**Carex roanensis**

**Current Status**
UEF

**Proposed Status**
PE

**Proposed by:**
Steve Grund

**Habitat**
WP/CP/NHP

**Factors that increase conservation concern**
- Trail edges often get taken over by micro-edges (e.g., by foot paths, deer trails, and bases of outcrops).
- Also in sandstone crevices.

**Factors that decrease conservation concern**
- Estimated number of extant individual (65) 100 – 250 (2000)
- Estimated number of extant occurrence (3) 5 – 10 (30)

**Factors that increase conservation concern**
- Although it is likely that more occurrences will be discovered, it does not seem likely that there will end up being enough to reach the level of PR. PT is a possibility, but the species appears to be rare enough to justify protection.
- The known localities are within Ohiopyle State Park.

**Estimated number of extant occurrences**
- 3 (5 – 10)

**Estimated number of extant individuals**
- 65 (100 – 250)

**Steve Grund**

WPC/PNHP

**Proposed Status**

**Proposed by:**
Steve Grund

- **UEF**
- **PE**
**Euthamia caroliniana**  
(E. tenuifolia)

**Current Status (as E. tenuifolia)**  
PT

**Proposed Status**  
PE

**Proposed by:** John Kunsman  
PNHP

**Habitat** mostly successional - clearings, openings, rights-of-way, old fields

**Estimated number of extant occurrences**  
() 1 – 3 ()

**Estimated number of extant individuals**  
() 6 – 8 () Genets

**Factors that increase conservation concern**  
continued development; increase in exotic species

Very small potential state range (coastal plain species); probably never was common (fewer than 10 sites in 200+ years of botanizing)

**Factors that decrease conservation concern**  
Some successional habitat is continually created, although whether this species will show up is unknown

The name change has to do with priority, not a change in the concept of the taxon. In other words, not an issue of lumping or splitting. From Arthur Haines in FNA: J. L. Reveal (1991c) determined that the types of Erigeron carolinianus and Solidago tenuifolia are conspecific.
**Juncus trifidus** Linnaeus

**Current Status** n/a

**Proposed Status** PX

**Proposed by:** Wesley M. Knapp
Maryland Natural Heritage Program

**Habitat:** Alleghany [sic] Mountains, PA (label). Rock crevices at high elevations, on greenstone, mica schist, amphibolite, hornblende gneiss, and quartzitic sandstone. (Sorrie and Knapp in Weakley's draft flora).

**Estimated number of extant occurrences**

0 -- a few

**Estimated number of extant individuals**

0 -- several

This specimen fills a gap in the species range being much more common in New England and Canada. This circumboreal species becomes sporadic and rare in the southern portion of the range in North America.
Juniperus communis var. depressa

Current Status
TU

Proposed Status
PT

Proposed by:
Chris Tracey

WPC/PNHP

Habitat
Dry slopes or pastures. (PA Flora Project)

Factors that decrease conservation concern
Rare south of Pennsylvania.
Development continues in SE Pennsylvania.
Historic range has been extensively urbanized.

Factors that increase conservation concern
Estimated number of extant occurrences (6) 8 – 20 (40)
Estimated number of extant individuals (50) 70 – 200 (500) Genets
Tolerant of some disturbance.
**Lithospermum canescens** (Michx.) Lehm.

**Current Status**  
TU

**Proposed Status**  
PT

**Proposed by:**  
Jessica McPherson and Steve Grund

**Habitat**  
Limestone bluffs and grasslands.

**Estimated number of extant occurrences**  
(16) 20 – 30 (50)

**Estimated number of extant individuals**  
(1800) 1900 – 3000 (6000) Genets

**Factors that increase conservation concern**

Has probably suffered because of fire suppression, habitat and populations typically small.

Much of the habitat has been lost because it makes great farmland.

We have almost certainly lost populations of this species to agriculture. We have perhaps lost or will lose sites, and certainly individuals, to invasive species.

One of the small occurrences is very close to disturbance activities and is likely seeing heavy invasion by now.
**Muhlenbergia cuspidata**

**Current Status**

**TU**

**Proposed Status**

**PX**

**Proposed by:**

Habitat is not usually subject to development.

Factors that decrease conservation concern

To relocate the historic site(s)?

PA, In 1946 and 1952. Has anyone attempted this species has been collected only twice in PA. Km from the next closest occurrence in SW PA. In 1946 and 1952. Has anyone attempted to relocate the historic site(s)?

This is primarily a species of the Great Plains, habitat is vulnerable to invasive species.

Factors that increase conservation concern

Estimated number of extant individuals

(0) 0 – 40 (500, 5000) Genets

Estimated number of extant occurrences

(0) 0 – 1 (5)

Grasses are often under-collected.

This species has been collected only twice in PA. Km from the next closest occurrence in SW PA. In 1946 and 1952. Has anyone attempted to relocate the historic site(s)?

This is primarily a species of the Great Plains, habitat is vulnerable to invasive species.

Factors that decrease conservation concern

Estimated number of extant individuals

(0) 0 – 40 (500, 5000) Genets

Estimated number of extant occurrences

(0) 0 – 1 (5)

Grasses are often under-collected.

Habitat is not usually subject to development.

Factors that decrease conservation concern

To relocate the historic site(s)?

PA, In 1946 and 1952. Has anyone attempted to relocate the historic site(s)?

This is primarily a species of the Great Plains, habitat is vulnerable to invasive species.

Factors that increase conservation concern

Estimated number of extant individuals

(0) 0 – 40 (500, 5000) Genets

Estimated number of extant occurrences

(0) 0 – 1 (5)

Grasses are often under-collected.

Habitat is not usually subject to development.

Factors that decrease conservation concern

To relocate the historic site(s)?

PA, In 1946 and 1952. Has anyone attempted to relocate the historic site(s)?

This is primarily a species of the Great Plains, habitat is vulnerable to invasive species.

Factors that increase conservation concern

Estimated number of extant individuals

(0) 0 – 40 (500, 5000) Genets

Estimated number of extant occurrences

(0) 0 – 1 (5)
**Solidago curtisii** Torr. & A. Gray

**Current Status** PE

**Proposed Status** N

**Proposed by:** Bonnie Isaac, CM

**Habitat:** Shaded mesic woods and thickets, mostly Appalachian Mountains; 300–1200+ m; Ga., Ky., N.C., S.C., Tenn., Va., W.Va. (Semple and Cook in FNA)

**Estimated number of extant occurrences** 0

**Estimated number of extant individuals** 0

John Semple has re-determined all specimens at CM previously identified as *S. curtisii* to other species of *Solidago*.

Bonnie,

Below are my identifications for the four specimens from CM.

-Solidago caesia L. var caesia, Thomson 1965 (CM) PA Greene Co.
-Solidago gigantea Ait., Thomson 1971 CM (PA) Greene Co.
-Solidago caesia L. var caesia Thomson 2010 (CM) PA Greene Co.
-Solidago gigantea Ait., Thomson 2095 (CM) PA Washington Co.

The two *S. gigantea* specimens have the triple-nerved leaves of the species. They look like flood plain plants growing in the shade; small inflorescences could be confusing. The long rhizomes of Th. 1971 are also normal for the species.

Cheers,

John
Solidago roanensis

Current Status
PR

Proposed Status
PT

Proposed by: Steve Grund, PNHP/WPC

Habitat
Does well in certain anthropogenic disturbance habitats.

Factors that decrease conservation concern
Does well in certain anthropogenic disturbance.

*Estimated number of extant occurrences (8):* 12 – 25
*Estimated number of extant individuals (1000):* 2000 – 4000

*Ramets (8000):*

Pennsylvania Flora Project

Floristic Synthesis of NA © BONAP

Gary Kauffman, USFS

Rocky banks, roadsides, cut-over woods and woods edges (PA Flora Project), Woods and clearings, edges of balds, crevices in rocks, mountain provinces (Semple and Cook, FNA)