ATTACHMENT SS2

REGION 2 SENSITIVE SPECIES EVALUATION FORM

Species: Catostomus platyrhynchus/Mountain sucker

Criteria	Rank	Rationale	Literature Citations
1 Distribution within R2	B	Medium confidence in rank. NatureServe (2001) shows the mountain sucker as critically imperiled in Nebraska, imperiled in Colorado, apparently secure in Wyoming and South Dakota and not present in Kansas. It appears that little information is currently available which documents the mountain sucker on many of the National Forests or Grasslands within Region 2 at this time. However, Rob Hoelscher, USFS (personal communication) stated that mountain sucker populations do exist within the Black Hills National Forest. Also, Dave Gerhardt, USFS (personal communication) found the mountain sucker to be present on three national forests in Colorado (see last page of document).	NatureServe. An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2001. Version 1.4. Arlington, Virginia, USA: Association for Biodiversity Information. Available: http://www.natureserve.org/. (Accessed: May 21, 2001).
2 Distribution outside R2	C	Medium confidence in rank. The mountain sucker is listed as being vulnerable in the Canadian provinces of Saskatchewan and British Columbia. In the United States, the sucker is listed as vulnerable in Washington, apparently secure in Oregon and Utah, secure in Idaho and unranked in Nevada and California (NatureServe, 2001).	NatureServe. An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2001. Version 1.4. Arlington, Virginia, USA: Association for Biodiversity Information. Available: http://www.natureserve.org/. (Accessed: May 21, 2001).
3 Dispersal Capability	B	Medium confidence in rank. The mountain sucker appears to have an adequate ability to disperse through suitable habitat in many geographic areas where it occurs as indicated on the distribution map on NatureServe, (2001).	NatureServe. An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2001. Version 1.4. Arlington, Virginia, USA: Association for Biodiversity Information. Available: http://www.natureserve.org/. (Accessed: May 21, 2001).

Species: Catostomus platyrhynchus/Mountain sucker			
Criteria	Rank	Rationale	Literature Citations
4 Abundance in R2	B	Medium confidence in rank. NatureServe (2001) shows the mountain sucker as being present in all Region 2 states except Kansas. It may be that the mountain sucker is not significantly abundant on any National Forest or Grassland. Personal communication with Doug Backlund of the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks Department indicated that only relict and disjunct populations occur within the Black Hills and it is not known to occur in the Cheyenne River. He suggested that perhaps competition with trout and the declining quality of water (siltation) may be responsible for low populations in South Dakota. A Black Hills National Forest species viability review team evaluated the mountain sucker in March of 2000 and found no viability concern stating that recent surveys indicate a healthy population existing throughout the Black Hills (Rob Hoelscher, personal communication).	NatureServe. An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2001. Version 1.4. Arlington, Virginia, USA: Association for Biodiversity Information. Available: http://www.natureserve.org/. (Accessed: May 21, 2001).
5 Population Trend in R2	D	Medium confidence in rank. Populations are known to occur within some states in Region 2. Apparently the populations in the Black Hills are declining for reasons stated in criteria 4 above (Doug Backlund SDGF&P, personal communication). Population trends throughout Region 2 may not be well documented at this time. A Black Hills National Forest species viability review team determined that the survey data collected by the South Dakota Game, Fish and Parks is inconclusive regarding population trends (Rob Hoelscher, personal communication).	
6 Habitat Trend in R2	D	Medium confidence in rank. Habitat trends throughout Region 2 may not be well documented at this time.	
7 Habitat Vulnerability or Modification	B	Medium confidence in rank. As described in NatureServe (2001), a decrease in mountain sucker populations in eastern California is a result of human-caused changes through the construction of reservoirs and other destructive management practices. It can be inferred that such human-caused changes may in the future increase the level of habitat vulnerability as habitats continue to be modified. Western Canada has several widely scattered populations which do not appear to be under any threat at this time (NatureServe, 2001).	NatureServe. An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2001. Version 1.4. Arlington, Virginia, USA: Association for Biodiversity Information. Available: http//www.natureserve.org/. (Accessed: May 21, 2001).

Species: Catostomus platyrhynchus/Mountain sucker			
Criteria	Rank	Rationale	Literature Citations
8 Life History and Demographics	D	Medium confidence in rank. NatureServe (2001), states that mountain sucker females are usually sexually mature in four to five years and males mature in two to three years. Female egg production varies from 900-4000 eggs depending on the size of the female (NatureServe, 2001). Apparently prefers clear, cold creeks and small to medium-sized rivers having a substrate of rubble, sand or gravel (NatureServe, 2001). Food items consist of algae, diatoms and some invertebrates which are scraped from rock by the sucker's cartilaginous jaw (NatureServe, 2001). Populations are most abundant where some form of cover is available in the water, rarely found in lakes (NatureServe, 2001).	NatureServe. An online encyclopedia of life [web application]. 2001. Version 1.4. Arlington, Virginia, USA; Association for Biodiversity Information. Available; http//www.natureserve.org/. (Accessed: May 21, 2001).
Initial Evaluator(s): Douglas L. Sargent, Wildlife Biologist, Buffalo Gap National Grassland, Wall Ranger District			Date: June 14, 2001

National Forests in the Rocky Mountain Region where species is KNOWN (K) or LIKELY(L)[1] to occur:

[1] Likely is defined as more likely to occur than not occur on the National Forest or Grassland. This generally can be thought of as having a 50% chance or greater of appearing on NFS lands.

ATTACHMENT SS2

Colorado NF/NG	**Known**	**Likely**	**Kansas NF/NG**	**Known**	**Likely**	**Nebraska NF/NG**	**Known**	**Likely**	**South Dakota NF/NG**	**Known**	**Likely**	**Wyoming NF/NG**	**Known**	**Likely**
Arapaho-Roosevelt NF	X		Cimmaron NG			Samuel R.McKelvie NF			Black Hills NF	X		Shoshone NF		X
White River NF	X					Halsey NF			Buffalo Gap NG			Bighorn NF		X
Routt NF	X					Nebraska NF			Ft. Pierre NG			Black Hills NF		X
Grand Mesa, Uncompahgre, Gunnison NF						Ogalala NG						Medicine Bow NF		X
San Juan NF												Thunder Basin NG		
Rio Grande NF														
Pike-San Isabel NF														
Comanche NG														