RIPLEY'S SENNA	G2 SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Chihushua Zacatecas, Mexico
	Sessyium trianthemoides ROUGHSEED SEA-PURSLANE	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Kenedy
х	Silene subcifiata SCARLET CATCHFLY	ලා න රා	5	LOW	Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson (H), Liberty, Newton, Polk, Sabine, Shelby, Tyler, LA
Х	Streptanthus bracteatus BRACTED TWISTFLOWER	G2 \$2 C2	2	нісн	Bandera, Caldwell (?), Comal, Medina, Real, Travis, Uvalde
Х	Streptanthus cutleri CUTLER'S TWISTFLOWER	G2 \$2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Conhuila, Mexico
X	Streptanthus sparsiflorus SPARSELY-FLOWERED JEWELFLOWER	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Culberson; NM
	Styrax youngise YOUNG'S SNOWBELLS	G1 SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Jeff Davis (H); Coahuila and Nuevo Leon, Mexico
	Suaeda duripes HARDTOE SEEPWEED	GHQ SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Pecos (H) and/or Reeves (H)
	Symphoricarpos guadalupensis MCKITTRICK SNOWBERRY	G1 S1 C2	12	Need to relocate	Culberson
X	Talinum regespermum ROUGH-SEED PLAME PLOWER	G3G4 S1 C2	ri s	LOW	Anderson, Franklin, Houston, Limestone, Nacogdochea, Rusk, Smith, Upahur, and Wood; IA, IL, IN, KS, MN, NE, WI
X : .	Thalistrum arkunsanum ARKANSAS MEADOW-RUE	G2Q Si C2	11	нісн	Bowie; Lamar, Red River, AR OK
Х	Thalistrum teranum HOUSTON MEADOW-RUE	G2Q S2 C2	. 8	нды	Brazos, Harris (H), Waller
х	Thelocactus bicolor var flavidispinus STRAW SPINE GLORY OF TEXAS	64072 S2 C2	8	нісн	Brewster Starr(?); Tamaulipas, Mexico
	Thetypodium tenue FRESNO CREEK THELYPODY	G1Q S1 C2	8	Need to relocate	Presidio
X	Tillandeia baileyi BAILEY'S BALLMOSS	03 25 C3	2	MEDIUM	Brooks (H), Cameron, Hidaigo, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Willacy, Tamaulipas, Mexico
х	Trillium pusillum var texanum TEXAS TRILLIUM	G3T2T3Q S2S3 C2	3	MEDIUM	Case, Harrison, Houston (H), Nacogdoches, Panola (H), Rusk, Smith, and Wood (?); AR, LA
	Valerianella teuma EDWARDS PLATEAU CORNSALAD	G2 S2 C2	В	LOW	Burnet, Gillespin, Liano
X	Viola guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS VIOLET	G1 S1 C2	5	MEDIUM	Culberson
х	Xyris drummendii DRUMMOND'S YELLOW-EYED GRASS	03 22 C2	nż	row	Angelina, Jasper, Newton; AL, FL, GA, LA, MS
X	Xyris scabrifolia ROUGH-LEAF YELLOW-EYED GRASS	G2G3 S2 C2	na	LOW	Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine; Al., Fl., GA, LA, MS, NC

X	Zanthoxylum parvum]	11	нісн	Brewster, Jeff Davis
L	SHINNERS' TICKLE-TONGUE	G1 S1 C2			

.

.

1

1

.

Scientific Name:

Acleisanthes crassifolia

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Texas trumpets

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G2 S2

Range:

Kinney, Maverick, and Val Verde Counties; Coahuila, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, grazing, and highway maintenance

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Acleisanthes crassifolia

completed triennially.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, summer - fall, Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Kinney County: two of four sites along Hwy 277; Maverick County:

Las Moras Creek on Hwy 277; Val Verde County: Carruthers

Creek, two sites

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks,

stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and tag them. If populations are large, take a subset, count the number of chasmogamous verses cleistogamous flowers/fruits. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment,

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744: and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, Status Report, 1989.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the Texas Department of Transportation to monitor the populations. The populations fluctuates from year to year, may need to consider other conditions such as rainfall that may be impacting this species. If possible, we may want to establish exclosures to determine the effects of grazing and highway

management practices.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name: Aga

Agave giomeruliflora

Candidate Category: C2

11

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Chisos agave

G/S Rank: G2QS2

Range:

Brewster, Culberson and Hudspeth Counties; Coahuila, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Twelve occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, low numbers, susceptible to grazing of young

plants.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of plants of Agave glomeruliflora

completed triennially, note pollinators, look for additional

populations, four sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, May

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park; Glass Mtns; Sibley

Ranch; Culberson County: Guadalupe Mtn. National Park

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count or estimate the plants present (depending on the population), if possible tag them. Upon field investigation, estimate the number of flowering stalks. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment,

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 - 7 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Tom and Betty Alex, Big Bend NP; Liz Ecker,

Wendy Hodgson, Desert Botanical Garden.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Big Bend and Guadalupe National Parks

to monitor the populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from BIBE, Guadalupe and TPWD to

assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Amsonia tharpii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

Tharp's blue-star

G/S Rank: G1\$1

Range:

Pecos County; New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations; only one site in Texas, some highway right-of-way maintenance activities would impact this species; sometimes out-competed in disturbed situations. The vast majority of this population is located in Texas adjacent to UT land which they

recently fenced.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Amsonia tharpii completed annually

including selected measures of vigor, one site.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, April - May; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD;TxDOT;University of Texas-Austin

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos County: McCamey turnoff IH 10, 67/385

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes

and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Take the following measurements of vigor: number of stems; and total number of inflorescences. Note any pollination, insect damage, recruitment or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bidg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, Gena Janssen, TPWD; Chester Rowell, Status Report,

Dec 1983; Bill Dunmire, New Mexico.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Highway Department to monitor and

properly manage the population. Possibly work with the University of Texas-Austin Society for Conservation Biology Student Chapter

to look for and monitor the population that occurs on their

property. This population is currently being monitored with HROW

but will end in 1995.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers or members from the UT-Austin

Conservation Biology Chapter to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Anemone edwardsiana var. petraea

Candidate Category: C2.

Listing Rank: 12

Common Name:

Edge Falls anemone

G/S Rank:

G3T1S1

Range:

Bandera and Kendall Counties

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

Two populations known, susceptible to pressures from recreational use; flooding and water diversion at one site, overgrazing, trampling and/or

brush encroachment at another.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of <u>Anemone edwardsiana</u> var. <u>petraea</u> to be completed triennially, including detailed measures for each plant (see

Methodology), two sites.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY - Need to determine if good variety

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, February - May Monitor Annually through a phone

call to site manager, site visit every three years.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bandera County: Gunsight Mountain Ranch; Kendall County: Edge

Falls.

Methodology:

Permanently defineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. A sub-sample of the populations should be counted, take the following measurements of that sub-sample: an estimate of the number fruits/flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including recruitment, or any other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, Bill Carr, TPWD; Sara Hoot.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the Nature Conservancy to monitor population

and to enlist the landowner in monitoring efforts. Coordinate

monitoring efforts of other candidate species that occur on Gunsight

Mountain Ranch.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TNC or members from the Native Plant

Society (at the Bandera site) to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Aquilegia chrysantha var. hincklevana

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Hinckley columbine

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G4T1 S1

Range:

Presidio County

Known Occurrences:

Species is known from a single canyon, Capote Canyon, located on

private land. Approximately 500 plants at this site.

Reasons for Concern:

Threats include diversion or impoundment of the creek which provides water to a portion of the population, also lowering of the water table which might cause springs supplying the creek to dry up. Need to

determine who owns the land.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a total population census of all plants of <u>Aquilegia chrysantha</u> var. <u>hinckleyana</u>, including detailed measures of vigor for each plant (see Methodology), located at Capote Falls, Presidio County, completed

triennially.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially in March-April during peak bloom; blooms March through November; Perennial. Need to check water conditions and level on an annual basis, probably via a phone call.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Presidio County; Capote Falls Canyon, located in the cooler, wetter spots in the canyon along seeps, springs or near falls. Private land,

need access.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. The plants occur on seeping, more or less vertical cliff faces up to 100 feet high. Tagging individuals will be difficult, most work will need to be done using binoculars. Count the plants, for those that can be reached or a subset of the population, and take the following measurements for that subset: evidence of fruit and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproductive activity or recruitment, approximate seedling count or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires, binoculars.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Emily Lott, M.S. thesis, 1979; J. Jeff Clark, A.Michael Powell, Status

Report 1983.

Recommendations: This site is privately owned, apparently the owners are not receptive to

any type of access or monitoring. Access will be a problem. When monitoring is established, a regular, annual dialog with the landowners should be established to ensure there are no threats to the population.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the Nature Conservancy, landowners

and any regional TPWD volunteers in the area. Considerations include

the long hike into the canyon, and fragile areas around the falls.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name: Aquilegia longissima Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank: 11

Common Name: long spur columbine G/S Rank: G3 S2

Range: Brewster, Jeff Davis and Presidio Counties; Chihuahua, Coahuila and Nuevo

Leon, Mexico

Known Occurrences: Eleven occurrences, only a few recently verified.

Reasons for Concern: Few, isolated populations; ground water depletion; habitat alteration or

destruction from heavy livestock use; water diversion.

Monitoring Objective: Obtain a population count of Aquilegia longissima completed triennially

at selected sites, including detailed measures for each plant (see

Methodology), three to five sites.

Priority: LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Triennially, June - November; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD/BIBE/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Brewster County: Big Bend NP, Upper Maple Canyon; Upper pine

Canyon; Cattail Falls; Jeff Davis County: one site (need to relocate

previous known sites). Presidio County: relocate this site.

Methodology: Permanently delineate and describe the population areas. Ideally, a map

of the population should be completed as baseline information. Count the plants (upon site visit, total count may not be possible, modify as

necessary). Take the following measurements: number

fruiting/flowering stems. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 4+ Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Emily Lott; Brook Milligan, NMSU

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park to monitor the

populations located on their property.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and BIBE to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Arenaria livermorensis

Livermore sandwort

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

G/S Rank:

G1S1

5

Range:

Jeff Davis County

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences, all from Mt. Livermore.

Reasons for Concern:

Two recently verified localities, road clearing could wipe out one population, there are low numbers of individuals and populations;

highly localized geographically.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Arenaria livermorensis,

including detailed measure of vigor for each plant (see

Methodology), completed triennially at each site.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, August-October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: SW slope of Mt. Livermore, east and south of

Baldy Peak. TNC-Land Steward Society Member, private ranch.

access needed.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Upon site visit, it may be determined to take vigor measurements (number of flowers and fruits or length and width) for each plant. Note any herbivory. insect damage, recruitment, reproduction activity or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires, and

close focus binoculars.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

1

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TNC to monitor the populations. Plants occur on rock faces, some of which are inaccessible except by viewing them through binoculars. Monitoring efforts may need to be modified.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TNC and the landowner to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Argythamnia aphoroides

Candidate Category: C2

11

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Hill Country wild mercury

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Blanco, Comal, Gillespie, Hays (Historical), Kendall (Historical), Kerr.

Menard, Mills (Historical), Tom Green, and Uvalde Counties

Known Occurrences:

Seventeen occurrences on record, five populations are recently

observed.

Reasons for Concern:

Known populations are in low numbers, four of five sites are on the highway right-of-way (HROW), the fifth is located in Garner State Park. Reproduction success unknown, pressures from mowing

unknown.

Monitoring Objective:

To obtain a total population count of all plants of Argythamnia aphoroides, including detailed measures of vigor for each plant (See Methodology) located at each of the five sites, two in Blanco County: one in Menard County one in Uvalde County, and one in Gillespie County, completed initially, monitoring frequency to be determined

after site visit.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Monitor one time for baseline information than determine

frequency after initial visit. April - May during flowering:

Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Blanco County: 1-HROW South side of US Rt 290, 2.05 road miles West of its junction with Co. Rd 204-6 plants located in 1991: 2-HROW East side of US Rt. 281, 5.0 road miles South of its junction with St. Rt. 962--ca. 35 plants seen in 1991. Menard County: HROW East side of R.M. 1311, 0.3 - 0.35 road miles south of center of low water crossing bridge over San Saba River-5 plants located in 1991. Gillespie County: HROW East side of R.M. 783, 5.75 road miles north of its junction with US Rt 290 at Harper-6 plants located in 1991. Uvalde County: Garner State Park, two populations, one on the lower third of south facing slope on the north side of the mouth of a small canyon behind (west of) the screened shelter area in the southern half of the park, the other is on the upper half of the north facing slope of the same canyon.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population area. If possible mark boundaries using easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants and take the following measurements from each plant: number of primary and secondary stems; number of male and female flowers; fruits; and height. Note whether the plants are monoecious or dioecious, if there is any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, seedling count or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, flagging/pin flags, stakes, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr and David Hernandez, TPWD; Marshall Johnston, Austin,

Texas.

Recommendations:

Work with the TPWD Park staff to assist with the monitoring in the State Park and to monitor any disturbance. Work with the Highway Department regarding management techniques and enlist their

assistance in the monitoring effort. When possible, relocate some or all of the known occurrences as well as additional populations of this

species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

May be able to utilize Park volunteers. Volunteers will need to be able

to distinguish between Argythamnia aphoroides and A. mercurialina.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Asclepias prostrata

Candidate Category: C2

Common Name:

prostrate milkweed

Listing Rank: G/S Rank: G1S1

Range:

Starr and Zapata Counties; Tamaulipas, Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences, primarily in Starr and Zapata Counties.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction from agriculture and pasture improvement, also oil and gas exploration, development and transportation all destroy populations; also, invasive non-native plants shade out this low-

growing species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of <u>Asclepias prostrata</u> completed biennially including selected measures of vigor at five sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, spring; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Starr County: near Falcon State Park; north of Roma; Zapata County: south of Webb/Zapata Co. line; 23 mi. north of Roma;

north of Arroyo del Tigre Grande.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Take the following measurements for vigor: number of branches and length of branches recorded for each plant. Note any pollination, insect

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires, ruler.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: And

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Noreen Damude and Jackie Poole, Status Report, 1990, Bill Carr,

Gena Janssen, TPWD; Joe Ideker, Edinburg, Tx; Angela Brooks,

USFWS.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Highway Department to monitor the

populations. This monitoring can be completed in conjunction with

monitoring Lesquerella thamnophila.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the State Park to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Aster puniceus ssp. elliottii

Candidate Category: C1

var. scabricaulis

Listing Rank: 3

Common Name:

rough-stem aster

G/S Rank: G5T2O S2

Range:

Anderson, Cherokee, Smith, Van Zandt and Wood Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Fifteen occurrences (Several of these are probably extirpated and several

others have not been recently verified).

Reasons for Concern:

Few known populations; all currently subject to right-of-way

maintenance procedures; habitat subject to modification, alteration and

destruction.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count including detailed measures for each plant (see Methodology) of <u>Aster puniceus</u> ssp. <u>elliottii</u> var. <u>scabricaulis</u> to be completed annually at select sites. One site from each of the three counties to be selected upon field review of the sites. Additional sites to eventually include at least two non-highway right-of-way populations.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY - Taxonomy not assured, need to verify with Guy

Nessom.

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Anderson County: one site; Van Zandt County: one site; Wood

County: one site. Sites to be selected upon field review of the sites.

Methodology:

Permanently defineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be estimated or counted dependent on the conditions. Those with populations ≤ 100 plants, take the following measures of vigor: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; and height. For those populations > 100 plants, randomly select a subset of the plants to take the above measures

of vigor. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other conditions.

Additional non-highway right-of-way sites to be added as they become

available.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX

78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, Gena Janssen, Mary Candee, TPWD; Kathryn Kennedy,

USFWS; Wm. Mahler, Status Report, 1984.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the State Railroad State Park and the Highway

Department to monitor populations on the respective properties.

Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Astragalus mollissimus

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

var. marcidus withered wooly loco Listing Rank: 6/S Rank: 6

\$532.52

12

Range:

Dallam, Jeff Davis (historical) and Presidio Counties

Known Occurrences:

Eleven occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

No populations recently observed, populations may depend on some sort

of disturbance to maintain their seral stage status.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate or count of individuals triennially,

including selected measures of vigor, two to three sites if all relocated.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Need to relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, April - July Look for every three years, Access

needs to be obtained,

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: relocate population; Presidio County: relocate

populations.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Inconspicuously tag and count the population. A sub-set of the population may need to be monitored depending on the field conditions, adjust as necessary. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, recruitment, reproduction activity or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Dr. B.L. Turner, UT-Austin.

Recommendations:

Combine monitoring efforts with other west Texas species that flower at

this time.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Avenia limitaris

Candidate Category: E

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas avenia

G/S Rank: G2S1

Range:

Cameron and Hidalgo Counties; Coahuila, Nuevo Leon and Tamaulipas,

Mexico

Known Occurrences:

One known occurrence in Hidalgo County on property owned by the Methodist Church. Six plants known as of 1988. One plant known as of 1993. Twenty additional plants discovered by Joe Ideker recently.

Status Report completed 1990, N. Damude and J. Poole.

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to habitat destruction and alteration due to agriculture. recreational and urban development. Species may be at risk by herbivores, pests, parasites and diseases. Justicia runyonii (C2) and

Manihot walkerae (C1) occur in similar habitat.

Monitoring Objective:

To obtain a total population census of all plants of Avenia limitaris including detailed measures of vigor for each individual plant (see Methodology) located at the Methodist Church Camp site, Hidalgo

County, completed annually.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually in fall, September - October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hidalgo County: Methodist Camp, 2.6 miles north of junction Hwy 281 and FM 1015 just south of Progresso; on the east side of the road, 0.4 miles north of the Llano Grand Lake; plants found in deep shade in the interior of the woods, Progresso and Mercedes USGS 7.5' quadrangle. Private land, need access.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks. stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants or tag nearby, heartier species to ensure relocating the same plant(s) from year to year. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; height; and width. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, seedling count or other conditions. Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days, 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management,

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Angie Brooks, USFWS-Corpus Christi; Jim Everitt, USDA-Weslaco;

Carmen Cristbol, Argentina; Joe Ideker, Edinburg, Texas; Gary

Waggerman, TPWD; Noreen Damude and Jackie Poole, Status Report

1990, TPWĎ.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Methodist Church Camp to ensure the

protection of the remaining plant. Involve staff from the Rio Grande Valley National Wildlife Refuge system, either in monitoring and/or looking for additional populations of Avenia limitaris. Further protection of this species may be necessary. If possible, search for additional populations in Mexico as well. Joe Ideker of the Native Plant project has been monitoring this species for the USFWS.

Potential use of Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the Methodist Church Camp and any

regional TPWD volunteers in the area. Considerations include that

this is the only known plant left in the United States.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation;

Scientific Name:

Batesimalya violacea

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

purple gay-mallow

G/S Rank:

Range:

Brewster County; Coahuila and Nuevo Leon, Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences, probably one population.

Reasons for Concern:

In the U.S., known only from the population below the "Window" of Big Bend National Park; possible pollution or diminution of water

source will affect this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Batesimalya violacea completed biennially.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, October - November; Shrubby Perennial. Monitor

water use frequently, if water use plan stable then monitoring

can be dropped to triennially.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BJBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park, below the "Window".

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Each plant should be tagged and numbered. In addition, take the following measurements: number of fruits and flowers; and number of stems. Note any herbivory, insect

damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population

and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If the

the cause is related to management, management recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

J. Jeff Clark and A. Michael Powell, Status Report, 1983; Bill

Carr and Jackie Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park to monitor the

population. To be monitored with Ouercus graciliformis.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and BIBE to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Boerhavia mathisiana

Candidate Category: C2

5

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Mathis spiderling

G/S Rank: G2S1

Range:

Live Oak and San Patricio Counties; San Luis Potosi and Tamaulipas,

Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Six occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

Occurs on caliche soils which are typically dug for gravel.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Boerhavia mathisiana completed

annually at four sites.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, May - August; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Live Oak: Pernitas Point; San Patricio County: three sites-

northwest of Mathis; north east of IH-37; FM 3377, brush tract-

caliche pit.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The number of individuals within each population should be counted. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2-3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population and any changes/shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Rafael Coral, New Mexico State University, Status Report, 1988;

Sue Gardner and Ruth O'Brien, Corpus Christi Botanical Gardens,

Status Survey Update, 1986; B.L. Turner, UT- Austin, Status

Report, 1983; Jackie Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD, USFWS-Corpus Christi, and

Corpus Christi Botanical Gardens to monitor the populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

\$

Scientific Name:

Bonamia ovalifolia

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

bigpod bonamia

G/S Rank: G1S1

Range:

Brewster County, Adjacent Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Two populations known in U.S., one located in Big Bend National Park

(BIBE).

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to landfall and/or flood damage along Rio Grande -

Boquillas Canyon.

Monitoring Objective:

We want a total population census of all plants of Bonamia ovalifolia,

including measures of vigor for individual plants located at BIBE,

Boquillas Canyon completed biennially,

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY* Wait for status report to be completed to see

what the recommendations are.

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially in May during flowering, with visual check during the

intervening years; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

Big Bend National Park (BIBE)/TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park, deep alluvial sands in

canyon of the Rio Grande. Around the Sand Slide at the head of

Boquillas Canyon and ca. 1/4 mile down canyon.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants, inconspicuously tag

individual plants and take the following measurements for those tagged plants: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and

flowers; height; and width. Note any herbivory, insect damage,

pollination, recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; Big Bend National Park, National Park Service, Big Bend National Park, Tx 78934; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Mike Flemming, Betty Alex, site staff, Big Bend National Park; Lynda

Pritchett-Kozak, Liz Ecker, Desert Botanical Garden, Phoenix; Daniel

F. Austin, Department of Biological Sciences, Florida Atlantic

University; Bonnie Amos, Angelo State University, completed the status

report.

Recommendations: Continue following progress of efforts undertaken by the Desert

Botanical Garden in Arizona. If time and staffing permit, a closer look at individual plants from year to year may be desirable including an annual count of flowers and fruits, especially noting any recruitment.

Potential use of

Volunteers: May be able to utilize National Park Volunteers or possibly volunteers

from Big Bend Ranch SNA and/or members of the Native Plant

Society of Texas.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Brickellia brachvohvlla var.

Candidate Category: C2

hincklevi

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

Hinckley's brickellbush

G/S Rank:

G5T2 S2

Range:

Brewster (Historical), and Jeff Davis Counties

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few occurrences, few individuals, limited range, susceptible to

vacation home development, grazing pressures and road construction

in the Davis Mountains area.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Brickellia brachyphylla var. hincklevi,

including selected measures of vigor, completed triennially, one to

two sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, July - October; Perennial. Look for every three

years.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: along Limpia Creek, Mt. Livermore, other site if

relocated.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Take the following measures of vigor: height; number of flowering heads; and number

of stems. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Mike Powell, Sul Ross State University.

Recommendations: Work with staff from the Nature Conservancy to coordinate

monitoring efforts with this C2 species and others that occur on this

private property.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and TNC to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Brickellia brachvohylla

Candidate Category: C2

var. terlinguensis

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

Terlingua brickellbush

G/S Rank:

G5TH SH

Range:

Brewster (Historical), and Hudspeth (Historical) Counties

Known Occurrences:

No recent sightings, populations need to be relocated

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, none recently observed

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Brickellia brachyphylla var

terlinguensis, including selected measures of vigor, completed

triennially, populations need to be located.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - need to relocate, then HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, July - October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County, relocate population(s); Hudspeth County: relocate

population(s).

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be inconspicuously tagged and counted. Take the following measures of vigor: height: number of flowering heads; number of stems. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment, or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

> population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Mike Powell, Sul Ross State University

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the National Park to relocate this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD and/or BIBE volunteers to assist in

relocating and later monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Brickellia vieiensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

Sierra Vieja brickellbush

G/S Rank:

G1G2 \$1\$2

Range:

Presidio County

Known Occurrences:

Ten known occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Only one population recently observed, need to relocate this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Relocate and obtain a population count of <u>Brickellia vieiensis</u> completed triennially, including selected measures of vigor (see

Methodology), relocate population.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - need to relocate - then HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, September; Perennial. Look for every three

years.

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Presidio County; Sierra Tierra Vieja, relocate population(s).

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Count the plants, take the following measures of vigor: height; number of stems and flowering heads. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires...

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Mike Powell, Sul Ross State University

Recommendations:

Look for populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in relocating and

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Brongniartia minutifolia

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank: 11

Common Name:

little-leaf brongniartia

G/S Rank:

G2S1

Range:

Brewster County; Chihuahua, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Six occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, low numbers of individuals.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count and continue monitoring selected

measures of vigor of plants of Brongniartia minutifolia annually, one

site.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, June - August; shrub

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: desert foothills south of the Chisos Mountains

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count and inconspicuously tag the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: height; and a count of the basal stems. Take a count of number's of flowers on a subset of flowering branches. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

..____

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Mike Fleming, BIBE.

Recommendations:

Populations may currently be monitored by students at BIBE.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD and/or BIBE volunteers to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Caesalpinia brachycarpa

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Renk:

Common Name:

broadpod rushpea

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Crockett (Historical), Edwards (H), Kinney, Llano and Sutton Counties

Known Occurrences:

Eight recorded occurrences, three are from precisely known locations.

These include two occurrences in Kinney County and one in Sutton

County Status Report reported in 1981. When Market

County. Status Report completed in 1981, Wm. Mahler.

Reasons for Concern:

Limited distribution, known occurrences are along highway right-of-way.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain an estimate of the populations at the three verified occurrences of <u>Caesalpinia brachycarpa</u> located in Kinney and Sutton Counties completed biennially. Where possible obtain a total population census.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, flowers April to June - Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Three verified locations in Kinney and Sutton Counties are to be monitored. Kinney Cty: 1-Southeast side of R.M. 334, 13.1 road miles west of junction with St Rt 55; 2- R.M. 334, 9.0 - 9.1 road miles northeast of junction with R.M. 674, northeast of Brackettville. Sutton Cty: 7.8 miles north of north access road of I-10 on east side of US 277 at old highway junction.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Most sites will allow for a total population count. Where that is not feasible, the population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, a 100 meter tape will be placed within the population. Along this meter tape, ten 5m x 5m randomly placed quadrats will be randomly selected along either side of the tape. Total number of individuals will be counted within each quadrat. Where possible, take the following measurements: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, recruitment, or other conditions.

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20%

change in the density of <u>Caesalpinia brachycarpa</u> between any two years, and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Quadrant (5m x 5m), measuring tapes-at least 4, pin flags, stakes,

compass (s), random numbers table.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring

design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: William R. Carr and Jackie M. Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations: Work with the Highway Department regarding management methods

and enlist staff to assist in the monitoring efforts.

Potential use of

į

Volunteers: May be able to utilize regional TPWD volunteers for the annual

monitoring.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Castilleia ciliata

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

fringed paintbrush

G/S Rank:

G1Q \$1

Range:

Jeff Davis County

Known Occurrences:

Five occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Very few occurrences, few individuals, restricted range, area

susceptible to road building impacts; fire suppression

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Castilleia ciliata completed biennially,

including selected measures of vigor, one site.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY - Access Needed

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, June - October, Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: Mt. Livermore, private property, need access.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each population. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count and inconspicuously tag the plants if the population is less than 50. Take the following measures of vigor: height; number of fruit and flowering stems. Note any herbivory,

insect damage, reproduction activity, recruitment or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 4-5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

ſ

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Jeff Clark, Mike Powell, Status Report, 1983;

Mark Lockwood.

Recommendations: Additional populations need to be located, work with staff from

TNC to assist monitoring this species. Known populations occur on private property, access is needed. Taxonomy needs clarification, utilize genetic techniques. Mark Lockwood needs to be present to

verify species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TNC and TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring

this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Castilleia elongata

Candidate Category: C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

tall paintbrush

G/S Rank: G2OS2

Range:

Brewster County

Known Occurrences:

Nine occurrences all within Big Bend National Park (BIBE).

Reasons for Concern:

Low numbers of individuals and populations; this may be a fire-

dependent species in a fire-suppressed environment.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of Castilleia elongata completed

annually.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, mid-August - September; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park, Chisos Mountains.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The number of individuals within the population should be counted. Take the following measures of vigor: height; number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Peter Scott, Louisiana State University;

Donna Howell, Status Report, 1986; Denise Louie.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the National Park to assist with monitoring

the populations. Coordinate monitoring efforts with Festuca

ligulata.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and BIBE to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Chaetopaopa hersheyi

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

11 G2 S2

Common Name:

mat leastdaisy

G/S Rank:

Range:

Culberson and Hudspeth Counties; New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Eight occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Known from the Guadalupe Mountains, restricted to limestone boulders and cliff walls in deep mesic canyons; may require higher humidity than that available outside canyons, changes in water table

would negatively impact this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of Chaetopappa hersheyi to be completed triennially, including selected measures of vigor, three

sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, May; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Guadalupe Mt. NP

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Guadalupe Mountains National Park, Mckittrick

Ridge Trail; Hunter Peak; Bear Canyon Trail

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted or estimated depending on field conditions. Access to individual plants may be difficult, adjust field techniques as necessary. The measures of vigor should be adjusted dependent on field conditions, a sub-set of the population may be sufficient. Take the following measurements: number of plants flowering and fruiting; and number of flowering heads. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination reproduction

activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Work with staff from Guadalupe Mountains National Park to assist

in monitoring this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD or Park volunteers to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Chamaesvee chaetocalyx var. triligulata Candidate Category:

C211

Common Name:

three-tongue spurge

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G5T1 S1

Range:

Brewster, and Randall (No specimen) Counties; Coahuila, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Small numbers, limited distribution, human disturbance on park.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Chamaesyce chaetocalyx var.

triligulata completed biennially including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, April - September

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Boquillas Canyon, Big Bend National Park

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count and tag the plants. Modify as necessary as field conditions permit. Take the following measurements of vigor: number of basal stems; and total number of fruits and flowers. Note any pollination, insect damage, recruitment or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires,

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

ſ

suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758...

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Denise Louie; Michael Powell and Dennis Miller, Status Report, July 1983; Mark Mayfield, UT Austin

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park to coordinate the monitoring methodology and proper management of the population. According to JMP a college group may already be monitoring this species or they are surveying for it, need to contact Denise Louie for further information.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize Park and TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring

this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Chamaesyce golondrina

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

swallow spurge

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Brewster, Hudspeth and Presidio Counties; Chihuahua and Coahuila,

Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Six occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Occurs on alluvial soils which tend to be cultivated, susceptible to

invasive non-natives

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Chamaesyce golondrina completed

triennially, one to four sites if all relocated.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, July - October; Annual. Look for every three

years

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend, Boquillas Canyon, other site(s) to be

relocated; Hudspeth County: relocate; Presidio County: relocate

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population areas.

Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline

information. The population should be counted. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 5

5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Mark Mayfield, UT-Austin; Dennis Miller, Mike Powell, Status

Report, June 1983.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Big Bend NP to manage and monitor the

population.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the Park or TPWD to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Chloris texensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas windmill-grass

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Brazoria, Brazos (Historical), Chambers, Galveston, Harris, Hidalgo (?-

questionable location or identity), Nueces and Refugio Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-nine occurrences, few recently verified.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction due to development, oil and gas production,

pasture improvement all affect this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Chloris texensis completed annually at

four sites. Other sites may be added.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Mid-June to mid August; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility: -

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Harris County: Rankin Road; northeast corner Spencer Hwy and

Center St; Galveston County: Hwy 646, north of Dickerson; Calder

Road and IH-45.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The number of individuals within each population should be counted. Note any herbivory, insect damage,

reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jay Wipff.

Recommendations:

This species occurs with <u>Machaeranthera aurea</u> and <u>Hymenoxys</u> texana at the Cypress Rose Hill Road location, however, it is not

flowering when either of these species are.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Colubrina stricta

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

Comal snakewood

G/S Rank:

G2S1

Range:

Comal, and El Paso Counties; Coahuila and Nuevo Leon, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Only one population is known in U.S., from Hueco Tanks State Park.

Reasons for Concern:

Low population numbers in Texas.

Monitoring Objective:

To obtain a total population census of all plants of <u>Colubrina</u> stricta including detailed measures of vigor for each individual plant (see

Methodology) located at Hueco Tanks State Park site annually, adjust

as necessary.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Initially Annually, adjust after field determination, in late spring

or early summer during flowering; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

El Paso County: Hueco Mountains, south side of North Mountain.

Hueco Tanks State Park.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If possible mark boundaries using easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; height; and width. Note any herbivory, insect damage, recruitment, or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, flagging/pin flags, stakes, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Marshall Johnston, Austin, Texas

Recommendations:

Work with the TPWD site staff such as Kelly Bryant, to monitor any

disturbance. Enlist site staff in the monitoring effort.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

May be able to utilize Park volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Chrysothamnus nauseosus ssp texensis Candidate Category:

C2 12

Common Name:

Guadalupe Mountains rabbitbrush

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G5T2 S1

Range: '

Culberson County; New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Five occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, status unknown in Texas

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Chrysothamnus nauseosus ssp

texensis completed triennially, note pollinators. Need to relocate

populations.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, September - October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Guadalupe Mt. NP

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Guadalupe Mountains National Park, relocate

populations in Smith Spring Canyon; South McKittrick Canyon;

Pine Springs; or Bartlett Peak.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and tag them. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment.

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Loran Anderson, Texas Tech

Work with the staff from Guadalupe Mountains National Park to

monitor the populations.

Potential use of

Recommendations:

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from Guadalupe Mountains NP and

TPWD to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Condalia hookeri var edwardsiana

Candidate Category:

C2 12

Common Name:

Edwards Plateau capul negro

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G5T1Q S1

Range:

Edwards County

Known Occurrences:

One occurrence

Reasons for Concern:

One collection, no one has relocated, impacts of grazing unknown as

well as response to chemical/mechanical brush control practices

unknown.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Condalia hookeri var edwardsiana

completed triennially including selected measures of vigor, relocate

population.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY -Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, June - August; Perennial shrub

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Edwards County: vicinity of Rock Springs (1944) Relocate

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count and tag the plants. Take the following measurements of vigor: height; number of stems; diameter of largest stem; and total number of fruits and flowers. If the population is too large delineate a sub-sample and take the same

population is too large, delineate a sub-sample and take the same measures as above. Modify as field conditions warrant. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, insect damage, reproduction activity,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758...

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, Status Review, 1989; Marshall Johnston

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Texas Agricultural Experiment

Substation to monitor and properly manage the population.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Coreopsis intermedia

Candidate Category:

C2 na

Common Name:

golden wave tickseed

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G3S3

Range:

Anderson, Cass, Cherokee, Franklin, Freestone, Harris, Harrison,

Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches (Questionable identification or

locality), Trinity, Upshur, and Wood (Historical) Counties; Louisiana

Known Occurrences:

Thirty occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to pressures from recreational use and/or overgrazing.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Coreopsis intermedia to be completed

appually.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, February - May; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Anderson County: Engling WMA; Leon County: Eunice; Houston

County: McCann Cemetery. If possible, locate additional monitoring sites that represent various land use practices.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity.

including recruitment, or any other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Sidney McDaniel, W.C. Holmes, Status Review, 1981; Jason

Singhurst; TPWD.

Recommendations:

May want to spot check other localities for presence/absence

and/or other populations that would be suitable to monitor.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Coryphantha albicolumnaria

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

ີ່າ

Common Name:

white column cactus

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Brewster, Pecos and Presidio Counties; Chihuahua, Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Eighteen occurrences,

Reasons for Concern:

Illegal cactus trade, few populations known.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Coryphantha albicolumnaria completed

triennially, including selected measures of vigor (see Methodology).

Three sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - May be delisted to a 3C

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, March - May; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County; Terlingua sinkhole; Mariposa Mine road-two sites.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The number of individuals within each population should be counted. Take the following measures: height; and number of fruits

and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination,

reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population

and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If the cause is related to management, management recommendations

will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Donna Howell, Status Report, 1986; Richard

Worthington, UTEP, Status Report, 1994.

Recommendations:

Occurs with Genistidium dumosum at the Route 170 site; not easy to identify, use Worthington's Status Report Key. Highway right-of-

way monitoring in progress.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD and Big Bend National Park volunteers to

assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Corvohantha chaffevi

Candidate Category:

C2 11

Common Name:

Chaffey's cory cactus

G/S Rank;

Listing Rank:

G2 \$1

Range:

Brewster County; Coahuila, San Luis Potosi and Zacatecas, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Five occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Coryphantha chaffeyi completed

annually at selected sites, including detailed measures for each plant

(see Methodology).

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, June - November; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: three sites, Big Bend National Park. If possible,

locate additional monitoring sites off the park that represent

different land use practices.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population areas. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. Count the plants (upon site visit, total count may not be possible, modify as necessary). Take the following measurements: stem diameter and height and number fruits/flowers. Note any herbivory,

insect damage, pollination, or reproduction activity, including

recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3-4 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Steve Brack, Ken Heil, Allen Zimmerman; Denise Louie.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park to coordinate

monitoring the populations located on their property.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Enlisting volunteers with monitoring cacti is not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Coryphantha dasvacantha

Candidate Category:

C2 12

Common Name:

var. dasyacantha dense cory cactus

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G3T2 S2

Range:

Brewster, El Paso (Historical), Hudspeth, Jeff Davis and Pecos Counties

Known Occurrences:

Fifteen occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

Subject to collecting pressures, housing and road developments

affect this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Corvohantha dasvacantha

var.dasvacantha completed annually including selected measures of

vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, April - July; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD and/or Big Bend National Park

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: relocate populations, Big Bend National Park. If

possible, locate additional monitoring sites off the park that

represent various land use practices.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Count the population, take the following measures of vigor: height, diameter and number of flowers and fruits. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, recruitment

or reproduction activity or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX. 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX. 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Mike Powell, Denny Miller, Allen Zimmerman

Recommendations: Combine monitoring efforts with other west Texas species that

flower at this time. Will need someone able to properly id this

species

Potential use of

Volunteers: Enlisting volunteers with monitoring cacti is not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

June 1995 - Review Comment 1995

Scientific Name:

Coryphantha duncanii

Candidate Category:

C2 .11

Common Name:

Duncan's cory cactus

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G3S1

Range:

Brewster and Presidio Counties; New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to pressures from recreational use and cactus trade.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Coryohautha duncanii to be completed

biennially.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, mid April - May

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park; Presidio County:

Relocate the population.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Count the plants (upon site visit, total count may not be possible, modify as necessary). Take the following

measurements: stem diameter and height and number

fruits/flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including recruitment, or any other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD, Denise Louie; Kenneth Heil, Status Report,

August 1982; Ted Anderson, Desert Botanical Garden

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park to coordinate the

monitoring methodology and proper management of the population.

May want to spot check other localities for presence/absence and/or other populations that would be suitable to monitor.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Enlisting volunteers with monitoring cacti is not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Coryphantha hesteri

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Hester's cory cactus

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2 S2

Range:

Brewster, Pecos and Terrell Counties

Known Occurrences:

Seventeen occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction, cacti trade

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Coryphantha hesteri completed

biennially at selected sites.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, May - June

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Marathon, two sites; Pecos County: Relocate;

Terrell County: Relocate

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population areas. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. Count the plants (upon site visit, total count may not be possible, modify as necessary). Take the following measurements: stem diameter and height and number fruits/flowers. Note any herbivory,

insect damage, pollination, or reproduction activity, including

recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Denise Louie; Kenneth Heil, Edward

Anderson, Status Report, August 1982; Gerald Raun, retired herpetologist from Angelo State is studying a population of this species, he is working out of the Chihuahuan Desert Research

Institute with Denny Miller.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park to coordinate the

monitoring methodology and proper management of the population.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Enlisting volunteers with monitoring cacti is not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Crataegus warneri

Candidate Category:

C2 11

Common Name:

Warner's hawthorn

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G2Q S2

Range:

Anderson, Cherokee, Freestone, Houston, Morris, Panola, Smith

(Historical), and Walker Counties

Known Occurrences:

Fourteen occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction for forestry, agriculture, industry and

development.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Crataegus warneri, including selected

measures of vigor, completed triennially.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY - Clarify taxonomic questions

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, July - September; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Anderson County: Relocate at least 2 populations: Houston

County: Augusta, relocate population.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Take the following measures: dbh or diameter of largest stem at one foot off the ground. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or

reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2-3 Days; 1-2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Jason Singhurst; William Mahler, Status

Review 1985.

Recommendations:

Work with East Texas Conservation groups to coordinate monitoring

efforts with this C2 species and others that occur in this region.

This species is very difficult to identify, will need someone capable

to do so in order to locate this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Croton alabamensis

Candidate Category:

C2

var. texensis

Listing Rank:

G/S Rank:

R

G3T1 S1

Common Name:

Texahama croton

Range:

Bell, Coryell and Travis Counties

Known Occurrences:

Fifteen occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Suburban development

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Croton alabamensis var. texensis

completed triennially including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, April - July; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Travis County/USFWS/DOD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Coryell County: Ft Hood Military Reservation; Travis County:

Post Oak Ridge. If possible, locate an additional site that is unlike

the previous two sites.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Count and tag the population, take the following measure of vigor: height. If field conditions warrant, a subset of the population may be necessary, modify as needed. Location may need to be recorded using GPS. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, recruitment or reproduction activity or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD; Steve Ginzbarg; and Sidney McDaniel, Status

Report, February 1981.

Recommendations:

There is questionable long-distance dispersal with this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD/ Travis County, Ft. Hood

and/or USFWS to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Cyperus gravioides

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

na

Common Name:

Mohlenbrock's umbrella sedge

G/S Rank: G3G4S3

Range:

Anderson, Angelina, Burleson, Colorado, Franklin, Freestone, Hardin, Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches, Newton, Parker (? questionable locality or identification), Robertson, Rusk, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Tyler, Upshur, Van Zandt and Wood Counties; Illinois, Louisiana and

Missouri.

Known Occurrences:

Forty two occurrences are known in Texas. Cyperus gravioides also

occurs in Missouri, Illinois and Louisiana.

Reasons for Concern:

Reasons for concern include habitat alteration. The species may be susceptible to soil compaction and unknown affects of prescribed fire.

Monitoring Objective:

To obtain an estimate of at least three populations of Cyperus

gravioides and to monitor the impacts of fire management on at least

one site.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY-May be down listed to a 3C, taxonomy needs to be

determined.

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, in August during flowering: Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC (The Nature Conservancy)

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hardin County: Roy E. Larson Sandylands Preserve, The Nature Conservancy-north side of F.M. 327, 3.6 miles west of its junction with St. Rt. 92 in Silsbee. Hardin County: Village Creek State Park, northeast and southeast of the barn. Parker County: Lake Mineral Wells State Park, west side of park, 100-1000 feet north of parking lot at equestrian campground.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If possible mark boundaries using easily recognizable landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Obtain an estimate of the populations at three of the localities of Cyperus gravioides located in Hardin and Parker Counties, annually.

•

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20%

Borland, March 1996

change in the density of <u>Cyperus grayioides</u> between any two years, and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, Pin Flags, Stakes, Metal tags/Wires

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bidg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Bill Carr, TPWD; Steve Orzell, Florida NHP.

Recommendations: Some feel this species should be re-categorized as 3C due to its

widespread distribution in Texas. In Missouri, it is state listed endangered and the protection status of the 16 known sites on private

property is uncertain. In Illinois it is state listed as threatened, with at least eight sites protected. One site is protected in Louisiana and eight sites protected in Texas. Staff at TNC's Sandylands Preserve may

incorporate a study addressing the affects of fire on the populations of <u>Cyperus grayioides</u>. Additional sites that could be monitored include populations that occur on: private lands; Angelina National Forest; Engling Wildlife Management Area; Big Thicket National Preserve;

Sabine National Forest and others along roadsides.

Potential use of

Volunteers: May be able to utilize TPWD and TNC volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Cyperus onerosus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

dune umbrella-sedge

G/S Rank:

G2S2

5

Range:

Andrews, Ward, and Winkler Counties

Known Occurrences:

Nine recorded occurrences, four are from precisely known locations. These include two occurrences in Winkler County, one in Ward County, and one in Andrews County. Status Report completed in 1991, W.R. Carr.

Reasons for Concern:

Occurs in an area where there is risk of oil spills and gas leaks, in addition, the effects of oil/gas drilling on the area hydrology is unknown. Potential loss of habitat from well drilling may occur. Wetlands are subject to use by grazing cattle, especially in the park. Stabilization of the dunes might allow for filling in of intradunal depressions and result in habitat loss.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a total count if possible or an estimate of the populations at the four verified occurrences of Cyperus onerosus located in Andrews, Ward and

Winkler Counties completed annually. See Recommendations.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, June-November - Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Andrews County: 30 ft. east of fence line on southeast side of St. Rt. 115, 0.7 road miles northeast of junction with St. Rt 128, Sand Ranch-Need Access; Ward County: Monahans Sandhills State Park, north of Scrub Oak Pienic Area, west and south of Pumpjack Pienic Area, both sides of main park road; Winkler County: 1-north side of F.M. 874, from its junction with St. Rt. 115 to ca. 1 mile west of this junction; 2-northwest side of St. R. 115, 1.6-1.7 road miles along Hwy 115, frequent in moist sand margins of standing water of ponds between dunes.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Most sites will allow for a total population count. Where that is not feasible, the population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, a 100 meter tape will be placed within the population. Along this meter tape, ten 5m x 5m randomly placed quadrats will be randomly placed along either side of the tape. Total number of individuals will be counted within each quadrat.

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20% change in

the density of <u>Cyperus onerosus</u> between any two years, and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Rubber boots, 5m quadrant, measuring tapes-at least 4, pin flags,

stakes, compass (s), random numbers table.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet

Road, Suite 200, Hardand Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: William R. Carr, TPWD; Dr. Marshall Johnston; Dr. Barton Warnock; Dr.

Chester Rowell, Dr. Richard Carter, Pat McNeal,

Recommendations: Preferred objective is to obtain an estimate of available habitat of Cyperus

onerosus through the use of high resolution color infrared aerial

photography. Appropriate habitat can be identified and verified via ground

passes in a low flying helicopter, particularly over the State Park.

Additional monitoring effort should strongly address the affects the cattle have on the population. This would include establishing exclosures in different areas of the State Park. Work with the TPWD site staff to assist with the responsibility of monitoring the populations that occur on the state park. For populations that occur on highway right-of-way, work with the Highway Department to assist with the monitoring. Sites occurring on private land, work with the land owner to allow access and enable monitoring annually as well as oversee the sites throughout the year.

Potential use of Volunteers:

Plan Approval Date:

May be able to utilize Park volunteers for the annual monitoring as well as

Date of Implementation:

keeping an eye on the wetland habitat throughout the year.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Revised 3/6/95

Scientific Name:

Cypripedium kentuckiense

Candidate Category: C2

na

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

southern lady's-slipper

G/S Rank: G3S1

Range:

Cass(?)*, Harrison, Nacogdoches, Newton (X)*, Sabine and San Augustine Counties; Alabama, Arkansas, Kentucky, Louisiana, Mississippi, Oklahoma,

Tennessee. *?=questionable locality or identification; X=presumed

extirpated

Known Occurrences:

There are nine records for Cypripedium kentuckiense, four are verified

records with low population numbers. Status Report completed,

November 1985, Max Medley.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction and disturbance affect this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a total population census of all plants of Cypripedium

kentuckiense, including detailed measures of vigor for each individual (see Methodology) located in Sabine and San Augustine County.

completed annually.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually in June-August: Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Sabine National Forest/Angelina National Forest

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sabine County, three occurrences, Sabine National Forest, Tenaha Ranger District, ca 0.3 miles north of FS Road 108 and 2 miles east of Black Ankle along tributary to Colorow Creek; 2-Sabine National Forest, Tenaha Ranger District, ca 3 miles north of Geneva, access on east by FM 330, then FS Road 198 to Cordrey Cemetery; 3-Sabine National Forest, Yellow Pine Ranger District, Indian Mounds

Wilderness. San Augustine County, Angelina National Forest, Angelina Ranger District, east of FM 705 at a point 2 miles south of Tx 103 and 3.6 miles south of Macune, northwest of Pisgah Cemetery and east of

Turkey Hill Wilderness.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage, recruitment or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Max Medley, Status Report 1985.

Recommendations: Involve staff from the Forest Service in the monitoring efforts as well as

searching for additional populations such as Rob Evans or Jason

Singhurst.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize regional TPWD volunteers in the area.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Dalea bartonii

Candidate Category:

C211

Common Name:

Cox's dalea

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G1 S1

Range:

Brewster County

Known Occurrences:

No recent occurrences, population needs to be relocated

Reasons for Concern:

No known populations.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Dalea bartonii including selected

measures of vigor, completed triennially. Access necessary and not

likely.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, July - October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County, relocate population

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Individuals should identified and counted. Upon site visit possibly take the following measures of vigor: height and/or number of primary branches. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including recruitment.

or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Donna Howell, Status Review, 1986.

Recommendations:

Work with the landowners to relocate this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in relocating and later

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

1

Scientific Name:

Dalea reverchonii

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Comanche Peak prairie-clover

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Hood (Presumed extirpated), Parker and Wise Counties

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-one occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Urban and suburban development; recreational development of the

Hood County site; overgrazing and agriculture.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Dalea reverebonii including selected

measures of vigor, completed biennially.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, June; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan;

Site Description:

Parker County: upon county visit, select two - three sites; Wise

County: upon county visit, select two sites

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Individuals should identified, counted and tagged if possible, if field conditions warrant, take a subset of the population. Upon site visit take the following measures of vigor: height and/or number of primary branches. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including

recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

1

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bánk Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Bill Carr, TPWD; Wm Mahler, Status

Report, July 1984

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in relocating and later

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Dalea sabinalis Scientific Name: Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name: Sabinal prairie-clover G/S Rank: G1S1

Bandera (Historical), Uvalde (Historical), and Val Verde Counties. Range:

Known Occurrences: Four occurrences, none recently verified.

Apparently not seen since the '40's - populations to be relocated. Reasons for Concern:

Obtain a population count of plants of Dalea sabinalis completed Monitoring Objective:

triennially if located.

Priority: LOW PRIORITY (Until relocated, then HIGH PRIORITY)

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Triennially, Look for every three years, May - July; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Val Verde County: one site--once relocated, south of Loma Alta.

Methodology: Once relocated---Permanently delineate and describe the population

> area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Note any

herbivory, insect damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

> Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744;

and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Wm. Mahler, Status Report, 1985.

Recommendations:

Additional populations need to be located.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the State Park to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Draba standlevi

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Standley's draba

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G3 S1

Range:

Jeff Davis County; Arizona and New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Low populations, low numbers, need to locate additional

populations of this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Relocate and obtain a population count of Draba standleyi

completed annually, including selected measures of vigor (see

Methodology). Access is needed.

Priority:

MEDIUM - LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, August - September: Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: East of Mt. Livermore, relocate population(s).

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population. areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as

baseline information. Count the plants, take the following measures of vigor: height; number of fruits and flowers. Note any

herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity.

including recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, rebar, metal tags, wire, and

compass.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2-3 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline. TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD

Recommendations:

Look for additional populations. Access is needed.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD & TNC volunteers to assist in locating and

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Echeandia chandleri

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

lila de los llanos

G/S Rank:

Range:

Cameron, Kleberg and Nueces Counties

Known Occurrences:

Known from 29 sites in south Texas, occurring on clay soils.

Reasons for Concern:

Development could extirpate the majority of the populations.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of plants of Echeandia chandleri, completed

annually located at five sites...

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually in the fall, September - November, early morning, sunny

days; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Cameron County: 1-north side of Hwy 4, Loma de la Estrella. 7.4 miles west of Boca Chica Beach; 2-just northwest of junction of Hwy 510 and 100, along 100 up to one mile southeast of this intersection: 3-Loma Pelona, Playa del Rio; Nueces County: 1-Saint James Cemetery; 2-north side of St Rt. 44, 100-1000 feet east of junction St Rt. 2, just west of

Violet.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. The population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, a 50 to 100 meter tape (dependent on the habitat) will be placed within the population. If possible, establish a "permanent" transect location. Along this meter tape, ten 1m x 2m randomly placed quadrats will be randomly placed along either side of the tape, with the 1m edge along the tape. Total number of individuals will be counted within each quadrat. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, recruitment, reproduction activity or other conditions.

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20% change in the density of Echeandia chandleri, between any year, and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring; 4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet

Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations: Work with USFWS staff from the Corpus Christi office and Laguna

Atascosa National Wildlife Refuge to assist with the monitoring efforts, and possibly relocate and monitor the population that occurs on the Refuge. Verify the record for Green Island and work with Audubon staff to monitor this candidate and others that occur on the Island. Other site records of this

species occur on property of unknown ownership.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the Refuge, local community and TPWD

volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name: Echinocereus papillosus var. angusticeps Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

small papillosus cactus

G/S Rank: G3T1S1

Range:

Hidalgo (Historical), Jim Hogg (?-questionable identification), and Starr

Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences, only one recently verified.

Reasons for Concern:

Only one population currently known; habitat destruction or

alteration due to agriculture and pasture improvements affect this

species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Echinocereus papillosus var.

angusticeps completed annually. One site.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, April - May; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jim Hogg County: relocate this population; Starr County: La

Reforma Training Area, Tx National Guard, private land.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each population. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: height; number of stems, number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD: Allen Zimmerman

Recommendations:

Additional populations need to be located, land owner contact will

be necessary for the Starr County site.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

•

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Scientific Name:

cylinder spikesedge

Eleocharis cylindrica

G/S Rank: G1S1

Range:

Lubbock (Historic) and Presidio Counties.

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences, none recent.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction or alteration due to hydrologic changes (stream diversion, lowering of water table), pasture improvement all affect this species. There is direct threat to plants from herbivory and

trampling.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Eleocharis cylindrica to be completed

triennially, one site when relocated.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY -Need to Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, June - July; Rhizomatous Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Presidio County: east tributary of Capote Creek, Sierra Vieja

Mountains.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Take the following measurements: number of flowering or fruiting stems. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Dennis Miller, Status Report, 1984; Bill Carr, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Populations need to be located and land owner contact needed.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Erigeron mimegletes

Candidate Category:

C2 12

Common Name:

bushy wild buckwheat

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Brewster (Historic), Crockett (Historic), Edwards (Historic), Kerr, Real,

Schleicher, Sutton, Uvalde, and Val Verde (Historic) Counties; Coahuila,

Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Fourteen occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Grazing pressures and habitat alteration

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Erigeron mimegletes

completed annually, including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY - Clarify Taxonomy question

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, April - June; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Kerr County: State Route 187 and FM 39; Real County: Leakey

and State Route 41 two sites. If possible, locate additional sites on

private land that represent various land use practices.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. If the population is too large, take a subset of the population and obtain the following measures of

vigor: number of flowering heads. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Guy Nesom; Toney Keeney

Recommendations: Listed populations need to be relocated. The description of this

species in the Manual of the Vascular Plants of Texas (Correll & Johnston, 1970) has an error in length of ray florets, this needs to be

checked.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Eriocaulon koemickianum

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

small-headed pipewort

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2G3 S1

Range:

Anderson, Brazos, Limestone, Leon (Questionable identity), and Tyler

(Historic) Counties; Arkansas, Georgia and Oklahoma

Known Occurrences:

Five occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Low populations, few occurrences, risk of land development

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Eriocaulon koernickianum completed

annually, including selected measures of vigor (see Methodology).

Access is needed.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, spring, May - June, Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Anderson County: Engling WMA; Upon field investigations, locate

at least one other monitoring site in another county; try to ensure representation of habitat types and risks to the population.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as

baseline information. Count the plants, take the following measure of vigor: height. Take a subset of the population if field conditions

warrant. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Jason Singhurst; Gordon Uno; J. Gentry, R.

Tyul, P. Riser, J. Crockett, Status Report, December 1978; Gary Tucker, Status Report, 1983; Linda Watson, Status Survey in

Oklahoma, Dec 1989.

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

June 1995 Reviewd August 1995

Scientific Name:

Briogonum suffruticosum

Candidate Category:

C2 12

Common Name:

bushy wild buckwheat

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Brewster, Pecos, and Presidio Counties

Known Occurrences:

Ten occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Road building, dirt biking, grazing, and small acreage development

all impact this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Eriogonum suffruticosum

completed triennially, including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, April - May; Perennial sub-shrub

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: two sites, Big Bend Ranch State Natural Area. If

possible, locate 2 - 3 additional monitoring sites off the SNA that

represent various land use practices.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Tag and count the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: height; number of fruit and flower clusters. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, including

recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jean Hardy; Jackie Poole, TPWD; Mike Powell and Jeff Clark,

Status Review, December 1983.

Recommendations:

Known populations need to be relocated.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

ŧ

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Escobaria guadalupensis

Candidate Category:

Listing Rank:

C211

Guadalupe Mountains pincushion cactus G/S Rank:

G1 S1

Range:

Culberson County

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations; possible collection pressures

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Escobaria guadalupensis completed

biennially, including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, April - May, Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: McKittrick Ridge Trail

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags that are discreetly located. Count the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: height; diameter and number of stems; and number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Ken Heil, Steve Brack, Mike Powell, Allen

Zimmerman.

Recommendations:

Additional populations need to be located, work with staff from Guadalupe Mountains National Park (GMNP) to coordinate and

assist in monitoring this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Enlisting volunteers with monitoring cacti is not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD, Status Report, 1989; Lynda Pritchett-Kozak

and Liz Ecker, Desert Botanical Garden, Phoenix Arizona; Denise

Louie

Recommendations: Work with the staff from BIBE to monitor the populations.

Castilleja elongata also occurs in the Chisos Mountains and flowers at the same time. These two species should be monitored on the

same trip.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and BIBE to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Festuca ligulata

Candidate Category: C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Guadalupe Mountains fescue

G/S Rank: G1S1

Range:

Brewster and Culberson Counties; Coahuila, Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences, one recent in Big Bend National Park (BIBE).

Reasons for Concern:

One known population, vulnerable to trampling along the trail by humans as well as domestic animals used by the trail crew and other

trail maintenance activities.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Festuca ligulata completed annually,

one site.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, August - September; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park, Chisos Mountains, lower

Boot Springs.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted and number of fruiting/flowering stalks counted. Note any herbivory, insect

damage, reproduction activity or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires, compass

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department by August 1st of each year noting annual population and any changes/ shifts in sample area.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant unless it can be related to moisture conditions. If

the cause is related to management, management

recommendations will be reviewed.

Scientific Name:

Fryxellia pygmaea

Candidate Category:

C210

Common Name:

small fryxell wort

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G1 SH

Range:

west Texas (Historical; county unknown); Coahuila, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

One occurrence from 1854

Reasons for Concern:

Two collections known; habitat alteration

Monitoring Objective:

Relocate population, when found- obtain a count of Fryxellia

pygmaea to be completed triennially, including selected measures of

vigor.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Triennially, May - June. Look for every three years

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Unknown

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Take the following measurements: number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including

recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2-3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

David Bates; Paul Fryxell. Resource Specialists:

Recommendations: Texas populations need to be relocated. Visit site in Mexico to

identify key habitat characteristics.

Potential use of

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in relocating and Volunteers:

eventually monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Scientific Name: Gaillardia aestivalis var. winkleri Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank: 12

Common Name: white firewheel G/S Rank: G5T1S1

Range: Hardin County

Known Occurrences: Known from one county, eight records, four sites verified.

Reasons for Concern: Low numbers of populations and some types of disturbance could

eliminate populations.

Monitoring Objective: Obtain a population count of plants of Gaillardia aestivalis var.

winkleri, including detailed measures of vigor for each plant (see Methodology), completed annually at each of the four verified sites.

Priority: MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Annually, April - October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Hardin County: 1-Northwest shoulder of McNelly Bridge Road, 0.4-0.5

road miles northeast of FM 420; 2-Roy E. Larsen Sandylands Preserve, along trails through uplands, 5 1/4 miles; 3-North side of FM 418, south of Dry Creek, 0.2 miles east of Village Creek; 4-Willard Lake Road and Village Creek Road, development east of Lumberton.

Methodology: Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas.

If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: Number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD; Ike McWhorter, TNC

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Nature Conservancy to monitor populations on

the Sandylands Preserve.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TNC and regional TPWD volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Helianthus praecox ssp. hirtus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Dimmit sunflower

G/S Rank: G4T1Q\$1

Range:

Dimmit County

Known Occurrences:

One population is known in U.S. in the area of Carrizo Springs.

Population of approximately 60-80 plants in 1987, approximately 10 plants in 1993. Also occurs with Carrizo Springs Pocket Gopher (C2).

Reasons for Concern:

Only two known occurrences.

Monitoring Objective:

To obtain a total population census of all plants of Helianthus praecox

ssp. hirtus including detailed measures of vigor for each plant (see

Methodology) located at the Carrizo Springs site, annually,

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY - there are taxonomic questions regarding this

subspecies that need to be clarified.

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, August, during flowering; Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Dimmit County: Carrizo Springs, located in the middle of town in an overgrown field across from the ACCO feed building on FM 186. As of fall 1993, a community center and parking lot occupy the majority of the field. Small remnant patch remaining. Additional site discovered

fall of 1993.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area and count

individuals plants. If possible mark boundaries using easily recognizable landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproductive activity, recruitment, or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Review March 1972

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Loren Rieseberg, Indiana University, Department of Biology,

Bloomington, Indiana; Angela Brooks, USFWS-Corpus Christi.

Recommendations: Status survey is being completed by BRIT. Work with the citizens of

Carrizo Springs to raise their awareness of the unique plant they have

in their town.

Potential use of

Volunteers: May be able to utilize regional TPWD volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Genistidium dumosum

Candidate Category:

C210

Common Name:

brush-pea

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Brewster County; Coahuila, Mexico.

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Low numbers, one population along highway susceptible to highway

expansion and maintenance activities.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Genistidium dumosum

completed triennially, including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, June - September; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: nine miles east of Lajitas, south side of Highway

170

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. take the following measures of vigor: height and number of flowers/fruits. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

J. Clark, A.M. Powell, Status Report, Dec 1982; Jackie Poole, TPWD, Status Report, Dec 1992; Liz Slauson, Desert Botanical Garden, Arizona.

Recommendations:

Highway right-of-way monitoring completed, may be able to continue working with staff from the Highway Department to continue monitoring this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Helianthus paradoxus

Candidate Category: C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

puzzle sunflower

G/S Rank:

G2S1

Range:

Pecos and Reeves Counties: New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Eight occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Species susceptible to grazing pressures and adversely affected by the lowering of the water table from pumping of groundwater for irrigation purposes; also, hybridization with other annual sunflowers

is a concern.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Helianthus paradoxus

completed annually, one site.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, September: Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos County: Diamond Y Springs, TNC Preserve; highway right-

of-way site.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants that occur within 26 -5m x 10m² plots. Take the following measures of vigor: stem height, number of flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage. recruitment, hybridization or other conditions. Set up a

standardized photo point location or locations to encompass the

population.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD, Status Report Update, 1992; Wagner and

Sabo, Status Report, 1977; Dennis Miller et al, Status Report, 1982;

Sivinski, Status Report, New Mexico, 1992; Bill Van Auken.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TNC to monitor the populations.

Potential use of

ſ

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TNC and the former landowner to

assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Hexalectris nitida

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Rank: 11

Common Name:

Glass Mountain coral-root

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Bandera, Brewster, Coryell, Dallas, Hays, Kendall, Pecos (Historical), Taylor

and Travis Counties; Coahuila, Mexico; possibly New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Twelve known occurrences, widely separated localities

Reasons for Concern:

Few individuals, fugitive.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Hexalectris nitida, including

detailed measures of vigor for each plant (see Methodology), completed

triennially at selected sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, August; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/NPS/USFWS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Taylor County: Abilene State Recreation Area, dry gravelly areas south of county road, southern tip of the SRA; Brewster County: Big

Bend National Park, Pine Canyon Trail and North side of Boot Canyon;

Travis County: Post Oak Ridge Wildlife Refuge, Webster Tract.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas.

If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks,

stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: Number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 1 Day at each site; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD, the National Park and the National Wildlife Refuge to monitor populations on the respective properties. A more rigorous study regarding the life history of this species and that of H. warnockii should be undertaken at the State Recreation Area where these both occur. In time additional monitoring sites could be established at Fort Hood Military Reservation and Camp Barkley National Guard site as well as on private property.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the National Park, National Wildlife Refuge, regional TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan;

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Hexalectris warnockii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Warnock's coral-root

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Brewster, Dallas, Gillespie, Hays, Jeff Davis, Taylor and Terrell Counties;

Arizona and New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Fifteen known occurrences, widely separated localities

Reasons for Concern:

Few individuals, fugitive.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of plants of Hexalectris warnockii,

including detailed measures of vigor for each plant (see Methodology),

completed triennially at selected sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, June - August; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/NPS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Taylor County: Abilene State Recreation Area, dry gravelly areas

south of county road, southern tip of the SRA; Brewster County: Big

Bend National Park, various locations.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas.

If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks,

stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: Number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 Day at each site, + 2 days travel to each site; 5-6

Days total; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD and the National Park to monitor populations on the respective properties. Ensure diverse habitats are represented in the various monitoring sites. A more rigorous study regarding the life history of this species and that of H. nitida should be undertaken at the State Recreation Area where these both occur. In time additional monitoring sites could be established at Camp Barkley National Guard site as well as monitoring populations that occur on private property.

Potential use of Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the National Park and regional TPWD

volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Hibiscus dasvealyx

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Neches River rose-mallow

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Cherokee, Harrison, Houston, and Trinity Counties

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, those along roadways subject to disturbance of road building and maintenance activities; invasive non-natives; changes in hydrology; and impacts from utility line maintenance.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Hibiscus dasycalyx from two sites,

completed annually including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, August; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFWS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Houston County: southwest of Lovelady; Trinity County: roadside

park, near Black Cat Lake, Tx 94.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Inconspicuously tag and count the plants. Take the following measurements of vigor: height, number of primary stems from the base; and total number of fruits and flowers. Note any pollination, insect damage, recruitment, hybridization or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Kathryn Kennedy and Jackie Poole, Status Report, 1990; Bill Carr,

Gena Janssen, TPWD; Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Michael Warnock, Sam Houston State University, Status Report; Jason

Singhurst.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the Highway Department to monitor the

populations. Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Isoetes lithophila

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

rock quillwort

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Burnet, Llano and Mason Counties

Known Occurrences:

Sixteen known occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

Occur in vernal pools, very susceptible to disturbance.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population survey of Isoetes lithophila completed annually at

selected sites during the spring after sufficient rainfall. Flexibility is

essential.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, April - June; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/LCRA

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Burnet Count: Inks Lake State Park, three locations; LCRA tract JE-6. one location; Llano County: Enchanted Rock State Natural Area, two

locations; LCRA tract JW-6, one, possibly two locations.

Methodology:

Detailed maps showing precise locations of vernal pools will be necessary to permanently delineate and describe each of the seven+ population areas. The population should be surveyed to estimate the percent cover within the pool area circumscribed. Set-up photo point

records for each pool, using a photo scale stick.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, quadrats, camera, photo scale stick.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total Red Flag Conditions:

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring

design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Bill Carr, TPWD: Chester Rowell, Status Report, 1983 Resource Specialists:

Work with the staff from TPWD and the Lower Colorado River Recommendations:

Authority to monitor populations on the respective properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the two State Parks and LCRA

volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Justicia runyonii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Runyon's water-willow

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Brazoria, Cameron, Goliad (?)*, and Hidalgo County; Tamaulipas, Mexico

*(?-questionable locality or identification)

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-one occurrences, at least three extirpated.

Reasons for Concern:

Populations could be extirpated by land clearing activities, and impacts of exotics could significantly out compete the remaining native stands.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population survey of <u>Justicia runyonii</u>, including detailed measures of vigor for each plant in the sample set (see Methodology).

completed triennially at eight selected sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, September - November; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFWS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Cameron County: 1-Resaca de la Palma State Park, four locations; 2-USFWS, Thompson Road Brush Tract; 3-Sabal Palm Grove Sanctuary;

Hidalgo County: 1-Santa Ana National Wildlife Refuge; 2-Las

Palomas Wildlife Management Area.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the eight population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. The population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, a 100 meter tape will be placed within the population. Along this meter tape, ten 5m x 5m quadrats will be randomly selected placed along either side of the tape. Total number of individuals will be counted within each quadrat. Take the following measurements: number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20% change in the density of <u>Justicia runyonii</u> between any two years, and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires, 5m x 5m

quadrat.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, Status Report, 1989; Mike Heep; Gary Waggerman; Rose

Farmer; Jim Copeland

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD, USFWS, and Audubon to monitor

populations on the respective properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the State Park, Wildlife Management

Area, USFWS and Audubon members to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Justicia wrightii

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Wright's water-willow

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G2 S2

Range:

Brewster (Historical), Pecos, and Val Verde Counties

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

No recent populations have been found, occur on areas of intense

grazing pressures.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Justicia wrightii completed

triennially after populations are relocated.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, April - May

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Pecos County:

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and if appropriate, tag them. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity,

recruitment, damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD to monitor the populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Kallstroemia perennans

Candidate Category:

C2 11

Common Name:

perennial caltrop

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Brewster, Presidio and Val Verde Counties

Known Occurrences:

Five occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, low number of individuals, ORVs

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Kallstroemia perennans

completed annually, including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, August - October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend Ranch SNA; Presidio County: 20 miles

southeast of Redford along Hwy 170; Val Verde County: 21 miles

west of Comstock on Hwy 90:

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. Ideally, a

map of each population should be completed as baseline

information. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily

recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Tag and count the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: height and number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction

activity, including recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 - 4 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Michael Powell

Recommendations:

Site staff at Big Bend Ranch State Natural Area may be able to

monitor this species on the SNA.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Lachnocaulon digynum

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

tiny bog buttons

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G3 S1

Range:

Jasper and Newton Counties; Alabama, Florida, Louisiana and Mississippi

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Changes in the water table, grazing impacts on the habitat, fire

suppression and clearcutting

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Lachnocaulon digvnum completed

biennially, including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, Perennial, Late Summer - Fall

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jasper County: Little Rocky Nature Preserve; Newton County: two

sites, Scrappin' Valley Wildlife and Research Area and McKinn

Creek.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags that are discreetly located. Count the plants. Adjust if necessary if field conditions warrant. Note any

herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, including

recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jason Singhurst, TPWD; Steve Orzell, Fl NHP

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Leavenworthia texana

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Texas golden glade cress

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Nacogdoches (introduced), Sabine, and San Augustine Counties

Known Occurrences:

Eight occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations located along roadsides or grazed pastures, subject

to road maintenance pressures and grazing.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Leavenworthia texana to be completed

annually at three select sites, including detailed measures for each

plant (see Methodology).

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, March; Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sabine County: Tx 21 south of Geneva; San Augustine County:

east of San Augustine- two sites.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted, taking the following measurements: number fruiting/flowering stems. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity,

recruitment or other conditions. Access is needed.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Wm Mahler; Johnnie Gentry, Jr. et al,

Status Report, 1978; Elray Nixon; Robert George.

Recommendations: Work with landowners to enlist their assistance. This annual species

may move some distance from year to year, the exact area of the population needs to be very well defined and some time should be spent each year searching for suitable habitat in the vicinity

(approximately 1 mile radius) for other populations.

Potential use of (approximately 1 mile radius) for other populations

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Lepidospartum burgessii

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

gypsum scalebroom

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2 S1

Range:

Hudspeth County; New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Six occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Small range, substrate specific, few localities, low numbers as well as

some grazing, off-road vehicles, and road building impact this

species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a count of Lepidospartum burgessii to be completed

biennially, including selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, Perennial, May - late Summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC/NPS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hudspeth County: Dell City, two sites

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Tag the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: number of flowering heads or clusters, height, and basal stem diameter. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including

recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Te

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: R. Worthington; V. Davila, L. Higgins; C. Rowell, Status Report,

Dec 1983; Laura Huennecke, NMSU Las Cruces has been monitoring this species in New Mexico and possibly in Texas.

Recommendations: Work with TNC and Guadalupe Mountains National Park staff to

monitor this species. Contact Laura Huennecke, NMSU Las Cruces

to discuss her work on this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD, Guadalupe Mountain National Park and\or

TNC volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Scientific Name: Lesquerella thamnophila Candidate Category: PE

Listing Rank: 2

Common Name: Zapata bladderpod G/S Rank: G1S1

Range: Start and Zapata Counties

Known Occurrences: Three populations are known in U.S., none known in Mexico.

Reasons for Concern: Susceptible to grazing, clearing and development. In 1985 there were

approximately 6000 plants observed, in 1986 there were approximately 48, no count was made in 1988 but plants were observed. Fluctuation

was due to drought.

Monitoring Objective: To obtain a total population census of all plants of Lesquerella

thamnophila located at each of the three sites completed annually.

Priority: HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Annually in April during flowering; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Starr Cty.-Santa Margarita Ranch, 5 acres-private; Zapata Cty.- Tigre

Chiquita, 10 acres-private and Tx DOT; Zapata Cty.-Falcon Lake West,

15 acres-private. Need site access.

Methodology: Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If

possible mark boundaries using easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Obtain a total count of individuals. Note any

recruitment.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, Flagging/pin flags, Stakes, Metal tags and

Wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline.

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Drs. Elizabeth Shaw and Reed Rollins,

Department of Botany, Harvard University, Cambridge, MA

Recommendations: Work with the USFWS-Corpus Christi office, Rio Grande National

Wildlife Refuge and TPWD Wildlife Division staff to look for

additional populations in the Starr and Zapata County areas. Enlist site staff in the monitoring effort. Also work with the Tx DOT staff to take on the responsibility of monitoring on the highway right-of-way.

This species is being proposed endangered.

Potential use of

Volunteers: May be able to utilize TPWD volunteers from the Valley as well as

from the Refuges.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Scientific Name:

Liatris tenuis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

slender gay-feather

G/S Rank:

G2G3 S2S3

Range:

Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine, San Augustine and Tyler Counties;

Louisiana (questionable identification)

Known Occurrences:

Thirty-four occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Fire suppression, habitat destruction.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Liatris tenuis completed biennially at

selected sites. Four sites, additional sites may be added upon field

investigation.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, June - August

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Angelina County: Tx 63, 12 miles south of Zavalla; Jasper County: Boykin Spring Recreation Area; Newton County: Sabine County line site; Sabine County: Sabine National Forest, Compartment 139.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population areas. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. Count the plants (upon site visit, total count may not be possible, modify as necessary). Measures of vigor may be taken, including: number of flowering stems. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination,

reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline. TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD; Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Rob Evans, USFS

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from US Forest Service to monitor the populations located on their property. Species easily confused with other Liatris

species, monitors must know the taxonomy well.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and USFS to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Dr. David Wester, TTU has been monitoring Faskin Ranch, a low

level radioactive waste authority site.

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation

Scientific Name:

Lycium texanum

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Texas wolf-berry

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G2 S2

Range:

Brewster, Culberson and Hudspeth Counties

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few known populations, low numbers, susceptible to disturbance.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Lycium texanum completed

triennially, once relocated.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, July - October

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: south of Alpine; Culberson County: east of Van

Horn; Hudspeth County: Sierra Blanca, Faskin Ranch

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and tag them. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment.

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

suggestions for management changes, or define research

Scientific Name:

Machaeranthera aurea

Candidate Category: C2

Common Name:

Houston machaerantha

Listing Rank: G2S2

Range:

Galveston and Houston Counties

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-one occurrences are known. Twenty occurrences are known from Harris County, one from Galveston County (1974). Status Report

completed in 1980.

Reasons for Concern:

Located in urban Houston area, subject to urban expansion. Also occurs with Hymenoxys texana (LE) and Chloris texensis (C2).

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a total population census of at least six occurrences of plants of

Machaeranthera aurea located in the Houston area, and the one

occurrence in Galveston County completed annually.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, early to late October and November: Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Harris County: Six locations are to be monitored. Sites to be

monitored need to be revisited to ensure populations still exist.

Galveston County: One location in San Leon.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area and count individuals. If the monitoring personnel determine that the population is too large to easily perform a census in one day, the population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, a 100 meter tape will be placed within the population, (the transect to be permanently designated and described). Along this meter tape, ten 5m x 25m quadrats will be randomly place along either side of the tape, with the 5m side on the tape. Total number of individuals will be counted within each quadrat.

For this estimate, obtain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the value of the population and be 90% sure of detecting a 20% change in the density of <u>Machaeranthera aurea</u> between any two years and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes-at least 4, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires,

compass (s), random numbers table.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2-3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management

changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, TPWD; Larry E. Brown, Houston Community College;

Doug Williams; Greg Wieland, Mercer Arboretum; Kathy Nemec,

USFWS-Clear Lake

Recommendations: Work with the county highway maintenance staff to assist with the

responsibility of monitoring on the populations that occur on the

highway right-of-way.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Houston area Native Plant Society members may be enlisted to help

monitor as well as area TPWD volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Manfreda longiflora

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

5

Common Name:

Runyon's huaco

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Cameron (Historical), Hidalgo and Starr Counties

Known Occurrences:

Nine occurrences in two counties, seven have been recently observed.

Reasons for Concern:

Development could impact this species which is in low numbers and has few known populations; also potential collecting could impact this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Manfreda longiflora completed annually.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, September; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFWS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hidalgo County: two sites, one on Lower Rio Grande Valley National Wildlife Refuge; Starr County: five sites, LRGV NWR, highway-right-of-

way, and private, (need access).

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet

Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Noreen Damude and Jackie Poole, Status Report, 1990; Marshall Johnston

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD and USFWS to monitor populations on the

respective properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and USFWS to assist in monitoring

this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Matelea radiata

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Falfurrias milkvine

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

11 G1 S1

Range:

Brooks (Historical), Hidalgo (Historical), and Starr (Questionable

identification) Counties

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Farming and pasture improvements

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Matelea radiata completed

once population(s) are relocated and/or located.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, June - July, Look for every three years:

Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brooks County: Relocate 1909 population

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks. stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and tag them at the base if possible. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction

activity, recruitment, damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2-3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

å

suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the local area to monitor the populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name: Matelea texensis Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank: 8

Common Name: Texas milkvine G/S Rank: G1S1

Range: Brewster County

Known Occurrences: Species is known from a single location south of Alpine on private

property. Status Report, 1983, Brian Hanks and A. Michael Powell.

Reasons for Concern: Single population presently extant. The highway population may be

extinct due to the widening of Hwy 118 in the early 1980's. No other sites are listed in the database however, other populations apparently

occur on private property.

Monitoring Objective: We want a total population census of all plants of Matelea texensis.

including detailed measures of vigor for each individual plant (see Methodology) completed annually, providing access is granted on at

least one site.

Priority: HIGH PRIORITY.

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Annually in August; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Brewster County: extant population occurred in igneous soil along

highway, alt. 4,650 ft. Other site(s) location unknown.

Methodology: Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If

possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Take the following measurements of the plants: an annual count of flowers and fruits, and number of primary and secondary stems, and basal stem diameter. Note any herbivory.

insect damage, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

Revised March 1995

ŧ

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Barton Warnock; Brian G. Hanks & Michael Powell, Status Report

1983.

Recommendations:

Need to search for additional populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize regional TPWD volunteers in the area.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Nolina arenicola

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

sand sacahuista

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G2Q S2

Range:

Culberson, El Paso (Questionable identification), and Hudspeth Counties

Known Occurrences:

Eight occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Sheep and goat grazing on inflorescences and pasture improvements.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Nolina arenicola completed

annually with selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, May - June

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Highway right-of-way; Hudspeth County:

Guadalupe Mtns NP. If possible, locate additional monitoring sites

that represent additional land use practices.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and tag them. Take selected measures of vigor: number of infloresences. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment,

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole and Gena Janssen, Mary Candee, TPWD

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Guadalupe Mountains National Park to

> coordinate and monitor the population in Hudspeth County and the Highway Dept to monitor the HROW. This will require taxonomic

skill.

Potential use of

Possibly utilize volunteers from Guadalupe Mountains NP and Volunteers:

TPWD to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Opuntia arenaria

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

sand prickly-pear

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

El Paso and Hudspeth (historical) Counties; New Mexico; Chihuahua,

Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Six occurrences in Texas

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction from development impact this species. Potential

growth as a result of the free trade agreement may greatly impact

this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Opuntia arenaria completed annually,

one site.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, May - June: Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

El Paso: I-10, N. Mesa.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. Count the population. Note any herbivory. insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2-3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

David Sabo, Status Report, 1981; Richard Worthington, UTEP.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the Highway Department and/or Richard Worthington to assist in monitoring and managing for this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Dried Mills

Scientific Name:

Opuntia auresispina

Candidate Category:

C2 11

Common Name:

golden-spine prickly-pear

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G1 \$1

Range:

Brewster County

Known Occurrences:

One occurrence

Reasons for Concern:

Only one population, low numbers

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Opuntia auresispina

completed triennially.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Big Bend National Park

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and tag them. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment,

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management,

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Ken Heil, Steve Brack

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Big Bend National Park to monitor the

populations. May require some taxonomic skill.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Enlisting volunteers with monitoring cacti is not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Opuntia engelmannii var.

Candidate Category: C2

flexospina

Listing Rank:

12

Common Name:

few-spine Engelmann's

G/S Rank:

G3T1 S1

prickly-pear

Range:

Starr, Webb (historical), and Zapata Counties

Known Occurrences:

Three occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Low numbers of populations, subject to collecting pressures

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Opuntia engelmannii var. flexospina

completed triennially, one site.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - Relocate and verify taxonomy

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, April - June

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Starr County: one site, west of Roma.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Take the following measures of vigor: number of pads; number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity,

recruitment other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 1-2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 10% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

ŧ

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Phil Clayton,

Recommendations:

Coordinate monitoring efforts with other species in the valley.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

ŧ

Scientific Name:

Opuntia imbricata var. argentea

Candidate Category:

C2 12

Common Name:

silver cholla

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G5T1S1

Range:

Brewster County

Known Occurrences:

Four occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Known only from a few locations, may be potential for illegal

collecting.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Opuntia imbricata var. argentea

completed biennially.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially; Perennial, June -July

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park, two sites, Rooney's Place and Mariscal Mine Ruins. If at all possible, locate another population under different land use practices off the park, providing

access is allowed, and monitor.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be tagged and counted or estimated. Take the following measures of vigor: height, number of joints, and number of flowers and fruits. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable

decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Denise Louie, BIBE

Recommendations:

Work with staff from Big Bend National Park to coordinate

monitoring this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Enlisting volunteers with monitoring cacti is not recommended.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Ostrva chisosensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Big Bend hop-hornbeam

G/S Rank:

11 G2S1

Range:

Brewster County; northern Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Five occurrences, only one recently verified in Big Bend National

Park (BIBE).

Reasons for Concern:

Low population numbers

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Ostrya chisosensis completed every

three years.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, May - June

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/BIBE

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County, Chisos Mountains, Boot Spring, Emory Peak Trail

below the Pinnacles.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be tagged and counted. Measure dbh and note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires, calipers,

and dbh tape.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

Residence Sales (1997)

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the National Park to monitor this species.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD and/or BIBE volunteers to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Oxypolis ternata

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

threeleaf cowbane

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G3? S1

Range:

Hardin and Tyler (Questionable identification) Counties; Florida, Georgia,

Mississippi, North Carolina, South Carolina

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Only two populations have been found

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Oxypolis ternata completed

annually.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually; Perennial from tubers, late Summer - early Fall?

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Hardin County: Big Thicket

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Tag and count the plants. Modify as necessary. Take the following measures of vigor: height and number of fruiting and flowering clusters. Note any herbivory, insect damage, reproduction activity, including recruitment, or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Bill Carr, TPWD; Rob Evans, USFS; Geralidine Watson

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD and the US Forest Service to

monitor the populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and the Forest Service to

assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

June 1995 Revised August 1995

Scientific Name:

Paronychia congesta

Candidate Category: C1

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

bushy whitlow-wort

G/S Rank:

G1S1

Range:

Jim Hogg County.

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations known, low numbers, possible habitat destruction from

petrochemical development affect this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of Paronychia congesta completed

annually, including selected measures of vigor (see Methodology).

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, spring; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jim Hogg County; Hwy 649 and FR 3073, two sites.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be estimated using approximately 5 macroplots (5m x 5m) permanently placed within the population. Within the macroplots, count the plants, take the following measures: height; and number of flower clusters. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, 5m² quadrat, compass, metal tags and

wire.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days; 2-3 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline,

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive

appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Noreen Damude and Jackie Poole, Status Report, 1990, Gena Janssen.

TPWD.

Recommendations:

Look for additional populations. Monitoring in progress for this

species.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Paronychia wilkinsonii

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Wilkinson's whitlow-wort

Listing Rank: G/S Rank: 11 G2 S2

Range:

Brewster County; Chihuahua and Coahuila, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Six occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few known populations, low numbers, may be substrate specific

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Paronychia wilkinsonii

completed annually.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually; Perennial; April - ?

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: one to two sites near Marathon

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Take selected measures of vigor: height, length, and width. Upon site visit, it may be determined to count the number of stems or the height and width of the largest stem. Modify as necessary. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment, damage or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

June 1995 Revised August 1995

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD

Recommendations:

The Highway right-of-way monitoring project has been completed.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation

Scientific Name:

Pediomelum humile

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

11

Common Name:

Rydberg's scurfpea

G/S Rank:

G2S1

Range:

Val Verde County; Coahuila, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Four occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Low numbers of individuals and populations; highly localized; and

habitat destruction affect this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Pediomelum humile completed

annually, including selected measures of vigor, one site.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, May; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Val Verde County: east side of 277 north of Del Rio.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the population area. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: number of leaves; number of fruits and flowers. Note any

herbivory, insect damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife
Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Na

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611

East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole, Gena Janssen, Sylvestre Sorrola, Mary Candee, TPWD.

Recommendations: Work with the city of Del Rio, San Felipe Country Club and Texas

Department of Transportation to monitor populations on respective properties. Track individuals through time to better understand

responses to drought. Monitoring in progress at this site.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Penstemon alamosensis

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Alamo beardtongue

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G2 S1

Range:

El Paso County; New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Two occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Low numbers and few populations, susceptible to grazing

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Penstemon alamosensis

completed annually.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually; Perennial, late April - May

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/DOD(Ft. Bliss)

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

El Paso County: Ft. Bliss, two sites

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and tag them at the base if possible. Take the following measures of vigor: height, number of primary stems, number of flowers and fruits. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment,

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Re-

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide

acquist intentioring design or data confection, provide

suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Richard Worthington; R. Spellenberg, Status Report, May 1981;

Sandra Limerick

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Ft. Bliss to monitor this species on their

land.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and/or Ft. Bliss to assist in

monitoring this species.

Summer 1995 Date for Review of Plan:

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Revised August 1995

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Perityle huecoensis

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Hueco rock-daisy

G/S Rank: G1S1

Range:

El Paso County

Known Occurrences:

One population is known in U.S. in North Hueco Mountains.

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to disturbance, and only one known location of this species.

Monitoring Objective:

To obtain a total population census of all plants of Perityle huecoensis

located at the Hueco Mountains site, Canyons 4 and 5 completed

biennially.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY.

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially in September during flowering: Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

Ft. Bliss Military Reservation-Dept. of Defense-Conservation

Agreement with USFWS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

El Paso County: Hueco Mountains, 2.5 miles east of Nations East Well and approximately 3 miles west of Hueco Tanks State Historical Park, area primarily within and at the southeast corner of Fort Bliss Military Reservation. Canyons 4 and 5 hold the three sub-populations of Perityle huecoensis, canyon 5, near the mouth of the canyon on the East side with a north exposure (70 plants in 1991); back of the canyon (367 plants in 1991); canyon 4, on north cliff exposure (21 plants in 1991).

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area and count

individuals plants. If possible mark boundaries using easily

recognizable landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. In some cases it may be necessary to scan for and count individuals using binoculars. Note

any reproductive activity or recruitment.

Field Equipment Needed: Binoculars, measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work. Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758; Department of Defense-Fort Bliss Military Reservation, Ft. Bliss, TX.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Richard Worthington, The University of Texas at El Paso, Department

of Biological Sciences; Kevin von Finger; A. Michael Powell, Sul Ross

State University, Department of Biology; Rafael Corral.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Ft. Bliss Military Reservation. They are

contracting a small mammal research project through Texas Tech (S. Demaris) to assess potential impact of military tank operations on the arroyos. Also, a wildfire went through the area in 1993 and it would be interesting to determine any affects it had on the populations of P.

huecoensis based on Richard Worthingon's baseline data.

Potential use of

Volunteers: TPWD park volunteers, personnel from Ft. Bliss Military Reservation

and graduate and undergraduate students from Sul Ross State

University may be available for monitoring.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Philadelphus ernestii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

canyon mock orange

G/S Rank:

Range:

Blanco, Comal, Hays, Kendall and Travis Counties

Known Occurrences:

Known from 12 sites in Texas.

Reasons for Concern:

Limited occurrences and potential disturbance could affect the populations.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of plants of Philadelphus ernestii completed

biennially located at six sites.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially during flowering in April, with visual check during the

intervening years; Deciduous shrub

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Blanco County: Pedernales State Park, Bee Creek; Comal County: South side of Guadalupe River, ca 0.7-0.8 river miles west of "first" crossing on River Road; Hays County: Stream below Dead Man's Hole; Kendall County: along Curry Creek, above and below Edge Falls, 5 miles south of Kendalia--Need Access; Travis County: 1-West Bull Creek and 2-

Hamilton Pool.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, one or more 50 to 100 meter transect lines (dependent on the habitat) will be placed within the population. If possible, establish a "permanent" transect location. Along the line-intercept meter tape, total number of stems will be counted along the intercept. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20% change in the density of Philadelphus ernestii between any two years, and be willing

to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3-4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet

Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Jackie Poole and Bill Carr, TPWD; Wm Mahler, Status Report, 1981

Recommendations: Work with staff from Pedernales Falls State Park, Hamilton Pool County

Park and the Nature Conservancy to monitor the populations of

Philadelphus ernestii.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD, TNC and those from Hamilton

Pool County Park to assist with the monitoring.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name: Polemonium pauciflorum ssp. hincklevi Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank: 12

Common Name: Hinckley's jacob's-ladder G/S Rank: G3T1Q S1

Range: Jeff Davis County; Arizona; Chihuahua, Mexico

Known Occurrences: In Texas, known from the west slope of Mt. Livermore, in cool, shaded

areas above upper spring, Madera Canyon, ca 7500 ft elevation, in the Davis Mountains. There is a record for Goat Canyon as well, (1935). Private Property-TNC-Texas Land Steward Society Member. Need

Access.

Reasons for Concern: Only known location in Texas, population fluctuation may be due to

rainfall variation.

Monitoring Objective: Obtain a total population census of all plants of <u>Polemonium</u>

pauciflorum ssp hincklevi,, including detailed measures of vigor for each

plant (see Methodology), completed biennially. Access is needed.

Priority: HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Biennially in July-August; Perennial. If there is a change is land

use, then monitor Annually.

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Jeff Davis County: Davis Mountains, on the west slope of Mt.

Livermore, in cool, shaded areas above upper spring, Madera Canyon, ca 7500 ft elevation, 1987-located in drainage .15 mile below (north of)

Tobe Spring, upper Madera Canyon.

Methodology: Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. If

possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: Number of primary and secondary stems; number of fruits and flowers; and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage, recruitment or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Barton Warnock, Alpine; Michael Powell, Sul Ross State University;

Jackie Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations: Work with Nature Conservancy staff in monitoring this species and

other candidates that are located on this ranch.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the Nature Conservancy.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Prenanthes barbata

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

na

Common Name:

barbed rattlesnake root

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

Cass, Cherokee, Hardin, Jasper, Nacogdoches Newton, Polk, Rusk, San Augustine

and Shelby Counties; Alabama, Arkansas, Georgia, Kentucky, Louisiana and

Tennessee.

Known Occurrences:

Known from eight occurrences, two that have been recently verified.

Reasons for Concern:

Only two verified occurrences along highway right-of-way, susceptible to

disturbance which could extirpate the populations.

Monitoring Objective:

We want a population count of plants of Prenanthes barbata, including

detailed measure of vigor for each plant (see Methodology), completed

triennially at each of the two verified sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Shelby County: Sabine National Forest, ca. 1.5 miles north of Texas 147 and 1279 junction, on east side of Texas 147, Tenaha Road, Compartment 51; Nacogdoches County: State Rt. 21, 100 yards west of Bayou Loco.

0.4 miles east of County Rd 829.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. If possible, inconspicuously tag individual plants. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: number of fruits and flowers and height. Note any herbivory, insect damage,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, Pin Flags, Stakes, Metal Tags/Wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD; Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Rob Evans, USFS, Lufkin

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the Highway Department to monitor populations

and ensure proper management techniques are followed.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize regional TPWD volunteers.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Psilactis heterocarpa

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Welder machaeranthera

G/S Rank:

GISI

Range:

Nueces, Refugio, San Patricio and Victoria Counties

Known Occurrences:

Nineteen known occurrences, twelve have been recently relocated, mostly

from Refugio County.

Reasons for Concern:

Limited distribution and habitat alteration

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Psilactis heterocarpa completed

Biennially at selected sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN.

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Biennially, October; Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Refugio County: four sites north and northeast of Refugio, two sites south

and southeast of Refugio, two sites west of St Rt. 35; San Patricio: Welder Wildlife Foundation; Victoria: U.S Route 77, northwest side, 0.4

road miles north of FM 445, south end of county.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. ΙĘ possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes

and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Note any herbivory, insect damage,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

4 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline

is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to

determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet

Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD; Steve Orzell, Florida NHP

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the Welder Wildlife Foundation and the Highway

Department to monitor populations on their property with additional research on grazing affects on this species to be conducted by Welder.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize regional TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Rudbeckia scabrifolia

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

bog coneflower

G/S Rank: G2S2

Range:

Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine and Shelby Counties; Louisiana

Known Occurrences:

Thirty-two occurrences known.

Reasons for Concern:

Alteration of hydrology or impact to recharge area of seepage-bogs; grazing; fire exclusion or alteration of fire frequency; other logging

activities.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of plants of Rudbeckia scabrifolia

completed annually at selected sites-target 5 sites.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, June; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/US Forest Service

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Choose representative sites from both large and small populations from

each of the counties of occurrence, sites to include, pristine as well as

disturbed sites.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Estimate the number of plants through minimal impact on the environment. Exact methods to be determined on-site. Note any herbivory, insect damage, recruitment or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 4-5 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline.

TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified

immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Bill Carr, TPWD; Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Rob Evans, USFS; Larry

Brown, Houston Community College

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD and the National Forest to monitor

populations on the respective properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from the National Forest Service and

regional TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

وور شبيلا لينتيو

į

Scientific Name:

Salvia penstemonoides

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

2

Common Name:

big red sage

G/S Rank:

G1G2S1S2

Range:

Bandera, Bexar (Historical), Gillespie(Historical), Guadalupe (Historical),

Kendall, Kerr, Real, Travis (Introduced), and Wilson (Historical) Counties

Known Occurrences:

Sixteen occurrences recorded, six recently visited

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to disturbance, grazing and habitat alteration.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Salvia penstemonoides,

including detailed measure of vigor for each plant (see

Methodology), completed annually at each of the five verified sites.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, June-October; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Bandera County: Lost Maples State Park, three locations; Kendall

County: two sites-Big Joshua Creek, Fm 289; IH-10; Real County:

near Leakey, private ranch, access needed

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants, take the following measurements for each plant: number of primary and secondary stems; and a randomly selected subset number of plants are assessed for the number of fruits and flowers. At least 15 individuals should be selected from each site for the latter measurements. Note any herbivory, insect damage, recruitment,

reproduction activity or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 1 Day for each county; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, Gena Janssen, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD to monitor populations on the

State Park. Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the State Park to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Date of Implementation:

Series 1969

À

Scientific Name: Silene subciliata Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank: 5

Common Name: scarlet catchfly G/S Rank: G3S3

Range: Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson (Historical), Liberty, Newton, Polk, Sabine,

Shelby and Tyler County; Louisiana

Known Occurrences: Forty-nine occurrences.

Reasons for Concern: Habitat destruction or alteration through fire suppression, pine

plantations and exotic species affect this species.

Monitoring Objective: Obtain a population survey of <u>Silene subciliata</u> completed biennially

at four to eight selected sites. Sites to be selected upon field

investigation. At the Sandylands site, address the affects prescribed

burns have on the population.

Priority: LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Biennially, August-October; perennial

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD/USFS/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Hardin County: Roy E. Larson Sandylands Preserve; Village Creek

State Park; Polk County: Big Thicket National Preserve; Sabine County: Sabine National Forest. Sites to be selected upon field

investigation.

Methodology: Permanently delineate and describe each of the selected population

areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Note any herbivory, insect damage or other conditions. At Sandylands,

address populations that occur in burned verses unburned areas, set

up plots in each with different fire regimes and determine best

quantitative measurements to be taken.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 1 Day each county; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

į

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, Status Report, 1991; Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Rob

Evans, USFS; Ike McWhorter; Jason Singhurst.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD, USFS, and the Nature

Conservancy of Texas to monitor populations on the respective

properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the State Park, USFS and TNC to

assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Streptanthus bracteatus

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

2

Common Name:

bracted twistflower

G/S Rank:

G2\$2

Range:

Bandera, Caldwell (questionable locality), Comal, Medina, Real, Travis and

Uvalde Counties

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-two occurrences, primarily in Travis and Medina Counties

Reasons for Concern:

Few, small populations that fluctuate radically due to climate; also

susceptible to browsing and development.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of <u>Streptanthus bracteatus</u> to be completed annually at select sites, including detailed measures for each plant (see Methodology). Three sites within each, Travis and Medina counties are to be selected upon field investigation. Total

sites, seven.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, May, Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/City of Austin

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Travis County: three sites; Medina County: three sites. Uvalde

County: Garner State Park. Sites to be selected upon field

investigation.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Where possible, take the following measurements: height; and number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination,

reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 7-8 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseling

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: David Zippin, UT graduate student working on PhD; Noreen

Damude, Jackie Poole, TPWD, Status Report, 1990

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD and the City of Austin to monitor

populations on the respective properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and the City of Austin to

assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Streptanthus cutleri

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Cutler's twistflower

G/S Rank:

G2S2

3

Range:

Brewster County; Coahuila, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Thirteen occurrences, few recently verified

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to browsing or grazing pressures.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count from several populations of Streptanthus

cutleri completed annually, including selected measures of vigor.

Populations to be located, two to four sites to be selected.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, February - March; Annual

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD; BIBE (Big Bend National Park)

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: Big Bend National Park and Black Gap Wildlife

Management Area.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each population. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: height; number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, pollinators, insect damage, reproduction activity, recruitment or

other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Additional populations need to be located, work with staff from Black Gap and Big Bend National Park to assist monitoring this species. This annual species may move some distance from year to year, the exact area of the population needs to be very well defined and some time should be spent each year searching for suitable habitat in the vicinity (approximately 1 mile radius) for other

populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Streptanthus sparsiflorus

Candidate Category:

C2 11

Common Name:

sparsely-flowered jewelflower

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2 S2

Range:

Culberson County; New Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Nine occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few populations, very sensitive to browsing pressure

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Streptanthus sparsiflorus

completed annually.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, May - June

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Guadalupe Mountains National Park, three sites. If possible, locate a monitoring site off the park that would

represent other land use practices.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants. Take the following measures of vigor: height, and number of flowers and fruit, size of fruits and flowers should also be noted. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment, damage or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg. Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Jackie Poole, TPWD; Larry Higgins; David Zippin, UT Austin Resource Specialists:

Recommendations: Work with the staff from Guadalupe Mountains National Park to

monitor the populations. Populations are known to vary from year

to year.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and/or GMNP to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Thalictrum arkansanum

Candidate Category: C2

11

Common Name:

Arkansas meadow-rue

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G2QS1

Range:

Bowie, Lamar and Red River Counties; Arkansas and Oklahoma

Known Occurrences:

Six occurrences, Lennox Woods site is the largest population in the

tri-state range of this species.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction or alteration due to hydrologic changes such as

diversions or reservoirs would significantly impact the habitat of this

species as well as habitat clearing.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of Thalictrum arkansanum completed

annually, two sites.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, spring; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/TNC

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Red River County: Lennox Woods Preserve; Tx-DOT highway right-

of-way.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Note any

herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity,

recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Bill Carr, Jackie Poole, TPWD; Roger Sanders, BRIT Resource Specialists:

Work with the staff from TPWD and The Nature Conservancy to Recommendations:

monitor populations on the respective properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and TNC to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Date of Implementation: Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Thalictrum texanum

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Houston meadow-rue

G/S Rank:

G2QS2

Range:

Brazos, Harris (Historical) and Waller Counties

Known Occurrences:

Seven occurrences, two populations recently observed.

Reasons for Concern:

Low numbers, habitat destruction.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Thalictrum texanum completed annually,

two sites.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, Spring; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brazos County: Lick Creek County Park, southeast of College Station; Waller County: small roadside park along hwy 90, ca 0.5 miles west

of Brookshire.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment or other

conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

2-3 Days: 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management

changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate

management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX

78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Bill Carr, TPWD; Jason Singhurst.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD and Brazos County park staff to

monitor populations on the respective properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Thelocactus bicolor var.

Candidate Category: C2

flavidispinus

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

straw-spine glory-of-Texas

G/S Rank: G4T2 S2

Range:

Brewster and Starr (?-questionable identification or locality) Counties;

Tamaulipas, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Fourteen occurrences, one recent

Reasons for Concern:

Collecting pressures affect this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Thelocactus bicolor var. flavidispinus

to be completed annually, including selected measures of vigor, one

site. Access is needed.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, March

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brewster County: 3.3 miles south of junction US 90 and 3855 in

Marathon.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of the population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted. Take the following measurements: stem diameter; and number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity.

recruitment or other conditions. Need access.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires, ruler

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2-3 Days; 2 staff

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Reporting Procedure:

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total Red Flag Conditions:

> population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Edward Anderson, Status Report, 1982, Desert Botanical Garden;

Jackie Poole and David Hernandez, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Additional populations need to be located. Highway right-of-way

monitoring in progress.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize TPWD volunteers to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Tillandsia bailevi

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Bailey's ballmoss

G/S Rank:

G2S2

Range:

Brooks (H-historical), Cameron, Hidalgo, Jim Wells, Kenedy and Willacy

Counties; Tamaulipas, Mexico

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-one occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Few recent populations, susceptible to collecting pressures as an

ornamental.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of Tillandsia bailevi completed annually,

including selected measures of vigor, three sites

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, October

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Cameron County: Resaca de la Palma state Park; Lower Rio

Grande Valley NWR; Kenedy County: Sarita wayside-Highway

Right-of-way

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be counted and number of fruiting/flowering stalks counted. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination or reproduction activity or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

í

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 611 East 6th Street, Room 407, Austin, TX 78701.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, Gena Janssen, Mary Candee, TPWD.

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from the Highway Department to manage and

monitor the population. Highway right-of-way monitoring in

progress.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Trillium pusillum var. texanum

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Texas trillium

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

3 G3T2T3Q S2S3

Range:

Cass, Harrison, Houston (Historic), Nacogdoches, Panola (Historic), Rusk,

Smith, and Wood (Questionable identification) Counties; Arkansas,

Louisiana

Known Occurrences:

Thirteen occurrences

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction (clear-cutting, pine plantations); upstream disturbance may bury plants in sand and habitat alteration. It is

considered very collectible by wildflower enthusiasts.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Trillium pusillum var.

texanum completed annually with selected measures of vigor.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, March - May, Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Cass County: Linden; Harrison County: one site; Nacogdoches County: FM 1087 and US 59; Smith County: one site; Rusk County:

Hwy 322 and Dogwood Creek

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks, stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants Take selected measures of vigor: number of flowering plants and an estimate of juvenile plants. Upon site visit a subset of the population may be necessary

to monitor instead. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment, damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

June 1995 Berinal August 1995

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jason Singhurst; Wm Mahler, Status Report, August, 1983: Elray

Nixon, Robert Kral and John Freeman

Recommendations:

Potential use of

ſ

Volunteers:

Enlisting volunteers with monitoring this species is not

recommended.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

TEXAS

Scientific Name:

Viola guadalupensis

Candidate Category:

C2

Common Name:

Guadalupe Mountains violet

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G1 S1

Range:

Culberson County

Known Occurrences:

One occurrence

Reasons for Concern:

Only one population, low numbers

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population count of plants of Viola guadalupensis

completed annually.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually: Perennial, March - May

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Culberson County: Guadalupe Mountains National Park

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the population areas. If possible mark boundaries using stable, easily recognized landmarks. stakes and/or metal tags. Count the plants and take selected measures of vigor: number of fruits and flowers. Note any herbivory, insect pollination, reproduction activity, recruitment,

damage or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes; flagging/pin flags, metal tags and wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by or to Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

- 1985 Revised August 1995 needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Michael Powell, SRSC; B. Wauer, GMNP

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Guadalupe Mountains National Park to

monitor the populations.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Enlisting volunteers with monitoring this one known population is not recommended-it might introduce unnecessary risk to the species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Xvris drummondii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

na

Common Name:

Drummond's yellow-eyed grass

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

Angelina, Jasper and Newton County; Alabama, Florida, Georgia,

Louisiana and Mississippi

Known Occurrences:

Fourteen occurrences in three counties.

Reasons for Concern:

Disturbance to seepage-bogs, changes in water table, and fire

suppression could affect this species habitat,

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of Xyris drummondii completed

triennially at selected sites. Three to nine sites to be selected upon

field investigation.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - May be down listed to 3C

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, Mid-June to mid August; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Angelina County: one - three sites; Jasper County, one - three sites;

Newton County: one - three sites. Sites to be selected upon field

investigation

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, a large macro plot should be established (dependent on the habitat) within the population. If possible, establish a "permanent"

plot location. Within this plot, count the plants. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity.

recruitment or other conditions.

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20% change in the density of <u>Xyris drummondii</u> between any two years, and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

ş

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 5 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and

adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg,

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Robert Kral, Tennessee; Rob Evans

USFS.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the US Forest Service to monitor

populations on their properties.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and USFS to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Xvris scabrifolia

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

na

Common Name:

Rough-leaf yellow-eyed grass

G/S Rank:

G2G3S2

Range:

Angelina, Jasper, Newton and Sabine Counties; Alabama, Florida, Georgia,

Louisiana and Mississippi

Known Occurrences:

Thirty-four occurrences.

Reasons for Concern:

Disturbance of hillside seepage-bogs, changes in hydrology, fire suppression, and/or grazing would negatively impact this species.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a population estimate of Xyris scabrifolia completed

triennially at selected sites. Four to ten sites to be selected upon

field investigation.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY - May be down-listed to 3C

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, Late July - early September; Perennial

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Angelina County: one - three sites; Jasper County, one - three sites; Newton County: one - three sites; Sabine County; one site. Sites to

be selected upon field investigation.

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe each of the total population areas. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. The population should be sampled to estimate the total number of individuals within the population. To sample, a large macro plot should be established (dependent on the

habitat) within the population. If possible, establish a

"permanent"plot location. Within this plot, count the plants. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination, reproduction activity.

recruitment or other conditions.

For the population estimate, maintain 90% confidence that the estimate is within 25% of the population, be 90% sure of detecting a 20% change in the density of <u>Xyris scabrifolia</u> between any two years, and be willing to accept a False-Change error rate of 0.10.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 5 Days; 2-4 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research

needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg.

Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Steve Orzell, Florida NHP; Robert Kral.

Recommendations: Work with the staff from the US Forest Service to monitor

populations on their properties. This monitoring can be completed in conjunction with monitoring of <u>Xyris drummondii</u> and <u>Rudbeckia scabrifolia</u>; Both species of <u>Xyris</u> are difficult to distinguish, and experts in taxonomy of this species will need to oversee the

monitoring.

Potential use of

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD and USFWS to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Zanthoxylum parvum

Candidate Category: C1

11

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Shinner's tickle-tongue

G/S Rank: G1S1

Range:

Brewster and Jeff Davis Counties

Known Occurrences:

Only a few populations are known to occur in the Davis Mountains. Only one site is accessible. Other sites either have not been verified

and/or are not accessible.

Reasons for Concern:

Susceptible to browsing.

Monitoring Objective:

Obtain a total stem census of the plants of Zanthoxylum parvum located at the Pig Pen Canyon location completed every three years.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially during April

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Jeff Davis County: northeast slopes of Pig Pen Canyon, Forbidden

Mountain, Davis Mountains-less than 1 acre (approximately 1000

ramets in June 1989).

Methodology:

Permanently delineate and describe the total population area. Ideally, a map of each population should be completed as baseline information. If possible mark boundaries using easily recognizable landmarks, stakes

and/or metal tags. Obtain a total stem census. If possible, note

relative vigor of stems through size classes by stem diameter, note any crown or root sprouts. Note any herbivory, insect damage, pollination,

reproduction activity, recruitment or other conditions.

Field Equipment Needed: Measuring tapes, pin flags, stakes, metal tags/wires.

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 3 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered

J March 1995

4

significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Jackie Poole, TPWD; A. Michael Powell, Department of Biology, Sul Ross State University; Liz Ecker, Wendy Hodgson and Linda Pritchett-Kozak, Desert Botanical Garden, Phoenix; Barton Warnock, Alpine, TX; Julia Larke, Jim Weedin-former graduate students, Sul Ross State University.

Recommendations:

Work with representatives from Sul Ross to possibly assist and/or take on the biennial monitoring at the Pig Pen site. Other sites needing verification include: Tricky Gap, Ezra's Bedground and Wild Rose Pass. Need access to the Timber Mountain site.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Graduate and undergraduate students may be recruited for assistance.

Date for Review of Plan:

Spring/Summer 1994

Plan Approval Date:

Appendix K:

MONITORING PLANS FOR TEN SPECIES OF

REPTILES

LIST OF CANDIDATE SPECIES WITH MONITORING PLANS

SCIENTIFIC NAME	SIATUS	USPWS LIST PRI	MONIT PRIORITY
REPTILES		<u> </u>	
Cnemidophorus dizoni GRAY-CHECKERED WHIPTAIL	G3G4Q \$3\$4 C2		WEDIUM
Crotaphytus reticulatus RBIICULATE COLLARED LIZARD	G3 S2 C2	·	MEDIUM- HIGH
Grapuszys caglei CAGLES MAP TURTLE	G3 S2 C1	5	HIGH
Kinostenon histipus muutayi CHIHUAHUAN MUD TURTLE	G313 S1 C2	HIGH	ĦGH
Macroclemys temminetii ALLIGATOR SNAPPING TURTLE	G3G4 S3 C2		нісн
Malachemys terrapin littoralis TEXAS DIAMONDBACK TERRAPIN	G5T3 \$3 C2	нісн	MEDIUM- HIGH
Nerodia clarkii GULF SALTMARSH SNAKE	G4Q 84 C2		нісн
Nerodia harteri harteri BRAZOS WATER SNAKE	G2T2 S2 C2	LOW	MEDIUM- LOW
Phrypocoma corutum TEXAS HORNED LIZARD	GS \$4 C2	MEDIUM	MEDIUM
Pizuophis melanoleucus ruthveni LOUISIANA PINE SNAKE	G5T3 S2 C2		нісн
Sectoporus arenicolus DUNES SAGEBRUSH LIZARD	G5T2 S2 C2		MEDIUM
Thamnophis sirtalis annectens TEXAS GARTER SNAKE	GST3 S3 C2	MEDIUM	LOW

Scientific Name:

Cnemidophorus dixoni

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

gray-checkered whiptail

G/S Rank:

G3G4OS3S4

Range:

New Mexico and Texas, Presidio County

Known Occurrences:

Unknown occurrences. It prefers rocky soils in desert shrublands and degraded grasslands on alluvial benches, canyon bottoms and the lower southwestern slopes of the Chinati Mountains between 909 and 1515 m.

Reasons for Concern:

Highly restricted range

Monitoring Objective:

Intensively monitor through mark and recapture methods over a two-

week period in the spring.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, for two weeks in April - May (Again in fall if possible)

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Presidio County: Locate a population to study

Methodology:

Mark and recapture using pit-traps; obtain weather data, insect sampling; vegetation sampling, noting cover type, plant diversity etc.

Field Equipment Needed: Drift fences, pit traps, clippers, nets, jars, envelopes, weather

collection instruments

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 2 Weeks/possibly spring and fall; 2+ staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; James Dixon

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from Sul Ross graduate program to assist in

monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Crotaphytus reticulatus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

reticulate collared lizard

G/S Rank:

G3S2

Range:

From McMullen County, south and west. Dimmit, Duval, Hidalgo, Frio, Maverick, McMullen, Starr, Uvalde, Webb, and Zapata counties. South

Texas and portions of Tamaulipas, Nuevo Leon and Coahuila.

Known Occurrences:

X known occurrences. McMullen County. Thorn brush desert of the Tamaulipan biotic province. Prefers rolling terrain characterized by

shallow gravel soils.

Reasons for Concern:

Possible brush clearing practices may have led to elimination of the species from some grazing lands. Few individuals have been collected from partially cleared land. Loss of brush habitats from south Texas is a threat to the continued existence of this species as it is for many other species. Oil and gas development and coal production may also lead to

loss of significant areas of habitat.

Monitoring Objective:

Determine population density and distribution through capture, mark

and release.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually,

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

McMullen County: Chaparral Wildlife Management Area

Methodology:

Hand capture using a noose, mark and release/1 week at each site

Field Equipment Needed: Noose, collecting bags, marking materials

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

1 Week/site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Andy Price, TPWD; James Dixon, TAMU; James Judd

Recommendations: Involve Department biologists at Chaparral Wildlife Management Area.

Potential use of Volunteers:

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Graptemys caglei

Candidate Category:

C1

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Cagle's map turtle

G/S Rank:

G3S3

Range:

Endemic to the Guadalupe River system of Central Texas. Robust

populations between Victoria and Seguin, scattered populations

upstream.

Known Occurrences:

Nine known occurrences. Found in free-flowing reaches and shallow impoundments with unimproved banks, abundant emergent snags, rocks

and other basking sites, and frequent gravel bars.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction (reservoir construction, diversion of in-stream flow

needs); commercial exploitation; fire ants.

Monitoring Objective:

Quarterly document presence of Cagle's map turtles throughout the range through surface sampling. Also, monitor annual inflow regime.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

April through the summer

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Guadalupe River: various sites along the river

Methodology:

Sample for one week each quarter throughout the year/marking and

recapture following F. Killebrew's methodology.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

7 Days/Quarter; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Flavius Killebrew, WTAMU; Francis Rose,

SWTSU; David Hanes, San Antonio

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from Guadalupe River State Park/Honey Creek

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Work with volunteers from the state park.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Kinosternon hirtipes murravi

Chihuahuan mud turtle

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G3T3S1

Range:

Alamito Creek drainage, Presidio County.

Known Occurrences:

Nine known occurrences. This species is known from Alamito Creek

drainage. Presidio County in streams and spring-fed stock tanks.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat alteration (dewatering, pollution), landowner antagonism.

Monitoring Objective:

Semi-Annually document presence of Chihuahuan mud turtles at known

sites through mark and recapture methods. Determine flow regimes and inflow needs of springs and creeks of the Alamito Creek system.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Semi-Annually, one week in the spring and fall

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Presidio County: Cienega Creek, BBRSNA, sample other sites as

access is permitted

Methodology:

One week, intensive sampling using baited hoop nets, mark and

recapture.

Field Equipment Needed: Hoop nets, bait

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

4-8 Days/spring and fall; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of the last field

work for the year.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Jim Dixon, TAMU; Dennie Miller, CDRI

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD Big Bend Ranch State Natural Area

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Macroclemys temminckii

Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Alligator snapping turtle

G/S Rank:

G13G4\$3

Range:

Found throughout the eastern portion of the state, records from East Texas include Harris, Harrison, Anderson, Panola, Marion and Rusk counties. (Texas distribution -- piney woods, oak woods and prairies, blackland prairies, and the gulf coast prairies and marshes). Central and Southeastern U.S., including Arkansas, Alabama, Florida, Georgia, Illinois, Indiana, Kentucky, Kansas, Louisiana, Missouri, Oklahoma,

Tennessee and Texas.

Known Occurrences:

Four known occurrences. This large aquatic turtle is an inhabitant of deep fresh water (Garrett and Barker, 1987). It may occasionally enter brackish waters, but is most at home in deep rivers, lakes and large streams with muddy bottoms (Garrett and Barker, 1987).

Reasons for Concern:

Demands for its meat, reservoir construction, channelization of streams and rivers, placement of dredge spoil on river banks, recreational use of riverbanks and sandbars, removal of tree snags (that provide habitat for prev), and water pollution.

Monitoring Objective:

Because it stays just below the water surface or partially buried in the mud during the day, the species is difficult to spot. Difficulty in field monitoring is further increased due to the species wide range. Any sightings or incidence of catches or illegal harvesting should be recorded. Surveys need to be conducted to determine locations, population trends and number and distribution of occurrences.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan: -

Site Description:

East Texas: Toledo Bend; Angelina River system; Tyler, private

hunting club; Caddo Lake

Methodology:

At-large sampling, possible survey area fishermen and commercial

fishermen.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 4 - 5 Days/each site; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: If sufficient baseline information is gathered, a 20% decrease in total

population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data: Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists: Andy Price, TPWD; Jim Dixon, TAMU; USFWS Region 4

Recommendations: Work with the staff from TPWD sites in East Texas

Potential use of

-i-- 1995

Volunteers: Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan: Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date: Date of Implementation:

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Malaclemys terrapin

Candidate Category:

C2

littoralis

Texas diamondback terrapin

Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G5T3S3

Range:

Twenty-five known occurrences. Louisiana and Texas - along the Gulf Coast from the state's eastern border south to Corpus Christi; records from Aransas, Refugio, Calhoun, Jackson, Victoria, Brazoria, Galveston,

Chambers, Harris, Nueces, San Patricio and Orange Counties

Known Occurrences:

The species prefers brackish and salt water marshes, sloughs, lagoons

and tidal flats (Garrett and Barker, 1987).

Reasons for Concern:

Numbers unknown, the species may be declining due to habitat alteration and incidental take. This species is becoming rare in Texas due to over-harvesting as it is increasingly exploited as a food resource. It may suffer losses due to incidental catch by commercial fishermen (particularly crabbers). Loss of estuary wetlands to development may be detrimental to populations of this species as well as those of several other asterion dependent species. Declining water quality and limited

freshwater inflows also poses a significant threat.

Monitoring Objective:

Once locations of populations are established, population estimates can be made and populations can be monitored on a semi-annual basis to determine trends. Monitoring sites may be chosen on the basis of perceived impacts from the various threats. Monitoring will include

capture, mark and release and track individuals.

Priority:

MEDIUM - HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Semi-Annually - spring and fall, for one week each

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

along the Gulf Coast; sites to be selected

Methodology:

One week in the spring and fall, intensively trapping to mark and

recapture.

Field Equipment Needed: Turtle traps, pit tags

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 14 Days/Spring & Fall; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Lee Elliott, TPWD; Rich Seigel, NE La State Un.

Recommendations:

Monitoring of this species could be done in conjunction with studies on *Nerodia clarkii*. Work with the staff from TPWD and Aransas National Wildlife Refuge to monitor the candidate species in the area.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Nerodia clarkii

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Gulf saltmarsh snake

G/S Rank:

G40 S4

Range:

The Gulf Coast from Sabine Pass to Baffin Bay; eastward to Florida

and Cuba.

Known Occurrences:

Fourteen known occurrences. This species is known from along the

Gulf coast in salt marshes.

Reasons for Concern:

Affected by pollution and habitat modification.

Monitoring Objective:

Annually document presence of Gulf saltmarsh snakes at known sites

through capture, mark and release. Assess degree and rate of habitat

modification.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually, one week period

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Salt marshes along the Gulf Coast: sites to be chosen

Methodology:

Using minnow traps, mark and recapture using pit tags, take

morphological measurements

Field Equipment Needed: Minnow traps, PIT tags

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 7 Days: 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Jim Dixon, TAMU; Lee Elliott, TPWD

Recommendations:

Work with the staff from TPWD

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from TPWD to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Nerodia harteri harteri

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

Brazos water snake

G/S Rank:

G2T2S2

Range:

Deadman and Paint Creek tributaries of the Clear Fork of the Brazos River downstream to Brazos Point on the Brazos River proper. The

distribution is discontinuous.

Known Occurrences:

Six known occurrences. Occurs in rivers and streams with shallow riffles and rapids with rocky cover, dirt banks, rocky shorelines, woody vegetation near the rivers and streams, adequate flow regimes (both continuous and periodic flushing flows), and access to an adequate fish

prev base.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat alteration and destruction (reservoir construction, diversion/cessation of in-stream flows, pollution); population

fragmentation; landowner antagonism.

Monitoring Objective:

Annually document presence of Brazos Water Snake at known sites noting abundance through time-constrained sampling. Coordinate

efforts with existing Texas Watch volunteer program.

Priority:

MEDIUM - LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Brazos River

Methodology:

Annually monitor known populations noting abundance through time-

constrained sampling. Note habitat quality, when possible look at diet,

and water quality.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

5 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population

from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Jim Dixon, TAMU; Norm Scott, USFWS

Recommendations:

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name: Phrynosoma cornutum Candidate Category: C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name: Texas horned lizard G/S Rank: G5S4

Range: Central Kansas southward through Texas, and from the Missouri/Oklahoma border

westward to the southeastern corner of Arizona; southward in Mexico east of the Sierra Madre Occidental to eastern Durango, and eastward across Zacatecas and San Luis Potosi to the border between Tamaulipas and Veracruz along the coast of the Gulf of Mexico. The natural eastern boundary of the species' range may never be known with certainty; it has been widely introduced throughout most of the United States for at least 115 years, and

there are established populations in Florida and South Carolina.

Known Occurrences: Eight recorded occurrences. A wide variety of open deserts and grasslands,

shortgrass prairie, and shrublands on sandy to gravelly soils from sea level to

1830 m.

Reasons for Concern: Habitat alteration and destruction (landscape - scale land - use changes such

as agriculture and urbanization); indiscriminate use of pesticides; fire ants;

commercial utilization.

Monitoring Objective: Annually document presence of Texas horned lizards at known sites through a

standardized survey process. Continue to encourage public response to

horned lizard survey questionnaire.

Priority: MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season: Annually

Monitoring Responsibility: TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description: Chaparral WMA, continue research efforts; Matador WMA

Methodology: Standardize survey methodology; set-up permanent plots and mark population

using toe-clip method. Repeat status survey annually or biennially.

Field Equipment Needed:

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring: 6 Days; 2 staff

Reporting Procedure: Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department

within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions: After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from

one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be

notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive

appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Wendy Donaldson, UT; Jim Dixon TAMU; HLCS

Recommendations:

Work with the Horned Lizard Conservation Society to complete the annual

surveys

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize the volunteers from the Horned Lizard Conservation Society

to assist in monitoring this species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

1995 - Maried 1

Scientific Name:

Common Name:

Pituophis melanoleucus

Candidate Category:

C2

ruthveni

Louisiana pine snake

G/S Rank:

Listing Rank:

G5T3S2

Range:

Angela, Cherokee, Grimes, Hardin, Houston, Jasper, Nacogdoches, Newton, Polk, Trinity, Tyler, Walker, and Wood counties in eastern

Texas and western Louisiana.

Known Occurrences:

Ten known occurrences from thirteen counties in east Texas in pine

woods and savanna.

Reasons for Concern:

Alteration or loss of native conifer habitat from logging, cultivation and

urbanization.

Monitoring Objective:

Annually document presence of Louisiana Pine Snakes at known sites.

Priority:

HIGH PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Annually,

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFS

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Sites to be chosen

Methodology:

Set-up drift fences and pit-fall traps. May want to look at the

distribution of gophers and soil type.

Field Equipment Needed: drift fences, pit-fall traps, pit tags

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

7 - 14 Days/2+ Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for

management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

1975

Department, 4200 Smith 3School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Craig Rudoph, USFS

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from US Forest Service.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Sceloporus arenicolus

Candidate Category:

C2

Listing Rank:

Common Name:

dunes sagebrush lizard

G/S Rank:

G5T2S2

Range:

Andrews, Crane, Ward, and Winkler counties.

Known Occurrences:

Six known occurrences from four counties in active sand dunes with

shin oak (Quercus havardii).

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction (clearing and de-stabilization of dunes)

Monitoring Objective:

Semi-annually document presence of dunes sagebrush lizards at known

sites.

Priority:

MEDIUM PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Semi-Annually, Spring and Fall

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Monahans Sandhills State Park

Methodology:

Array trap system, mark and recapture, note specific habitat

requirements, sample insect abundance, vegetation, etc. Species may be

sensitive to habitat manipulation.

Field Equipment Needed: drift fences, pit traps, sweep nets

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

14 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife

Department within 60 days upon completion of field work.

Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of

significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife

Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more

comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust

monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine

appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife

Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Jim Dixon, TAMU

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from TPWD State Park

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Scientific Name:

Thamnophis sirtalis

Candidate Category:

 2

Common Name:

annectens Texas garter snake Listing Rank: G/S Rank:

G5T3S3

Range:

Texas and Kansas. This seldom encountered garter snake occurs in central Texas. Common in certain places along the Balcones Escarpment. Sporadic elsewhere. Prefers marshy, flooded pasture lands or meadows, particularly in spring where there is abundant prey such as cricket and chorus frogs (Tennant, 1985). The species is also found in grassy or brushy cover near ponds and streams as well as riparian canyon habitat at the eastern edge of the Edwards Plateau. Throughout range, inhabits virtually any type of wet or moist habitat. However, habitat preference exhibits rather pronounced regional differences (e.g. east vs. west). Irrigation canals and riparian-corridor farmlands in west; marshy, flooded pasture land, grassy or brushy

borders of permanent bodies of water; coastal salt marshes.

Known Occurrences:

Twenty-eight known occurrences. They have been recorded from Taylor, McLennan, Motley?, Palo Pinto, Travis, Williamson, Wise, Bell, Bastrop, Bosque, Llano, Burnet, San Saba, Hill, Hood, Navarro, Tarrant, Archer, Collin, Dallas, Ellis, Denton, Bexar, Brazoria,

Matagorda, Hays, Austin, Rand? counties.

Reasons for Concern:

Habitat destruction or modification, other factors unknown.

Monitoring Objective:

Triennially document presence of Texas garter snakes at known sites.

Priority:

LOW PRIORITY

PLAN

Monitoring Frequency/Season:

Triennially, One week, Spring and Fall

Monitoring Responsibility:

TPWD/USFWS-Arlington

Monitoring Plan:

Site Description:

Site(s) to be chosen

Methodology:

Drift fences, funnel traps set up in a secure area, mark and

recapture

Field Equipment Needed: Drift Fences, funnel traps

Estimated Time/Staff for Monitoring:

14 Days/2 Staff

Reporting Procedure:

Annual Report submitted by Texas Parks and Wildlife Department within 60 days upon completion of field work. Red Flag Conditions:

After baseline information gathered, a 20% decrease in total population from one year to the next will be considered significant. In the event of significant or unacceptable decline, TPWD and Fish and Wildlife Service should be notified immediately. When decline is noted, a more comprehensive appraisal should be initiated to evaluate and adjust monitoring design or data collection, provide suggestions for management changes, or define research needed to determine appropriate management.

Location of Archived Data:

Texas Natural Heritage Program, Texas Parks & Wildlife Department, 4200 Smith School Road, Austin, TX 78744; and U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service, Ecological Services Office, 10711 Burnet Road, Suite 200, Hartland Bank Bldg, Austin, TX 78758.

REVIEW/RECOMMENDATIONS/IMPLEMENTATION

Resource Specialists:

Andy Price, TPWD; Jim Dixon, TAMU; Carl Lieb, UTEP

Recommendations:

Work with the personnel from US Fish & Wildlife Service.

Potential use of

Volunteers:

Possibly utilize volunteers from the region to assist in monitoring this

species.

Date for Review of Plan:

Summer 1995

Plan Approval Date:

Appendix L:

CANDIDATE SPECIES MONITORING STATUS OVERVIEW

- PLANTS

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.	# SITES	DAYS/ STAFF	MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
PLANTS Acleisanthes crassifolia TEXAS TRUMPETS	G2S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Kinney, Maverick, Val Verde; Coahuila, Mex	TPWD	Triennially					
Agalinis auriculata AURICULATE FALSE FOXGLOVE	G2SX C2	2	Other Region	Tarrant (X-presumed extirpated); AL, AR, IA, IL, IN, KS, MD, MI, MN, MO, MS, NJ, OH, OK, PA, SC, TN, VA, WI, WV	TPWD						Possibly another Region to monitor
Agave glomeruliflora CHISOS AGAVE	G2Q S2 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth; Coahuila, Mex	BIBE/Sul Ross	May Triennially	4	3 - 7 2	3		
Agrimonia incisa INCISED GROOVEBUR	G3S1 C2	na	LOW	Angelina, Jasper; Sabine; AL, FL GA, MS, NC, SC		Biennially					
Ambrosia cheiranthifolia SOUTH TEXAS RAGWEED	G2S2 E	5	HIGH	Cameron (Historical), Jim Wells, Kleberg, & Nueces; Tamaulipas, Mexico							Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Amsonia tharpii THARP'S BLUE-STAR	G1S1 C2	11	HIGH	Pecos, NM	TPWD	April-May	1	2 2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Andrachne arida TRANS-PECOS MAIDENBUSH	G1S1 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Presidio, Brewster; Chihuahua and Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD	Triennially					
Anemone edwardsiana var. petraea EDGE FALLS ANEMONE	G3T1 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM	Bandera, Kendall	TNC/TLSS	Feb - May Triennially	2	2 2	3		Access is needed
Aquilegia chrysantha var hinckleyana HINCKLEY'S COLUMBINE	G4T1S1 C2	6	HIGH	Presidio	TNC/TLSS	March-April Triennially	1	3 2	3		Access is needed
Aquilegia longissima LONG SPUR COLUMBINE	G3S2 C2	11 -	LOW	Brewster, Jeff, Davis, Presidio, Chihuahua, Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Mexico	BIBE/TPWD	June -Nov Triennially	3-5	4 2	3		Relocate previous known sites
Arenaria livermorensis LIVERMORE SANDWORT	G1S1 C2	5	MEDIUM	Jeff Davis	TNC/TLSS	Aug - Oct Triennially	2	3 2	3		
Argythamnia aphoroides HILL COUNTRY WILD MERCURY	G2S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Blanco, Comal, Gillespie, Hays (H), Kendall (H), Kerr, Menard, Mills (H), Tom Green, Uvalde	TPWD	April - May	5	2 2	3		Obtain baseline information, determine frequency after initial visit
Armoracia aquatica LAKE CRESS	G4S1 C2		3C	Tyler, IN,KY,MI,MO,NC,OK,SC,TN	Other State						
Asclepias prostrata PROSTRATE MILKWEED	G1S1 C2	8	LOW	Starr, Zapata; Tamaulipas Mexico	TNC/TLSS	Spring Biennially	5	3 2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Aster puniceus ssp elliottii var scabricaulis ROUGH-STEM ASTER	G5T1S1 C1	3	MEDIUM	Anderson, Cherokee, Smith, Van Zandt, Wood	TPWD ·	October	3+	3 2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress. Taxonomy not assured

		TISPUS		nigate Species Monto	RESPON.	MONIT		DAYS/	MONIT	IMPLMT.	REMARKS
SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	PARTY	MO.	SITES	STAFF	LEVEL	DATE	
Astragalus mollissimus var marcidus WITHERED WOOLLY LOCO	G5T2S2 C2	12	Need to relocate		TPWD	April - July	2-3	3 2	3		Relocate Jeff Davis population
Batesimalya violacea PURPLE GAY-MALLOW	G2 S1 C2	8		Leon, Mexico	BIBE/TPWD	Oct - Nov Triennially	1	3 2	3		
Boerhavia mathisiana MATHIS SPIDERLING	G2 S1 C2	5		Live Oak, San Patricio; San Luis Potosi and Tamaulipas, Mexico		May - Aug	4	2 2	3		
Bonamia ovalifolia BIGPOD BONAMIA	GIS1 C2	8		Mexico	BIBE	May	1	3 2	3		
Brickellia brachyphylla var hinckleyi HINCKLEY'S BRICKELLBUSH	G5T2 S2 C2	11	LOW	Brewster (H) and Jeff Davis	TPWD/ TNC	July - Oct Triennially	1-2	3 2	3		Access is needed
Brickellia brachyphylla var terlinguensis TERLINGUA BRICKELLBUSH	G5TH SH C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brewster (H) Hudspeth (H)	TPWD	July - Oct Triennially	?	3 2	3		LOW- Need to relocate populations then HIGH PRIORITY
Brickellia viejensis SIERRA VIEJA BRICKELLBUSH	G1G2 S1S2 C2	11	LOW	Presidio	TPWD	Sept Triennially	?	5 2	3		LOW- Need to relocate populations then HIGH PRIORITY
Brongniartia minutifolia LITTLE-LEAF BRONGNIARTIA	G2 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster County; Chihuabua, Mexico	TPWD/ BIBE	June - Aug	1	3 2	3		
Caesalpinia brachycarpa BROADPOD RUSHPEA	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Crockett (H), Edwards (H), Kinney, Llano (H), Sutton	TPWD	April - June Biennially	3	3 2	2		
Carex hyalina TISSUE SEDGE	G5Q S4 C2	8	LOW taxonomy ?'s	Bowie, Brazoria, Cass, Dallas (H), Denton, Houston, Lamar, Liberty, Madison, Morris, Polk, Red River, and Walker; AR, MS and OK		Triennially					Possibly other Region or Other states to monitor this species
Castilleja ciliata FRINGED PAINTBRUSH	G1Q S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Jeff Davis	TNC/TPWD	June - Oct Biennially		4-5 2	3		Access is needed.
Castilleja elongata TALL PAINTBRUSH	G1Q S1 C2	5	HIGH	Brewster	TPWD/ BIBE	Mid Aug - Sept	1	3 2	3		

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.		DAYS/ STAFF		IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Cereus greggii var greggii DESERT NIGHT-BLOOMING CEREUS	G3T2S2 C2	9	Need to relocate	Brewster, El Paso, Hudspeth (H), Jeff Davis, Pecos (H), Presidio, Terrell (H); AZ, NM; Chihuahua, Coahuila, Durango, Zacatecas, Mexico							
Chaetopappa hersheyi MAT LEASTDAISY	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW	Culberson, Hudspeth; NM	Guad Mtns NPS/TPWD	May Triennially	3	3 2	3		
Chamaesyce chaetocalyx var triligulata THREE-TONGUE SPURGE	G5T1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Randall (?); Coahuila Mexico	BIBE	Biennially					
Chamaesyce golondrina SWALLOW SPURGE	G2 S2 C2		LOW Need to relocate	Brewster, Hudspeth, Presidio Counties; Chihuahua and Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD	July - Oct Triennially	1-4	5 2	3		Need to relocate popultions in Brewster, Hudspeth and Presidio Counties.
Chenopodium cycloides SANDHILL GOOSEFOOT	G4 S3 C2		LOW	Andrews, Crane, Culberson, El Paso, Jeff Davis, Jones, Kent, Loving, Ward, Winkler; CO, KS, and NM							
Chloris texensis TEXAS WINDMILL-GRASS	G2 S2 C2	8	HIGH	Brazoria, Brazos (H) Chambers, Galveston, Harris, Hidalgo (?), Nueces, and Refugio	USFWS-CL	Mid. June - Mid August	4	3 2	3		
Chrysothamnus nauseosus ssp texensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS RABBITBRUSH	G5T2 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM	Culberson County; NM	TPWD/ Guad.Mtn NPS	Sept - Oct Triennially		3 2	3		Every 2 years - Biennially
Cleome multicaulis MANYSTEM SPIDERFLOWER	G3 S1 C2	na	Need to relocate	Presidio County; AZ, CO, NM, WY; Chihuahua, Durango, Jalisco, Michoacan, Mexico	Other Region						
Colubrina stricta COMAL SNAKEWOOD	G2 S1 C2	11	HIGH	Comal (?), El Paso, Uvalde; Coahuila and Nuevo Leon Mexico	TPWD	May Biennially	1	3 2	3		Every 2 years - Biennially
Condalia hookeri var edwardsiana EDWARDS PLATEAU CAPUL NEGRO	G5T1Q C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Edwards	TPWD	March - May Triennially		2 2			Every 2 years - Biennially Need to relocate
Coreopsis intermedia GOLDEN WAVE TICKSEED	G3S3 C2	na	LOW Need to relocate	Anderson, Cass, Cherokee, Franklin, Freestone, Harris, Harrison, Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches (?), Trinity, Upshur, Wood (H); LA	TPWD	Feb - May					

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.	# SITES			IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Coryphantha albicolumnaria WHITE COLUMN	G2 S2 C2	2	LOW	Brewster, Pecos, Presidio; Chihuahua, Mexico	TPWD	March - May	3	3 2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Coryphantha chaffeyi CHAFFEY'S CORY CACTUS	G2 \$1 C2	11		Potosi, Zacatecas Mexico	BIBE						
Coryphantha dasyacantha var dasyacantha DENSE CORY CACTUS	G3T3 S2 C2	12	MEDIUM	Brewster, El Paso, Hudspeth, Jeff Davis, Pecos; NM(?); Chihuahua, Mexico	TPWD	Biennially					
Coryphantha duncanii DUNCAN'S CORY CACTUS	G3 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Presidio; NM	BIBE	Biennially					
Coryphantha hesteri HESTER'S CORY CACTUS	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Brewster, Pecos, Terrell	TPWD	Biennially					Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Coryphantha sulcata var nickelsiae NICKEL'S CORY CACTUS	G4T2 SH C2	12	Need to relocate	Webb (H); Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Tamaulipas, Mexico							
Crataegus wameri WARNER'S HAWTHORN	G2Q S2 C2	11	MEDIUM Need to relocate	Anderson, Cherokee, Freestone, Franklin, Houston, Morris, Panola, Smith (H), Upshur, Walker, Wood	TP W D	Triennially	<u> </u>				
Croton alabamensis var texensis TEXABAMA CROTON	G3T1S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	Bell, Coryell, Travis		Triennially					
Cuscuta attenuata MARSHELDER DODDER	G2 S2 C2	5	LOW	Cameron (H) Jackson (H) Liberty (H) Rains and Van Zandt; KS, OK		Triennially					
Cyperus cephalanthus GIANT SHARPSTEM UMBRELLA SEDGE	G2Q SH X2	na	Need to relocate	Texas (H; county unknown); LA							
Cyperus grayioides MOHLENBROCK'S UMBRELLA SEDGE	G3G4 S3 C2	na	LOW	Anderson, Angelina, Burleson, Colorado, Franklin, Freestone, Hardin, Henderson, Houston, Leon, Nacogdoches, Newton, Robertson, Rusk, San Augustine, Shelby, Smith, Tyler, Upshur, Van Zandt, Wood; AR, IL, LA, MO	TPWD/ TNC	Aug Triennially	3	3 2	2		
Cyperus onerosus DUNE UMBRELLA SEDGE	G2 S2 C2	5	HIGH	Andrews, Ward, Winkler	TPWD	June - Nov	4	3 2	1-3		

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USPWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.	# SITES		MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Cypripedium kentuckiense SOUTHERN LADY'S-SLIPPER	G3 S1 C2	na	HIGH		USFS	June - Aug	4	3 2	3		
Dalea bartonii COX'S DALEA	G1 S1 C2		Need to relocate	Brewsler	TPWD						
Dalea reverchonii COMANCHE PEAK PRAIRIE- CLOVER	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Hood (X), Parker, Wise	USFWS-FW	Biennially					
Dalea sabinalis SABINAL PRAIRIE-CLOVER	G1 S1 C2	8	LOW Need to relocate	Bandera (H), Uvalde (H), and Val Verde		May - July Triennially	1	3 2			Need to relocate first
Desmodium lindheimeri LINDHEIMER'S TICKSEED	G4 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Comal (?); Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, San Luis Potosi, Tamaulipas Mexico	TPWD						
Draba standleyi STANDLEY'S DRABA	G3 \$1 C2	?	MEDIUM - LOW	Jeff Davis; AZ, NM; Coahuila, Mexico							
Echeandia (Anthericum) chandleri LILA DE LOS LLANOS	G3Se C2	8	MEDIUM - LOW	Cameron, Kleberg, Nueces; Coahuila, Mexico (?)	TPWD/ USFWS	Sept-Nov, early morning	5	4 2	2		
Echinocereus chloranthus var neocapillus GOLDEN-SPINE HEDGEHOG CACTUS	G4T1 S1 C2	9	No Access	Brewster, Presidio	TPWD	Triennially					
Echinocereus papillosus var angusticeps SMALL PAPILLOSUS	G3T1 C2	3	HIGH Need to relocate	Hidalgo (H), Jim Hogg (?), Starr	TPWD	April - May	1	2 2	3		One population to be relocated
Eleocharis brachycarpa SHORT-FRUITED SPIKESEDGE	G1 SH C2		Need to relocate	South coastal Texas (H); (county unknown); Tamaulipas, Mexico	TPWD						
Eleocharis cylindrica CYLINDER SPIKESEDGE	G1 S1 C2	2	LOW Need to relocate	Lubbock (H), Presidio	TPWÐ	June - July Triennially	1	3 2	3		
Eleocharis wolfii WOLF'S SPIKESEDGE	G4G5 S1 C2		LOW	Jefferson; AL, CO, IA, IL, IN, KS, LA, MN, MO, ND, NE, OH, OK, TN, WI; Alberta and Saskatchewan, Canada							

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO:	# SITES		MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT, DATE	REMARKS
Erigeron mimegletes SONORA FLEABANE	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Brewster (H), Crockett (H) Edwards (H), Kerr, Real, Schleicher, Sutton, Uvalde, Val Verde (H); Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD						,
Eriocaulon koernickianum SMALL-HEADED PIPEWORT	G2G3 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM - HIGH	Anderson, Brazos, Limestone, Leon (?), Tyler (H); AR, GA, OK							
Eriogonum suffruticosum BUSHY WILD BUCKWHEAT	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Pecos, Presidio	TPWD	Triennially					
Escobaria guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS PINCUSHION CACTUS	G1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Culberson; NM	NPS	Biennially					
Festuca ligulata GUADALUPE FESCUE	G1 \$1 C1	8	HIGH	Brewster, Culberson; Coahuila, Mexico	BIBE/ TPWD	Aug - Sept	1	3 2	3		Monitoring in progress
Forsellesia texensis TEXAS GREASE BUSH	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Uvalde and Val Verde (H)							
Fryxellia pygmaea SMALL FRYXELL WORT	G1 SH C2	10	Need to relocate	west Texas (H; county unknown);Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD						
Gaillardia aestivalis var winkleri WHITE FIREWHEEL	G5T1 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM Need to relocate	Hardin	TNC	April - Oct	4	3 2	3		
Galium corellii CLIFF BEDSTRAW	G2 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Val Verde; Coahuila, Mexico	віве	Triennially					
Genistidium dumosum BRUSH-PEA	G1 S1C2	10	MEDIUM - HIGH	Brewster; Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD	Triennially			<u></u>		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Hedeoma pilosum OLD BLUE PENNYROYAL	GH SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster (H)							
Hedyotis butterwickiae MARY'S BLUET	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster	TNC						
Helianthus paradoxus PUZZLE SUNFLOWER	GISI CI	2	HIGH	Pecos, Reeves; NM	TNC	August - Sept		2 2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Helianthus praecox ssp hirtus DIMMIT SUNFLOWER	G5T1QS1 C2		HIGH	Dimmit and Zapata (M)	TNC	August	1-2	3 1-2	3		BRIT doing status survey. Known population reduced 10/93.

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USPWS LIST PRI		COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.	# SITES		MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Hexalectris nitida GLASS MOUNTAIN CORAL- ROOT	G3 S3 C2	11	LOW	Coryell, Dallas, Hays, Kendall, Pecos (H), Taylor, Travis; NM Coahuila, Mexico		August Triennially	3-4	3 2	3		
Hexalectris revoluta CHISOS CORAL-ROOT	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW	Leon, San Luis Potosi, Mexico		Triennially					
Hexalectris warnockii	G2 S2 C2	?	LOW	Brewster, Dallas, Gillespie, Hays, Jeff Davis (H), Taylor, Terrell; AZ, NM	TPWD/NPS	June - August Triennially	2+	3 2	3		Very difficult to monitor, specific study at Abilene SRA a possibility
Hibiscus dasycalyx NECHES RIVER ROSE-MALLOW	G1 S1 C2	2	HIGH	Cherokee, Harrison, Houston, Trinity	TPWD	August	2	3 2	4		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Isoetes lithophila ROCK QUILLWORT	G2 S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Burnet, Llano, Mason	TPWD	April - June	5	3 2	1		
Justicia runyonii RUNYON'S WATER-WILLOW	G2S2 C2	8	LOW	Brazoria (?), Cameron, Goliad (?), Hidalgo; Tamaulipas, Mexico		Sept - Nov Triennially	8	4 2	3		
Justicia wrightii WRIGHT'S WATER-WILLOW	G2 S2 C2	8	Need to relocate	Brewster (H) Pecos, Val Verde; NM (?)	TPWD		4	į			
Kalistroemia perennans PERENNIAL CALTROP	G1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster, Presidio, Val Verde	TPWD	Annually	2				
i achnocaulon digynum TINY BOG BUTTONS	G3 S1 C2	na	MEDIUM	Jasper, Newton; AL, FL, LA, MS		Biennially late summer - early fall	- 3 *	3 2	3		
Leavenworthia texana TEXAS GOLDEN GLADE CRESS	G1 S1 C2	2	HIGH	Nacogdoches (I), Sabine, San Augustine	TPWD	March	3	3 2	3		
Lechea mensalis CHISOS PINWEED	G1Q S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster; Coahuila, Mexico	віве						
Leitneria floridana CORKWOOD	G3G4 S1 C2		LOW	Brazoria, Chambers, Fort Bend, Jefferson; AL, AR, FL, GA, LA, MO							
Lepidospartum burgessii GYPSUM SCALEBROOM	G2 S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	Hudspeth; NM	TNC/GMNP	Biennially May - late summer	2	3 2	3		
Lesquerella thamnophila ZAPATA BLADDERPOD	G1 S1 C2	2	HIGH	Starr, Zapata	TPWD	April	3	2 2	2-3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.	# SITES		MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Liatris tenuis SLENDER GAY-FEATHER	G2G3 S2S3 C2	8	MEDIUM	Angelina, Hardin, Jasper, Newton, Orange, Sabine, San Augustine, Tyler; LA (?)	TPWD	June - August Biennially	4+	3 2	3		
Lycium texanum TEXAS WOLF-BERRY	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brewster, Culberson, Hudspeth	TPWD						
Machaeranthera aurea HOUSTON MACHAERANTHERA	G2 S2 C2	2	HIGH	Galveston, Harris	USFWS-CL	October - Nov	7	3 2	2		
Manfreda longiflora ST. JOSEPH'S STAFF	G2 S2 C2	5	MEDIUM	Cameron (H), Hidalgo, Starr; Tamaulipas, Mexico	USFWS-LRV	Sept	7	4 2	3		
Matelea radiata FALFURRIAS ANGLEPOD (MILKVINE)	G1S1 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Brooks (H), Hidalgo (H), Starr (?)	TPWD						
Matelea texensis TEXAS MILKVINE	G1 S1 C2	8	HIGH	Brewster	TPWD	June - August	?	3 2	2-3		Access is needed. Need to relocate.
Nolina arenicola SAND SACAHUISTA	G2Q S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Culberson, El Paso (?) and Hudspeth	TPWD						Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
Oenothera pilosella ssp sessilis GRAND PRAIRIE EVENING PRIMROSE	G5T2 SH C2	па	Need to relocate	Galveston (H); AR, LA	Possibly other state/ region						
Opuntia arenaria SAND PRICKLY-PEAR	G2 S2 C2	2	HIGH	El Paso, Hudspeth (H); NM; Chihuahua, Mexico	Possibly other state/ region	May - June	1	2-3 2	3		
Opuntia aureispina GOLDEN-SPINE PRICKLY-PEAR	G1 S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster	BIBE						
Opuntia engelmannii var flexospina FEW-SPINE ENGELMANN'S PRICKLY-PEAR	G5T1 S1 C2	12	LOW Need to relocate	Starr, Webb (H), Zapata	TPWD	April - June Triennially	1	2	3		
Opuntia imbricata var argentea SILVER CHOLLA	G5T1 S1 C2	12	MEDIUM	Brewster	BIBE	Biennially June - July	2	3 2	3		
Osmorhiza mexicana ssp bipatriata LIVERMORE SWEET-CICELY	G4T1 S1 C2	12	Need to relocate	Jeff Davis; Coahuila, Nuevo Leon, Mexico	TNC						
Ostrya chisosensis BIG BEND HOP-HORNBEAM	G2S1 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster; northern Mexico	BIBE/ TPWD	May - June Triennially	1	3 2	3		Every three years
Oxypolis ternata THREELEAF COWBANE	G37 S1 C2		MEDIUM	Hardin, Tyler (?); FL, GA, MS, NC, SC	TPWD/SUFS ·	Annually late summer - early fall	1-2	3 2	3		

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.	# SITES	DAYS/ STAFF	MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
aronychia congesta	C1 S1 C2		HIGH	Jim Hogg	TNC/ TPWD	Annually June	2	2 2	3		Monitoring in progress
BUSHY WHITLOW-WORT 'aronychia maccartii MCCART'S WHITLOW-WORT	G1 S1 C2 G1 S1 C2	1	LOW Need to relocate	Webb	TPWD						
aronychia wilkinsonii WILKINSON'S WHITLOW- WORT	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Mexico	TPWD	Annually April - ?	1-2	2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
ediocactus papyracanthus PAPER-SPINED CACTUS	G2G3S1 C2	8	Need to relocate	Hudspeth; AZ, NM	Possibly other state/ region						Highway right-of-way monitoring in
ediomelum humile RYDBERG'S SCURFPEA	G2 S1 C2	11	HIGH	Val Verde; Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD	April - May	1	2 2	3		progress.
Pediomelum pentaphyllum THREE-NERVE SCURFPEA	G1SH C2	5	Need to relocate	Presidio (H); NM (H); Chihuahua, Mexico	TPWD						io. Du
enstemon alamosensis ALAMO BEARD TONGUE	G2 S1 C2	8	MEDIUM	El Paso; NM	TPWD/DOD	Annually late April - May	2	3 2	3		Ft. Bliss
Perityle bisetosa var bisetosa TWO-BRISTLE ROCK-DAISY	G2T1 S1 C2	12	Need to relocate	Brewster, Pecos	TPWD						
Perityle bisetosa var scalaris STAIRSTEP TWO-BRISTLE ROCK-DAISY	G2T1 S1 C2	12	LOW	Brewster	TPWD						C. Pilo
Perityle huecoensis HUECO ROCK-DAISY	GIS1 C2	5	HIGH	El Paso	TPWD	Sept Biennially	2	3 2	1		Conservation Agreement with Ft. Bliss
Perityle vitreomontana GLASS MOUNTAINS ROCK- DAISY	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster	TNC					ļ	
Perityle warnockii WARNOCK's RIVER ROCK- DAISY	G1S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Val Verde	TPWD						
Phacelia pallida PALE PHACELIA	G2S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster; Chihuahua, Coahuila Mexico	TPWD						
Philadelphus ernestii CANYON MOCK-ORANGE	G2S2 C2	8	MEDIUM	Blanco, Comal, Hays, Kendall, Travis	TNC/TPWD	April	6	3 2	2		
Phyllanthus ericoides HEATHER LEAF-FLOWER	G2 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster, Terrell; Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD						

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USFWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.	# SITES	DAYS/ STAFF	MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Physostegia correllii CORRELL'S FALSE DRAGON- HEAD	G2 S2 C2	11	LOW Need to relocate	Montgomery (H), Travis, Val Verde, Zapata; LA; Coahuila, Durango, Nuevo Leon, and Sonora, Mexico	Possibly other state/ region						
Physostegia longisepala LONG-SEPALED FALSE DRAGON-HEAD	G2G3 S2 C2	na	LOW	Hardin, Jasper, Newton, Orange, Tyler; LA	Possibly other state/ region						
Poa strictiramea DESERT MOUNTAINS BLUE GRASS	G3 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster; Chihuahua, Coahuila Durango, Nuevo Leon, Zacatecas, Mexico				_			
Polemonium pauciflorum ssp hinckleyi HINCKLEY'S JACOB'S LADDER	G3 T1Q C2	12	HIGH	Jeff Davis; AZ; Chihuahua Mexico	TPWD/TNC	July - August Biennially	1	3 2	2-3		Access is needed-TNCTLSS property
Polygala maravillasensis MARAVILLAS MILKWORT	G2S1 C2	11	row	Brewster, Terrell; Coahuila, Mexico							
Prenanthes barbata BARBED RATTLESNAKE-ROOT	G3S2 C2	na	LOW	Cass, Cherokee, Hardin, Jasper, Nacogdoches, Newton, Polk, Rusk, San Augustine, Shelby; AL, AR, GA, KY, LA, TN	TPWD	Oct Triennially	2	3 2	3		
Proboscidea spicata MANY-FLOWERED UNICORN- PLANT	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster, Jeff Davis, Presidio; Coahuila, Mexico	TPWD	:					
Psilactis heterocarpa WELDER MACHAERANTHERA	G2 S2 C2		MEDIUM - LOW	Nueces, Kleberg, Refugio, San Patricio, and Victoria	TPWD	Oct Biennially	3 - 6	2			
Quercus boyntonii BOYNTON'S OAK	GHQ SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Angelina (H); AL (H)	TPWD						
Quercus graciliformis CHISOS OAK	G1 S1 C2	11	LOW	Brewster	BIBE	Triennially					
Quercus tardifolia LATELEAF OAK	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster	BIBE						
Rudbeckia scabrifolia BOG CONEFLOWER	G2S2 C2	2	MEDIUM - HIGH	Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine Shelby; LA		June	5	4 2	23		
Salvia penstemonoides BIG RED SAGE	G1G2 S1S2 C2	2	HIGH	Bandera, Bexar (H), Gillespie (H), Guadalupe (H), Kendall, Kerr, Real, Travis (I), Wilson (H)	TPWD	June - Oct	5+	3 2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	USPWS LIST PRI	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.			MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Scirpus hallii HALL'S BULRUSH	G2QS? C2	na	Need to relocate		Possibly other state/ region						
Scutellaria laevis SMOOTH STEM SKULLCAP	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Culberson, Hudspeth	TPWD						
Scutellaria thieretii THIERET'S SKULLCAP	G2Q S1 C2	па	3 B	Nueces; LA						· · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · · ·	
Sedum robertsianum ROBERTS' STONECROP	G1Q \$1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster	BIBE						
Senna ripleyana RIPLEY'S SENNA	G2 SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Brewster; Chihuahua Zacatecas, Mexico							
Sesuvium trianthemoides ROUGHSEED SEA-PURSLANE	G1 S1 C2	11	Need to relocate	Kenedy	TPWD						
Silene subciliata SCARLET CATCHFLY	G3 S3 C2	5	LOW	Hardin, Jasper, Jefferson (H), Liberty, Newton, Polk, Sabine, Shelby, Tyler; LA		August - Oct Biennially	4-8	3 2	3		
Streptanthus bracteatus BRACTED TWISTFLOWER	G2 S2 C2	2	HIGH	Bandera, Caldwell (?), Comal, Medina, Real, Travis, Uvalde	TPWD	May	7	7-8 2	3		
Streptanthus cutleri CUTLER'S TWISTFLOWER	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Brewster; Coahuila, Mexico		Feb - March	2-4	3 2	3		
Streptanthus sparsiflorus SPARSELY-FLOWERED JEWELFLOWER	G2 S2 C2	11	MEDIUM	Culberson; NM	NPS	Annually					
Styrax youngiae YOUNG'S SNOWBELLS	G1 SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Jeff Davis (H); Coahuila and Nuevo Leon, Mexico	TPWD						
Suaeda duripes HARDTOE SEEPWEED	GHQ SH C2	11	Need to relocate	Pecos (H) and/or Reeves (H)	TPWD						
Symphoricarpos guadalupensis MCKITTRICK SNOWBERRY	G1 S1 C2	12	Need to relocate	Culberson	Guad MNP						
Talinum rugospermum ROUGH-SEED FLAME FLOWER	G3G4 S1 C2	па	LOW	Anderson, Franklin, Houston, Limestone, Nacogdoches, Rusk, Smith, Upshur, and Wood; IA, IL, IN, KS, MN, NE, WI	Possibly other state/ region	Triennially					

SCIENTIFIC NAME	STATUS	uspws List pri	PRIORITY	COUNTY OF OCCURRENCE	RESPON. PARTY	MONIT MO.			MONIT LEVEL	IMPLMT. DATE	REMARKS
Thalictrum arkansanum ARKANSAS MEADOW-RUE	G2Q S1 C2	11	HIGH	OK	TPWD/TNC/O ther state		2	3 2	3		
halictrum texanum HOUSTON MEADOW-RUE	G2Q S2 C2	8	HIGH			Spring	2	2 2	3		
helocactus bicolor var flavidispinus STRAW SPINE GLORY OF TEXAS	G4T2 S2 C2	8	HIGH	Brewster Starr(?); Tamaulipas, Mexico	TPWD	March	1	2-3	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
helypodium tenue FRESNO CREEK THELYPODY	G1Q S1 C2	8	Need to relocate	Presidio	TPWD						
'illandsia baileyi BAILEY'S BALLMOSS	G2 S2 C2	2	MEDIUM	Brooks (H), Cameron, Hidalgo, Jim Wells, Kenedy, Willacy; Tamaulipas, Mexico	TPWD	October	3	2 2	3		Highway right-of-way monitoring in progress.
rillium pusillum var texanum TEXAS TRILLIUM	G3T2T3Q S2S3 C2	3	MEDIUM	Cass, Harrison, Houston (H), Nacogdoches, Panola (H), Rusk, Smith, and Wood (?); AR, LA	TPWD	Annually	:				
Valerianella texana EDWARDS PLATEAU CORNSALAD	G2 S2 C2	8	LOW	Burnet, Gillespie, Llano	TPWD						
Viola guadalupensis GUADALUPE MOUNTAINS VIOLET	G1 S1 C2	5	MEDIUM	Culberson	Guadalupe MNP	Annually March - May	1	3 2	3		
Kyris drummondii DRUMMOND'S YELLOW-EYED GRASS	G3 S2 C2	na	LOW	Angelina, Jasper, Newton; AL, FL, GA, LA, MS	TPWD/ USFS	Mid June - Mid August Triennially	3-9	5 2	3		
Kyris scabrifolia ROUGH-LEAF YELLOW-EYED GRASS	G2G3 S2 C2	na	LOW	Angelina, Jasper, Newton, Sabine AL, FL, GA, LA, MS, NC	TPWD/ USFS	Late July - Early September Triennially	4-10	5 2	2		
Zanthoxylum parvum SHINNERS' TICKLE-TONGUE	G1 S1 C2	11	HIGH	Brewster, Jeff Davis	TPWD	April Triennially	1	3 2	3		Access is needed. Biennially