

Attachment 1 to IFA		Updated 2/14/18		
Species	Occurrence?	Substantial Concern?	Plan Components?	Recommendation
Northern Goshawk	Yes. 214 occurrences in the past 20 years.	No. Species is considered secure. Current trend of the population within the planning area is not identified. That falls short of 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Boreal Owl	Yes. 347 records on the forest.	No. According to overview, major threat may be indirect effects of forest harvesting practices. However, annual GMUG FY17 timber harvest acreage was only 1,449 acres, yet 1,012,631 acres have been identified as potential suitable owl habitat. This falls short of 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
White-tailed ptarmigan	Yes.	No. According to the overview, an estimated 160,287 acres of occupied range occurs within the planning area, representing approximately 10% of occupied range within USFS Region 2. While the distribution of white-tailed ptarmigan appears to be unchanged from historic levels, population sizes and trends are mostly unknown other than in localized areas of study. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Juniper titmouse	No. Only 1 sighting in the last 20 years does not support a conclusion that the species "is established" in the area (1909.12, 12.52c-1).	No. According to the overview information, population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Brown-capped rosy finch	Yes - although only 4 sightings in 20 years	No. The species is considered secure and has no known threats to the species. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Lewis's woodpecker	No. There have only been 2 sightings in the planning area in the past 20 years.	No. Species is considered secure and there have only been two sightings in the past 20 years. No abundance or trend information exists for the planning area. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Flammulated owl	Yes.	No. Species is considered secure and population trends for this species in the planning area have not been reported. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Purple Martin	Yes.	No. Species is considered secure. According to overview, they nest in mature aspen within 1,000 feet of water. However, annual GMUG FY17 timber harvest acreage in aspen was minor, yet 341,318 acres have been identified as potential suitable martin habitat. This falls short of 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Brewer's sparrow	Yes.	No. Species is considered secure and the occurrence is 'numerous.' This falls short of 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Bluehead sucker	Yes.	No. Species is considered secure and population trends for this species in the planning area have not been reported. This falls short of 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Boreal Toad	Yes.	Yes.	Plan must contain plan components (ecological or species-specific)	TBD
Northern Leopard Frog	No. According to overview, no occurrences documented on the GMUG.	N/A		Does not qualify for SCC.

Western bumblebee	Yes - only three sites. No occurrences documented in the NRIS database for planning area.	No. There are no documented occurrences and no status or trends have been identified for populations within the planning area. This falls short of 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Yellow-dotted alpine butterfly	Yes.	No. Trend information is not available and the threat is unknown. This falls short of 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
White-veined arctic butterfly	No. Only 4 sightings in the last 20 years and none in the last 11 does not support a conclusion that the species "is established" in the area (1909.12, 12.52c-1).	N/A		Does not qualify for SCC.
Nokomis fritillary	No. One sighting 32 years ago does not support a conclusion that the species "is established" in the area (1909.12, 12.52c-1).	N/A		Does not qualify for SCC.
Townsend's big-eared bat	No. One sighting 62 years ago does not support a conclusion that the species "is established" in the area (1909.12, 12.52c-1).	N/A		Does not qualify for SCC.
Gunnison's prairie dog	Yes.	No. According to the overview, no reliable trend information is available for this species within the Upper Gunnison Basin population area. No trends have been identified for portions of this population within the planning area. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
American marten	Yes.	No. Species is secure and population trend information for this species within the planning area is unknown. This species is considered well-distributed throughout the planning area. This fall short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Rocky mountain bighorn sheep	Yes.	No. Species is secure and population trends show an increase over time. Habitat conditions are not a limiting factor, nor is human disturbance, development, and habitat fragmentation. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Desert bighorn sheep	Yes.	No. Species is secure and population trends show an increase over time. Habitat conditions are not a limiting factor, nor is human disturbance, development, and habitat fragmentation. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Pygmy Shrew	No. Only 2 sightings in the last 20 years not support a conclusion that the species "is established" in the area (1909.12, 12.52c-1).	No. According to the overview, population and trend information in the planning unit is unknown. Threats and risks and unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.

Stonecrop gillia	Yes.	No. According to the overview, there are insufficient data to make any inferences regarding the population trend for <i>Aliciella sedifolia</i> . The population size of the Half Peak occurrence was estimated for the first time in 2003, and later observed again by Hogan and Tembrock in 2007. However, there have been no monitoring efforts from which a trend could be determined. It is very likely that other occurrences remain to be discovered, so more species inventory work is needed before the population trend can be accurately assessed. Further, no exists on abundance changes for the GMUG populations. Overall, based on current information, threats to <i>A.sedifolia</i> are considered relatively low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
House's sandwort	Yes.	No. According to the overview, based on current information, threats to <i>Minuartia macrantha</i> are considered relatively low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Crandall's rock-cress	Yes.	No. Considered very common in the Gunnison Basin and the threats are considered relatively low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Utah fescue	Yes.	No. Considered fairly common and "abundant" and threats are not listed. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Green spleenwort	Yes - but only 1 occurrence.	N/A	Does not qualify for SCC.
Gunnison milkvetch	Yes.	No. Population is stable and new sites can be discovered easily. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Naturita milkvetch	Yes.	No. Population is stable and threats are not listed. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Narrow-leaf grapefern	Yes - but only two records.	No. According to the overview information, abundance and trend on the GMUG are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Peculiar moonwort	Yes - but only 1 occurrence.	No. Population at the 1 site is stable, and the population and trend information on the planning area are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Arctic braya	Yes.	No. Current location by 4 of the 5 populations puts them at minimal risk for disturbance. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Alpine braya	Yes - although the 6 populations on the GMUG have not been verified in over 20 years.	No. Population verification has not been completed in over 20 years and trend information on the planning area are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Lesser panicked sedge	No.	No. No GMUG populations have been counted and no trend information is available. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.
Sierra hare sedge	Yes.	No. There are no population counts or trend information on the planning area. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.	Does not qualify for SCC.

Livid sedge	Yes - but only 1 record.	No. According to the overview information, population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Globe sedge	Yes.	No. According to the overview information, population and trend information on the planning unit does not exist. There are no known threats to the species on the GMUG. Therefore, this falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Canadian single-spike sedge	Yes.	No. Trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Threats are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Green sedge	Yes	No. Population at one site is considered "abundant" and trend information is unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Osterhout's thistle	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Threats on the GMUG are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Reindeer lichen	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit (and Colorado) is unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Willow hawthorn	Yes - but only two records	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown, although it is "believed to be more widespread than previously thought." This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Dwarf alpine hawksbeard	Yes.	No. Populations have been observed as stable and "these habitats are generally invulnerable to management activities." This falls sort of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Slender rock-brake	Yes - although some of the records are more than 50 years old.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. Threats and risks are low/non-existent. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Mountain bladder fern	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. Risks are low and threats due to the spruce beetle epidemic are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Rockcress draba	Yes - but only 1 or 2 records on the GMUG.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. No reports of effects on the GMUG. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
San Juan draba	Yes.	No. Species is considered "commonly encountered," with several hundred populations possible. Threats on the GMUG are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Yellowstone whitlow-grass	Yes - but only 2-3 sites on the GMUG.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. Threats are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Whitlow-grass	Yes - but only 2 known occurrences on the GMUG, well outside it's normal range.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.

Woods draba	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. Threats are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Colorado Divide whitlow-grass	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit are unknown. Habitat is "apparently restricted to areas above treeline in Colorado." Habitat is stable. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Tundra draba	Yes - although only 4 records on the GMUG	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit (and Colorado) is unknown. Threats are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Roundleaf sundew	Yes - but only one record.	No. The one population is stable and has been since 1977. The plant is currently within a FS Botanical Area and a Colorado State Natural Area, which provides protection. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Low fleabane	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Threats and risk are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Woolly fleabane	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Threats and risks are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Colorado wild buckwheat	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. 9 of the 10 sites are located in low risk areas. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Altai cottongrass	Yes.	No. Populations on the GMUG are located within protected areas, with the exception of 1. Risks are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Chamisso's cottongrass	Yes.	No. Population and trend data on the planning unit is unknown. Risk are low due to the plant being located in a wetland. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Slender cottongrass	Yes.	No. Populations on the GMUG are stable. Risks are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Variegated scouring rush	Yes.	No. Population and trend data on the planning unit is unknown. Risks is low as the plant is capable of tolerating fairly high levels of disturbance. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Large-flower globe-mallow	Yes.	No. Population and trend data on the planning unit is unknown. Natural habitat is unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Simple kobresia	No.	N/A		Does not qualify for SCC.
Northern twayblade	Yes.	No. Population and trend data on the planning unit is unknown. Threats are manageable. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Colorado desert-parsley	Yes - although locations are unknown.	No. In addition to no known locations, population and trend data on the planning unit are unknown. Risk are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.

Colorado wood-rush	Yes.	No. Population and trend data on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Bog stitchwort	Yes - although only 1 occurrence in the past 20 years.	No. Population and trend data on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Tundra saxifrage	No.	N/A		Does not qualify for SCC.
Western mouse-tail	Yes - although only 1 occurrence.	No. Population and trend data on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Grand Mesa penstemon	Yes.	No. There is 30-40 locations known on the GMUG. Populations are stable. Risks are low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Adobe beardtongue	Yes - although only 2 sites.	No. Individual population numbers are quite large. Risks are very low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Avery Peak twinpod	Yes - although only 1 occurrence.	No. Population on the GMUG is estimated to be larger than average. Trend information is unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Piceance bladderpod	Yes - although only 1 occurrence.	No. Populations outside of the GMUG are quite large and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. The GMUG site currently has no risk. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Feathermoss	Yes - although only 2 sites.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Risks appear to be manageable. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Tundra buttercup	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Lime-loving willow	Yes - although exact location of the 1 occurrence is unknown.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown, although the population seems stable at another site. Risks are very low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Sphagnum	No.	N/A		Does not qualify for SCC.
Girgensohn's sphagnum	Yes - but only 10% of one site.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit, or in Colorado, is unknown. Risks are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Water awlwort	Yes - but only 1 occurrence.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Hanging Garden	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are very low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Sun-loving meadowrue	Yes - but only 1 occurrence.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are very low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.

Rothrock townsend-daisy	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is unknown, although the species seems easily discoverable. Risks are very low. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Little bulrush	Yes - but only 1 occurrence with only 10% on NFS.	No. Population on the GMUG is "a dense population that is widespread on the site." Trend information on the planning unit is unknown. Risks are unknown. This falls short of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.
Lesser bladderwort	Yes.	No. Population and trend information on the planning unit is not well known. Risks are unknown. This falls shorts of the 'substantial concern' threshold.		Does not qualify for SCC.