A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas



Open-File Report No. 158 December 31, 2009

Kelly Kindscher, William H. Busby, Rachel Craft, Jennifer M. Delisle, Craig C. Freeman, Hayley Kilroy, Quinn Long, Hillary Loring, Ray Moranz, and Frank J. Norman

> Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory Kansas Biological Survey 2101 Constant Avenue Lawrence, KS 66047

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas

Cover photo: Native Prairie Hay Meadow, 2008. Photo by Kelly Kindscher

Report submitted December 31, 2009

Citation:

Kindscher, K, W. H. Busby, R. Craft, J. M. Delisle, C. C. Freeman, H. Kilroy, Q. Long, H. Loring, R. Moranz, and F. Norman. A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas. Open-File Report No. 158. Kansas Biological Survey. Lawrence, KS. iv+73 pp.

Abstract

In 2007, the Kansas Biological Survey initiated a 2-year inventory to identify and survey the remaining high-quality natural areas in Anderson and Linn counties and to identify habitat that might harbor rare species.

The primary natural areas in these counties are prairie and forest plant communities. We found a total of 236 high-quality prairies larger than 5 acres each. We also found 24 high-quality forest sites, most of which were larger than 10 acres each.

High-quality prairie communities include Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie, Low (Wet) Prairie and Claypan Prairie. High-quality forest communities include Oak-Hickory Forest and Maple-Basswood Forest.

Each high-quality plant community found is capable of sustaining known or possible rare species of interest. Specifically, we found regal fritillary butterflies at half the sites where butterflies were surveyed, a total of 28 sites.

In addition, we found 88 previously unknown populations of Mead's milkweed, a federally protected species listed as threatened. We also verified the continued existence of 31 previously known populations. These findings result in a total of 119 populations of Mead's milkweed for Anderson and Linn counties, a density unknown anywhere else throughout its global range.

We calculated the percentages of remaining high-quality native prairie in each county and compared them to the estimates of native prairie present in the 1850s from the Public Land Surveys of that time. We found that by 2009, remaining high-quality native prairie was only 1.11% of Anderson County, compared to 94% in the 1850s, and 0.01% of Linn County, compared to 81% in the 1850s.

Overall, these prairie gems are important sites for biological diversity. We have provided county maps showing the locations of remaining high-quality prairies and forests in the two-county area. We suggest several management recommendations for landowners and opportunities for both landowners and planning commissions to conserve some of their biologically rich tracts of land.

Table Of Contents

Abstract		i
List of Figures	s and Tables	iii
Chapter 1: Intr	oduction	1
1.1.	Project Purpose	1
1.2.	Objectives	1
Chapter 2: Ge	neral Description of Anderson and Linn Counties	2
2.1.	Survey Area and Landscape Features	2
2.2.	Land-Use History and Trends	3
2.3.	Potential Natural Communities and Species in the Two-County Area	5
Chapter 3: Inv	entory Methods	8
3.1.	Data Sources	8
3.2.	SiteSelection	8
3.3.	Ranking Criteria.	9
3.4.	Site Description Format	13
Chapter 4: Pla	nt Community Survey Results and Discussion	14
4.1.	Natural Areas Found during the County Inventory and	
	Their Significance.	14
4.2.	Significant Plant Species	17
4.3.	Direct Benefits of High-Quality Natural Areas to People	24
4.4.	Management Recommendations	25
Chapter 5: An	imal Survey Results and Discussion	27
5.1	Project Purpose	27
5.2	Species Accounts	29
5.3	Surveys of Species Groups	33
Literature Cite	ed and Data Sources.	37
Appendices: N	Aaps of Prairie and Forest Sites by County	
A:	Anderson County	39
B:	Linn County	40
C:	Prairie Plant Species Found during the County Inventory 2008-2009	41
D:	Forest Plant Species Found during the County Inventory	54
E:	Animal and Plant Species Protected by Federal and/or State Laws with	
	Historic or Current Occurrences in Anderson and Linn Counties, Kansas	62
F:	State Rank List of Prairie and Forest Plant Species Found in County Inventory	64
G:	Floristic Quality Indices for Prairie Sites	66
Acknowledgm	nents	73

List of Figures and Tables

Figures

Figure 2.1.	County Inventory Study Area of Linn and Anderson Counties in Kansas	2
Figure 2.2.	Map Showing Forested Areas in the 1850 Public Land Survey of Anderson	
	and Linn Counties	4
Figure 2.3.	Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie in Anderson County, 2009	6
Figure 2.4.	Spiderwort, Tradescantia ohiensis, in Native Prairie in Linn County, 2008	6
Figure 2.5.	Oak-Hickory Forest in Linn County, 2009	7
Figure 2.6.	Oak Leaf on a Fallen Tree in Oak-Hickory Forest	7
Figure 3.1.	Topeka Coneflower, Echinacea atrorubens	11
Figure 3.2.	Culver's Root, Veronicastrum virginicum	12
Figure 4.1.	Mead's Milkweed, Asclepias meadii	17
Figure 5.1.	Prairie Mole Cricket, Gryllotalpa major	29
Figure 5.2.	Regal Fritillary Butterfly, Speyeria idalia	31

Tables

Table 2.1.	Acreage and Percentage of Land in Native High-Quality Prairie in Anderson	
	and Linn Counties, 1850s–2005.	3
Table 2.2.	Major Terrestrial and Wetland Plant Communities in Anderson and Linn	
	Counties Before Euro-American Settlement	5
Table 4.1.	Prairie Sites Visited, by Community Type, 2008-2009	.14
Table 4.2.	Prairie Sites Visited, by County, 2008-2009	14
Table 4.3.	Number of Remaining Prairie Sites and Acreages in the 2009 Kansas Natural	
	Heritage Inventory Database, By Rank	.15
Table 4.4.	Forest Sites in the Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory Database, by Rank	16
Table 4.5.	New and Previously Known Populations of Mead's Milkweed in the Kansas	
	Natural Heritage Database	.18
Table 4.6.	The Most Conservative Prairie Plants Found, 2008-2009	.19
Table 4.7.	The Most Conservative Forest Plants Found, 2008-2009	.20
Table 4.8.	Kansas-Ranked S1 (Critically Imperiled) and S2 (Imperiled) Plant Species	
	Found at 235 High-Quality Prairie Sites, 2008-2009	.21
Table 4.9.	Kansas-Ranked S1 (Critically Imperiled) and S2 (Imperiled) Plant Species	
	Found at 27 High-Quality Forest Sites, 2008-2009.	.22
Table 4.10.	The Most Frequently Encountered Invasive Plant Species Found in	
	High-Quality Prairies During the County Inventory at 235 Sites, 2008-2009	.23
Table 4.11.	The Most Frequently Encountered Invasive Plant Species Found in	
	High-Quality Forests During the County Inventory at 27 Sites, 2008-2009	.24
Table 5.1	Tallgrass Prairie Species of Greatest Conservation Need Known or Likely to	
	Occur in High-Quality Prairies in Anderson and Linn Counties	.27

n or
linn
n
30
inn
32
dows in
34
in
in

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1. Project Purpose

In 2007, the Kansas Biological Survey was funded by a State Wildlife Grant from the Kansas Department of Wildlife & Parks to begin a project to identify the remaining, high-quality prairies, forests, and other natural areas in Anderson and Linn counties in northeast Kansas. The primary objective of this study was to provide information so policy makers can balance the need for development of natural resources with the need to preserve remaining natural areas in a changing landscape. Although some natural areas in Anderson County had been documented and mapped in the early 1990s, no recent systematic effort had been made previously to document all natural areas remaining in these counties.

High-quality natural areas are places on the landscape that support plant communities that closely approximate the native vegetation (e.g., tallgrass prairie or oak-hickory forest) that existed prior to Euro-American settlement. They provide many beneficial services to humans by buffering the effects of pollution, protecting water quality, preventing soil erosion, improving land values, and providing opportunities for outdoor recreation. They are reservoirs of biological diversity and sanctuaries for sensitive and declining species.

Our goal was to locate, classify, and evaluate the natural communities remaining in the study area and to identify the plants and animals that rely on them. We were especially concerned with identifying natural areas that provide critical habitat for rare and threatened species.

1.2. Objectives

The objectives of this study were

a) to find, identify, and assess through field surveys the remaining high-quality natural areas in the two-county area;

b) to document the locations of protected and rare animal and plant species in these areas and to record them in the Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory database;

c) to document the number of new and previously known sites supporting high-quality prairies, forests, and rare species;

d) to provide management recommendations to landowners interested in preserving and restoring natural areas on their property; and

e) to identify sensitive environments, potential parklands, and scenic recreational areas. This information will be valuable for planning purposes and will provide an opportunity for Anderson and Linn counties to lead in the integration of conservation planning with development planning.

Chapter 2: General Description of Anderson and Linn Counties

2.1. Survey Area and Landscape Features

The survey area includes Anderson and Linn counties (see Figure 2.1). This area is bounded on the east by Missouri and is traversed by the Marais des Cygnes River and several tributaries. The two-county area lies within the Osage Cuestas, which is south of the area in Kansas that was covered by glaciers in the Pleistocene. Major geology substrates are limestone, sandstone, and shale. The area is primarily in agricultural production of crops including corn, soybeans, wheat, grain sorghum, and alfalfa, as well as native pasture and cool-season pasture planted to brome and fescue. High-quality native prairies are scattered throughout both counties.



Figure 2.1. County Inventory study area of Linn and Anderson Counties in Kansas.

2.2. Land-Use History and Trends

2.2.a. Past Land-Use Patterns

Prior to Euro-American settlement, the area was inhabited by the Kansa, Osage, and other Native American tribes. Most of the land was then prairie, which was maintained by fire set by Native Americans or started by lightning. When Euro-American settlement began in the 1850s, federal land surveyors estimated prairie to cover 94% of Anderson County and 81% of Linn County (see Table 2.1). The remaining land was primarily covered with forest (see Figure 2.2). Europeans at first settled near rivers for access to timber, transportation, and commerce but then expanded to upland prairies, which they tilled for crops and used for pasture. Over time, livestock grazing and suppression of fire led to woody growth replacing grassland; in some areas, conversion of grassland to farmland further reduced prairie acreage. In addition, most wetlands were drained and many riparian forests were cut for timber use, farmland development, and river channel control.

Table 2.1. Acreage and Percentage of Land in Native High-Quality Prairie in Anderson and Linn counties, 1850s–2009.

County	1850s Prairie Acreage	1850s Estimated Percent of High- Quality Prairie	2009 Prairie Acreage	2009 Percent of High- Quality Prairie Remaining
Anderson	346,368	93.7%	3,766	1.11%
Linn	310,649	80.9%	2,654	0.01%

Note. Data for the 1850s are from the Kansas State Board of Agriculture (1877). The data for 2009 are for parcels greater than 5 acres that the Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory has identified (see Chapter 4).



Figure 2.2. Map showing forested areas in the 1850 Public Land Survey of Anderson and Linn counties.

2.2.b. Current Land Use Trends

At present, land in the United States is being converted to cropland, housing, offices, shopping centers, and industrial uses at an accelerating rate. Some estimates indicate that the amount of land being claimed for urban and suburban uses has increased by nearly 300% since 1955, while the U.S. population has increased by 75%. Conversion of natural areas to human uses reduces habitat for wildlife and limits ecosystem benefits and has become one of the most serious threats to native plant and animal species (Ewing et al. 2005). Although the area in this county inventory is outside of the greater Kansas City area, development is still a major part of the land-use trend. Most conversion of native prairie to agricultural land has already occurred, but when crop prices are high, some land still gets converted.

2.3. Potential Natural Communities and Species in Anderson and Linn Counties

Several prairie and forest community types were present in Anderson and Linn counties before Euro-American settlement (Table 2.2). The most common prairie community type was the Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie, found in the Osage Cuestas Region of east-central and southeast Kansas (see Figures 2.3 and 2.4). Low (Wet) Prairie was found along creeks and streams.

Numerous forest community types were found in the two-county area before European settlement, each characterized by proximity to rivers or moist habitats and the kind of trees dominant in the forest makeup. The most common community type was Oak-Hickory Forest (see Figures 2.5 and 2.6). Other community types included Ash-Elm-Hackberry Floodplain Forest, Cottonwood-Sycamore Floodplain Forest, Pecan-Hackberry Floodplain Forest, and Maple-Basswood Forest.

Ash-Elm-Hackberry Floodplain Forest	Mixed Oak Floodplain Forest
Bur Oak Floodplain Woodland	Mixed Oak Ravine Woodland
Buttonbush Swamp	Neutral Seep
Cottonwood–Black Willow Floodplain Forest	Oak-Hickory Forest
Cottonwood-Sycamore Floodplain Forest	Ozark Limestone Glade
Eastern Cattail Marsh	Pecan-Hackberry Floodplain Forest
Freshwater Marsh	Pondweed Aquatic Wetland
Loess Hills Tallgrass Prairie	Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie
Maple-Basswood Forest	Wet Prairie

Table 2.2. Major Terrestrial and Wetland Plant Communities in Anderson and Linn Counties Before Euro-American Settlement (Adapted From Lauver et al. 1999).



Figure 2.3. Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie in Anderson County, 2009.



Figure 2.4. Spiderwort, *Tradescantia ohiensis*, in native prairie in Linn County, 2008.



Figure 2.5 Oak-Hickory Forest in Linn County, 2009



Figure 2.6. An oak leaf on a fallen tree in Oak-Hickory Forest.

Chapter 3: Inventory Methods

3.1. Data Sources

Data sources used to develop the inventory included previously mapped sites in the Heritage database, digital satellite imagery, topographic maps, aerial photographs, and field surveys.

3.2. Site Selection

Work on the project began on November 1, 2007, and ended August 31, 2009. Fieldwork concentrated on the April–July field season each year. Our initial efforts focused on identification of potential natural areas using digital satellite imagery, recent and historical aerial photography (U.S. Department of Agriculture 2003), and previously mapped sites recorded in the Heritage database. Locations were mapped onto USGS 1:24,000 topographic maps and verified in the field.

Forested areas could be observed readily on aerial photographs, and potential high-quality sites were digitized using GIS software. These polygons were overlain on aerial photographs and topographic maps and the area mapped as forest in the 1850 Public Land Survey to create reference maps for use in the field.

Using satellite imagery to locate potential prairies was not as successful as using aerial photographs and topographic maps. We had anticipated using digital satellite data and aerial photography to differentiate between prairie and human-influenced grasslands like fescue pastures and crops. We discovered early in the first season that aerial photographs were helpful up to a point, but Landsat satellite imagery lacked the resolution needed to allow identification of small prairies in a highly fragmented landscape. It became clear that it would be easier to drive all roads looking for sites than to investigate all sites identified as possible natural areas by remote sensing, and we changed our study procedure. To make sure we found appropriate potential natural area sites in the two-county area, field crews drove along all county roads in Anderson and Linn counties. Sites identified in this manner were compared to historical maps (Public Land Surveys of Kansas 1850s) and previously mapped sites in the Heritage database.

Potential prairie sites of 5 acres or more, forest sites of 10 acres or more, and sites that were smaller but potentially supported rare species or were buffered by important plant communities were mapped onto field maps that were used in field surveys during April–July 2008 and March–July 2009. Natural communities that met the quality criteria used by the Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory were identified and assessed by three crews, each of at least two field biologists, botanists, or ecologists, who mapped community boundaries, assessed site condition following standard Heritage methodology, and identified species of plants present. Considering the importance of property rights and our respect for them, we obtained landowner permission before we visited potential sites. We contacted landowners by asking who owned the tract of land at the nearest house, by using county land ownership maps, and by obtaining information through the county courthouses. In exchange for permission to inventory their land, we offered to send prop-

erty owners the plant species lists we compiled while surveying their property.

3.3. Ranking Criteria

The objective of a natural areas inventory is to locate tracts of relatively undisturbed natural land that contain one or more natural communities existing in undisturbed or minimally disturbed conditions. Based on what we know about presettlement vegetation and communities (Table 2.2), and the rarity of certain plants and animals in the area (Appendix E), we can employ ranking criteria to determine the overall quality of our potential natural areas.

3.3.a. Natural Heritage Procedures

We used standard Natural Heritage procedures (NatureServe 2005c) to assign a grade to each community and species occurrence to summarize its quality and condition. Four grades ranging from A to D were used, while X was used to indicate a site that had been extirpated (e.g., developed for housing or converted to cropland or other uses). For plant communities, an A-grade indicated a pristine or relatively undisturbed occurrence, while a D-grade site was severely degraded.

The Heritage program gathers detailed information only for A- and B-grade community occurrences, limited information for most C-grade occurrences, and only the information needed to assign a grade for D-grade sites. Information about lower-quality sites, however, may be useful (e.g., for determining whether those sites can serve as buffers for high-quality core areas, links between high-quality sites, restoration projects, or parklands and recreational areas), and where appropriate, we gathered that information, too. These areas may be identified and characterized if the information is deemed potentially useful, but normally they are not added to the Natural Heritage databases.

Sites are ranked by using three key factors: landscape context, size, and condition. Landscape context is the extent to which an area is imbedded in a landscape of intact natural communities. Normally, landscape context and size are weighted more heavily than condition. The rationale is that landscape context and size cannot increase, or can do so only slightly with time, whereas condition is a more variable attribute and can be increased fairly quickly with appropriate management. Also, the assessed condition of a prairie remnant may vary with season, observer, management, or environmental conditions.

Landscape Context — Landscape context refers to the general condition of the landscape in which a site occurs, considering such issues as disturbance regimes, fragmentation, topography, and biological diversity. Landscape context is ranked A–D. Generally speaking, A-grade land-scapes have not been converted to human land uses (like cropland or housing) and are dominated by natural communities. Natural processes, species interactions, and species migrations can occur across all natural communities and experience no complete barriers. Surrounding vegetation is greater than 80% natural. B-grade landscapes have experienced some land conversion, but natural communities remain well-connected. Natural processes and species interactions and migrations can occur across many natural communities and experience few barriers. Surround-

ing vegetation is 50–80% natural. C-grade landscapes are fragmented by cultural land, including cropland or developed areas. Barriers severely affect many natural processes, species interactions, and migrations, and many species are unable to maintain viable populations. Surrounding vegetation is 20–50% natural. D-grade landscapes are surrounded almost entirely by cultural land. Natural processes and species migrations are severely compromised and cannot occur at natural scales. Only a subset of the historic biological diversity is viable within natural communities.

Size — Determining the size of a natural community may appear straightforward, but several issues complicate this process: patch size and minimum distance separating two occurrences.

Patch size denotes the size and landscape position of a natural community (Lauver et al. 1999). Four patch types usually are recognized: matrix, large-patch, small-patch, and linear. Matrix communities occur on the dominant landforms in an ecoregion and form extensive and often contiguous cover, usually greater than 1,000 acres. Large-patch communities generally occur on subdominant landform features and form large but interrupted cover, usually 20–1,000 acres. Small-patch communities occur on specialized landforms and microhabitats, and generally are less than 20 acres. Linear communities are long, narrow communities usually associated with riverine features.

Size standards have been established for many natural communities to distinguish viable from nonviable occurrences and, for viable occurrences, to rank them (A–D, with A being the best and D being the worst). Each community occurrence must meet the minimum size set for its type to be considered viable. For example, for Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie, a matrix community type, occurrences less than 10,000 acres usually are not considered viable (able to support ecosystem functions necessary to maintain high levels of native biodiversity for more than 100 years).

A second factor complicating the size issue is how far apart two occurrences of the same community type can be before they are considered distinct occurrences. Several evaluation guidelines are available to assist in determining the minimum distance of separation for terrestrial natural communities. Basically, two tracts are treated as distinct if they are separated by:

- 1) a substantial barrier to natural processes and/or to native species, such as a busy highway, developed area, or large body of water;
- 2) cultural vegetation that limits connection of patches;
- 3) a different community type coverage greater than 0.5 mile wide if the communities frequently do not occur in a mosaic, or 1–2 miles wide if frequently in a mosaic;
- 4) a tract subjected to management that is significantly different from that employed on the separated tracts; or
- 5) a major break or change in ecological land unit.

Condition — Condition refers to the impact that human disturbance has had on a site. Condition can be estimated by any of several available methods. Most Natural Heritage programs use subjective field assessments, which are based on estimates of native species richness, abundance of exotic species, and ecological processes. As with landscape context, condition may be ranked from A–D, with A being the best (least affected by human disturbance) and D being the worst (severely affected by human disturbance).

The determination of condition at a site was a primary purpose of our fieldwork. For each site we visited, we took note of the ecological and physical characteristics present, working in teams of two or more to put together an accurate plant species list for each site. Plant species that could not be identified in the field were brought back to the Kansas Biological Survey and the R. L. McGregor Herbarium for more exact identification.

3.3.b. Floristic Quality Assessment

Floristic Quality Assessment (FQA) is a standardized tool used to estimate the floristic quality of a natural area based on the vascular plants growing there (Taft et al. 1997; Freeman and Morse 2002). By extension, it can be used to assess the overall ecological quality of a site. Ecologists, botanists, environmental professionals, and land managers use FQA to establish baseline assessments, to conduct long-term monitoring, and to assess restoration progress in a variety of ecological settings (Herman et al. 1997; Taft et al. 1997). Developed in the 1970s (Wilhelm 1977; Swink and Wilhelm 1979), the method has been refined from its original form (Wilhelm and Ladd 1988; Taft et al. 1997; Rooney and Rogers 2002) and now is in

use or development in numerous states and provinces in the United States and Canada (Taft et al. 1997).

The method was developed to avoid subjective measures of natural community quality, such as "high" or "low". Some elements of FQA still are subjective, but the method has clear advantages over other evaluation tools, including repeatability and ease of application. Ideally, FQA should be used with other content-based and context-based measures (sensu Rooney and Rogers 2002) to estimate the integrity of native plant communities (Taft et al. 1997).

The FQA method is based on calculating an average coefficient of conservatism (C) and a floristic quality index (FQI) for a site. It may be used to compare several sites supporting the same community type (e.g., several Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairies) but should not be used to compare different community types (Rooney and Rogers 2002). A coefficient of conservatism is an integer from 0–10 that is assigned to each native plant species in a given geographic region—often a state or province. Naturally occurring hybrids and infraspe-



Figure 3.1. Topeka coneflower, *Echinacea atrorubens*, has a coefficient of conservatism of 8.

cific taxa usually are not assigned coefficients.

Coefficients of conservatism express two basic ecological tenets: plants differ in their tolerance of the type, frequency, and amplitude of anthropogenic disturbance, and plants vary in their fidelity to remnant natural plant communities (Taft et al. 1997). As employed in FQA, these two principles exhibit an inverse relationship: the lower a species' tolerance of human-mediated disturbance, the higher its likelihood of occurring only in a natural plant community. Low coefficient values (0-3) denote taxa often found in highly disturbed habitats and without a strong affinity for natural communities. High coefficient values (7–10) denote species that tolerate only limited disturbance and usually are found in natural communities (see Figures 3.1 and 3.2). With these principles as a guide, the C value applied to each species represents a relative rank based on observed behavior and patterns of occurrence in Kansas natural communities. Non-native species are not assigned coefficients because they were not part of the presettlement landscape. They do have an effect on FQA, however, and they may be incorporated in the assessment process.

The FQA process begins with a thorough inventory of vascular plants at a site of interest. The checklist then is used to calculate a floristic quality index (FQI) for the site. A mean C value (mean C) is calculated. The mean C value for a site is the arithmetic mean of the coefficients of all native vascular plants occurring on the entire site (mean $C = \Sigma C/N$), without regard to dominance or frequency. Non-native taxa are excluded from the calculation of mean C. The FQI is the mean C multiplied by the square root of the total number of taxa (\sqrt{N}) inventoried on the site (FQI = mean C $\times \sqrt{N}$). Separate calculations may be made using N = all taxa (native and non-

native) and N = native taxa only (see analysis and discussion in Taft et al. 1997). The basic formula for FQI combines the conservatism of the taxa with a measure of the taxon richness of the site. By multiplying by \sqrt{N} instead of N, the formula reduces the effect of the size of the site (larger sites tend to have a larger total number of species). If the sampling method involves transects or quadrats, a mean C and FQI can be calculated for each sample (Wilhelm 1977; Taft et al. 1997).

3.3.c. Rare Species

Natural Heritage programs across the United States determine state ranks for rare species (NatureServe 2005b). Factors considered in assessing conservation status include total number and condition of populations; population size; range extent and area of occupancy; short- and long-term trends in the above factors; scope, severity, and immediacy of threats to the species; number of protected and managed populations; intrinsic vulnerability, and environmen-



Figure 3.2. Culver's root, Veronicastrum virginicum, has a coefficient of conservatism of 8.

tal restrictions.

State conservation status ranks of species are based on a 1–5 scale, ranging from critically imperiled (S1) to demonstrably secure (S5). The two state rankings of interest in the County Inventory are the S1 (critically imperiled) and S2 (imperiled) species. We noted the presence of each S1 and S2 plant and animal species found in our survey.

3.4. Site Description Format

Once permission to survey a site was received from the landowner, each site was visited by a two- or three-person crew. They filled out data sheets with the following information:

- 1) latitude and longitude by GPS and a general description of the area;
- 2) landscape description of the site and the surrounding area;
- 3) description of the vegetative community and ranking (according to standard Heritage methodology; NatureServe 2005c);
- 4) the names of all plant species found on the site (the taxonomy used was from the USDA Plants Database 2010);
- 5) any occurrences of rare, threatened, or endangered species; and
- 6) the outline of the site on an aerial photograph of the area.

Data were entered into the Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory database and into plant species databases. Polygons representing natural area occurrences were digitized using ArcView 3.3 software using current aerial photographs as base maps. Tabular data were exported from the Heritage database and attached to each polygon as attributes.

The focus of this study was on the identification of remaining high-quality natural terrestrial communities, which are considered important habitats for many rare species. Resources did not permit systematic assessments of target animals with the exception of one easily surveyed species, the Regal fritillary butterfly (see Section 5.3.a below). Inventory methods for individual target animals were limited to recording evidence of any target animals encountered in the course of other field work. A rare species report form was used to record such species.

Chapter 4: Plant Community Survey Results and Discussion

4.1. Natural Areas Found during the County Inventory and Their Significance

4.1.a. Plant Communities and Their Distribution

Prairie Communities — During the 2008–2009 project season, we visited a total of 235 prairie sites in the two-county area. The prairies fell into three community types: Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie (232 sites), Low (Wet) Prairie (3 sites), and Claypan Prairie (3 sites) (see Table 4.1).

Table 4.1. Prairie Sites Visited, by Community Type, 2008–2009.

Community	Anderson	Linn
Unglaciated Tallgrass Prairie	104	125
Low (Wet) Prairie	1	2
Claypan	0	3

For this inventory work, we concentrated our efforts on finding sites that were previously unknown and undocumented (new sites) in the Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory database. During the second season we continued to look for new sites, but we also quickly looked at sites that had been previously documented in the Heritage database (revisits) to verify whether those sites still exist as native habitat and to reevaluate their overall rank (= grade). Many of these previously documented sites had not been revisited for over 15 years, and several were known to have been converted to other land uses—primarily agriculture or development.

Of the 235 sites we visited and ranked during 2008–2009, 226 sites are new and 9 are sites previously tracked in the Heritage database (see Table 4.2).

Table 4.2. Prairie Sites Visited, by County, 2008-2009.

	Anderson	Linn
New	99	127
Revisits	8	1

To be considered A-grade according to Heritage methods, a prairie would be surrounded by a large-acreage, high-quality prairie landscape. Such landscape no longer exists in the County Inventory area, so no prairie we visited during 2008–2009 had an overall rank of A. Of the 235 sites visited, 229 sites were C-grade or better. Five prairie sites were D-grade (severely degraded), 2 were X-grade (extirpated), and 14 sites were E (previously ranked and still occur but were not visited due to not having access (see Tables 4.3 and 4.4). The severely degraded and extirpated sites are considered to be areas of high-quality tallgrass prairie that have been lost during the last 15 years.

County	A Sites	B Sites	C Sites	D Sites ¹	X Sites ²	E Sites ³
Anderson						
No. of	0	24	83	5	2	13
Sites						
Acres	0	1177	2855	2547	587	2469
Linn						
No. of	0	53	76	0	0	1
Sites						
Acres	0	1324	1416	0	0	100
Total						
No. of	0	77	159	5	2	14
Sites						
Acres	0	2501	4271	2547	587	2569

 Table 4.3.
 Number of Remaining Prairie Sites and Acreages in the 2009 Kansas Natural
Heritage Inventory Database, by Rank (No. of Sites = 229).

Note. All sites meet the five-acre minimum requirement. D-ranked sites are revisits that were previously recorded in the Natural Heritage Inventory Database.

X = extirpated sites (previously documented sites that have been converted to housing or cropland).

E = previously tracked sites determined to be extant; viability not assessed.

¹ Sites previously ranked as A, B, or C that have been significantly degraded.

 2 Sites previously ranked as A, B, or C that are no longer prairie.

 3 Sites previously ranked as A, B, or C that were determined to be still prairie according to a drive-by, but which were not visited.

Mapping of Plant Communities.—The distribution of all prairie sites can be seen in the county maps in Appendices A and B. We are confident that we have successfully inventoried almost all of the remaining high-quality tallgrass prairie remnants in these counties. Since we drove the roads, we may have missed a small number of sites that are not visible from county roads.

The mapping of these sites is very useful for planning purposes and to see where our native prairies remain. Overall, more native prairie remains in 2009 in Anderson County than in Linn County (Appendices A and B), but in both cases it is a very small portion of the remaining natural landscape. Areas with numerous rock outcrops seem to harbor the most remaining highquality prairie.

Forest Communities.—We found 24 high-quality forest sites (grades B and C) in the two-county area (see Appendices A, B, D, and F). They included five different community types, including Ash-Elm-Hackberry Forest, Cottonwood-Sycamore Floodplain Forest, two Cross Timbers–Post Oak Woodlands, three Maple-Basswood Forests, and 15 Oak-Hickory Forests. The addition of these sites brings the total number of forest sites in the two-county area that are documented in the Heritage database to 45 (see Table 4.4). The floodplain forests were most common along the Marais des Cygnes River and its tributaries, while the other forest community types were found most typically on north-facing slopes along bluffs and steep hills associated with streams.

While there were no A-grade forest sites found, owing to their small size and occurrence in fragmented landscapes, there were 6 B-grade and 18 C-grade sites, mostly in Linn County (see Table 4.4).

County	В	С	D	Total
Anderson				
No. of Sites	0	2	5	7
Acreage	0	102.07	212.93	315.00
Linn				
No. of Sites	6	16	16	38
Acreage	503.49	983.70	936.28	2423.47
Both Counties				
No. of Sites	6	18	21	45
Acreage	503.49	1085.77	1149.20	2738.46

Table 4.4. Forest Sites in the Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory Database, by Rank, 2008-2009.

Overall, we documented slightly more native forest acreage in the two counties than prairie acreage even though more than 80% of the area was originally covered with native prairie. Almost 90% of the forest acres ranked in the County Inventory were in Linn County, but each county had some forest sites of B- or C-grade. The large area of forest in Linn County is due to the Marais des Cygnes drainage. There are still some sites that remain undocumented. Forest sites were considerably more difficult to inventory because of their large size, often linear shape along bluffs and rivers, and because they usually had multiple ownership. In addition, we wanted to find as many spring ephemeral woodland species—which are often indicators of forest quality as possible when we inventoried, and those could be readily observed only in April and May, which limited our survey time.

There are also many sites in both counties that have become forested over the last several decades, as landscape fires have been eliminated and brush and trees have spread where landscape management, suburban growth, availability of seeds, and other factors have inadvertently encouraged them. These areas provide significant habitat for wildlife species, but they are not high-quality plant communities, so they have not been inventoried or mapped in the survey work. Typically, these areas do not serve as habitat for many of our rare species.

4.1.b. Floristic Quality Assessment Results

The Floristic Quality Index provides additional support that the communities identified during the 2008-2009 inventory are high-quality tracts (see Appendix G). Areas with the highest-ranked condition grades (independent of overall rank) were more likely to have high Floristic Quality Index scores than other sites.

4.2. **Significant Plant Species**

4.2.a. Mead's Milkweed (*Asclepias meadii*)

Description and Location.-Mead's milkweed, which is federally protected and listed as threatened, occurs in the Midwest and eastern Great Plains (U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service 2003). It is a smooth, rhizomatous, perennial herb with a distinctive single nodding head of greenish-creamcolored, fragrant flowers produced at the end of each flowering stem (see Figure 4.1). Flowers are produced from mid-May to early June. Slender, hairy, erect pods mature from mid-June to late September. Slender, vegetative plants often arise from the rhizomes in the vicinity of flowering or fruiting stems.

Mead's milkweed was the only federally-protected species found in our survey work in Anderson



and Linn counties. It has declined due to habitat destruction and alteration by humans. Because of its rhizomes, plants can survive annual mowing, a common practice on native prairies in eastern Kansas. Unfortunately, having removes fruits before they can mature and release seeds, which prevents new plants from growing in most populations. Consequently, populations on most prairies with a long history of having show less genetic variability than do populations on sites managed by fire (Freeman and Hall 1991).

A majority of the remaining concentrations of the species occurs in Kansas, where more than 100 populations have been documented in the eastern two tiers of counties in the Osage Cuestas and in the southern Glaciated Region (Freeman and Hall 1991). Large populations may include several thousand stems, but most populations in Kansas have fewer than 50. Most populations occur on

Figure 4.1. Mead's milkweed, Asclepias meadii.

dry-mesic to mesic tallgrass prairies that are hayed annually, but a few sites are known to be grazed lightly. Plants grow most frequently on the middle and upper slopes of ridges and hills that have shallow, well-drained, limestone or (infrequently) sandstone soils.

County Inventory Results.—We found 88 new sites and verified six previously known sites in the County Inventory that had Mead's milkweed on them. Sites were fairly equally divided between the two counties, but Anderson County had sites with larger acreages and larger populations, including two populations with several thousand stems. All of the Mead's milkweed locations in Anderson and Linn counties are on B- and C-grade sites (see Table 4.7).

Table 4.5. New and Previously Known Populations of Mead's Milkweed in the Kansas Natural Heritage Database.

	Total Number of Mead's Milkweed Populations	New Populations Found in 2008-2009	Populations Known Previous to 2008
Anderson	59	37	22
Linn	60	51	9
Total	119	88	31

4.2.c. Indicator Species and Conservative Species

To determine if sites are high-quality native prairies or high-quality native forests, we look for species that are indicators of quality (see Tables 4.6 and 4.7). These are typically referred to as conservative species, which are species that have high fidelity to certain community types, which is reflected by a high coefficient of conservatism. Many of these species—for example, the high-quality prairie indicators inland New Jersey tea (*Ceanothus herbaceous*) and azure aster (*Symphyotrichum oolentangiense*)—occur almost exclusively on our highest-quality sites. Finding one of these species often means that other important species might be present, and they often indicate that some of our rarest species might also be present, such as Mead's milkweed (*Asclepias meadii*).

Most of our efforts to find new prairies were based on looking for indicator species while driving the roads. When we had personal leads about locating additional native prairie sites from land-owners and other knowledgeable people, and when we identified sites through aerial photography, we quickly determined whether we would be interested in inventorying promising sites by looking for these indicator species, which are typically showy or large conservative species.

Table 4.6. The Most Conservative Prairie Plants Found During the County Inventory for 235 Sites.

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
COEFFICIENT OF CONSERVATISM = 10:		
Asclepias meadii	Mead's milkweed	91
Trifolium reflexum	buffalo clover	27
COEFFICIENT OF CONSERVATISM = 9:		
Buchnera americana	blue hearts	35
Ceanothus americanus	New Jersey tea	92
COEFFICIENT OF CONSERVATISM = 8:		
Camassia angusta	prairie camas	56
Camassia scilloides	wild hyacinth	18
Carex bicknellii	Bicknell's sedge	38
Carex microdonta	littletooth sedge	36
Ceanothus herbaceus	inland New Jersey tea	51
Coreopsis grandiflora	bigflower coreopsis	91
Dodecatheon meadia	shooting star	4
Echinacea atrorubens	Topeka purple coneflower	4
Eleocharis tenuis var. verrucosa	slender spikerush	14
Fimbristylis puberula	hairy fimbristylis	133
Gentiana puberulenta	downy gentian	132
Hesperostipa spartea	porcupinegrass	21
Lilium michiganense	Michigan lily	3
Minuartia patula	pitcher's stitchwort	6
Pediomelum argophyllum	silverleaf Indian breadroot	1
Perideridia americana	eastern yampah	6
Polygala incarnata	slender milkwort	43
Polygala sanguinea	blood milkwort	43
Prenanthes aspera	rough rattlesnakeroot	74
Scleria triglomerata	whip razorsedge	120
Spiranthes vernalis	spring ladies'-tresses	1
Sporobolus heterolepis	prairie dropseed	25
Symphyotrichum oolentangiense	skyblue aster	105
Symphyotrichum sericeum	western silver aster	2

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites
		Where Found
COEFFICIENT OF CONSERVATISM = 8:		
Aplectrum hyemale	Adam and Eve	1
Camassia scilloides	Atlantic camas	4
Carex bicknellii	Bicknell's sedge	1
Collinsia verna	spring blue eyed Mary	1
Hybanthus concolor	eastern greenviolet	4
Lilium michiganense	Michigan lily	14
Maianthemum stellatum	starry false lily of the valley	4
Thalictrum thalictroides	rue anemone	4

Table 4.7. The Most Conservative Forest Plants Found During the County Inventory for 27 Sites.

*No species with Coefficient of Conservation equal to 9 or 10 were found.

4.2.d. Protected and Rare Species Occurrences

The rare plant species found during our survey work (Kansas state-ranked critically imperiled and imperiled species) are listed in Tables 4.8 and 4.9. These data will help determine their status and rank. Finding them at numerous sites indicates that the sites surveyed, especially the prairie sites, contain many species of statewide importance.

4.2.e. Non-Native and Invasive Plant Species

Invasive species are non-native (exotic) species that rapidly establish themselves in new habitats, especially habitats that have experienced localized or generalized disturbance. The species listed in Tables 4.10 and 4.11 are those that have most often invaded our prairies and forests.

Table 4.8. Kansas State-Ranked S1 (Critically Imperiled) and S2 (Imperiled) Plant Species At 235 High-Quality Prairie Sites, 2008-2009.

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
STATE RANK = S1		
Carex arkansana	Arkansas sedge	3
Coreopsis grandiflora	bigflower coreopsis	91
Eleocharis wolfii	Wolf's spikerush	1
Perideridia americana	eastern yampah	6
Physostegia angustifolia	narrowleaf false dragonhead	64
Rosa blanda	smooth rose	4
Rubus argutus	sawtooth blackberry	28
STATE RANK = S2		
Asclepias meadii	Mead's milkweed	91
Camassia angusta	prairie camas	56
Carex caroliniana	Carolina sedge	1
Carex hisutella	hairy-leaf hirsute sedge	1
Cyperus pseudovegetus	marsh flatsedge	2
Desmodium ciliare	hairy small-leaf ticktrefoil	1
Dichanthelium linearifolium	slimleaf panicgrass	5
Dichanthelium scoparium	velvet panicum	22
Eleocharis montevidensis	sand spikerush	1
Eleocharis tenuis	slender spikerush	14
Helenium flexuosum	purple-head sneezeweed	11
Phalaris caroliniana	Carolina canarygrass	2
Sporobolus heterolepis	prairie dropseed	25
Trifolium reflexum	buffalo clover	27
Verbesina helianthoides	gravelweed	1

Table 4.9. Kansas State-Ranked S1 (Critically Imperiled) and S2 (Imperiled) Plant Species Found At 27 High-Quality Forest Sites, 2008-2009.

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites
		Where Found
STATE RANK = S1		
Collinsia verna	spring blue eyed Mary	1
Polymnia canadensis	whiteflower leafcup	2
Smilax ecirrhata	upright carrionflower	2
STATE RANK = S2		
Aplectrum hyemale	Adam and Eve	1
Carex radiata	eastern star sedge	1
Carex rosea	rosy sedge	1
Carya laciniosa	shellbark hickory	10
Dichanthelium latifolium	wide leaf panicgrass	2
Hybanthus concolor	eastern greenviolet	4
Hydrophyllum appendiculatum	great waterleaf	3
Maianthemum stellatum	starry false lily of the valley	4
Packera glabella	butterweed	2
Ranunculus hispidus	bristly buttercup	2
Taenidia integerrima	yellow pimpernel	5
Thalictrum thalictroides	rue anemone	4
Trillium sessile	toadshade	5
Viburnum prunifolium	blackhaw	1

Table 4.10. The Most Frequently Encountered Invasive Plant Species Found in High-Quality Prairies During the County Inventory at 235 Sites, 2008-2009.

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites
_		Where Found
Dianthus armeria	Deptford pink	177
Potentilla recta	sulphur cinquefoil	172
Schedonorus phoenix	tall fescue	165
Bromus arvensis	field brome	158
Leucanthemum vulgare	oxeye daisy	153
Trifolium pratense	red clover	153
Trifolium campestre	low hop clover	119
Hypericum perforatum	common St. Johnswort	118
Tragopogon dubius	goat's beard	94
Poa pratensis	Kentucky bluegrass	90
Daucus carota	wild carrot	87
Melilotus officinalis	yellow sweet clover	84
Rumex crispus	curly dock	68
Prunella vulgaris	self-heal	65
Lespedeza cuneata	sericea lespedeza	57
Barbarea vulgaris	garden yellowrocket	49
Phleum pratense	timothy	38
Medicago lupulina	black medick	33
Bromus inermis	smooth brome	28
Stellaria media	common chickweed	25
Cruciata pedemontana	piedmont bedstraw	20
Trifolium repens	white clover	16
Kummerowia striata	Japanese clover	14
Agrostis stolonifera	redtop	12
Cirsium vulgare	bull thistle	12
Dactylis glomerata	orchardgrass	10
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	10
Torilis arvensis	hedge parsley	9
Lepidium campestre	field peppergrass	8
Trifolium hybridum	alsike clover	8
Allium vineale	field garlic	6
Morus alba	white mulberry	6
Plantago lanceolata	English plantain	6

Table 4.11. The Most Frequently Encountered Invasive Plant Species Found in High-Quality Forests During the County Inventory at 27 Sites, 2008-2009.

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites
		Where Found
Maclura pomifera	osage orange	8
Lamium purpureum	purple deadnettle	7
Taraxacum officinale	common dandelion	7
Alliaria petiolata	garlic mustard	6
Lysimachia nummularia	moneywort	4
Allium vineale	field garlic	3
Lactuca serriola	prickly lettuce	3
Morus alba	white mulberry	3
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	2
Stellaria media	common chickweed	2
Ailanthus altissima	tree of heaven	1
Brassica nigra	black mustard	1
Bromus inermis	smooth brome	1
Campsis radicans	trumpet creeper	1
Cirsium vulgare	bull thistle	1
Elaeagnus angustifolia	Russian olive	1
Euonymus fortunei	winter creeper	1
Lamium amplexicaule	henbit deadnettle	1
Leonurus cardiaca	common motherwort	1
Securigera varia	crownvetch	1
Verbascum thapsus	woolly mullein	1
Veronica arvensis	corn speedwell	1
Veronica hederifolia	ivyleaf speedwell	1
Vinca minor	common periwinkle	1

4.3. Direct Benefits of High-Quality Natural Areas to People

Native prairies and forests provide many benefits to the public including habitat for rare species, flood control, water- or air-quality control, recreational opportunities, and aesthetic enjoyment of the outdoors. The remaining natural areas also provide habitat for some of the state's sensitive and declining species and help to maintain biological diversity. In addition, many of the residents in the region appreciate the pastoral, native landscapes of Kansas and want to see them remain as part of the identifiable Kansas landscape.

4.4. Management Recommendations

The County Inventory revealed that high-quality prairies and forests still exist in northeast Kansas, but as Table 2.1 shows, less than 0.5% of original high-quality prairie still exists. Our data also indicate that during the last 10 years a significant number of these remaining prairies have decreased and are still decreasing in both size and number. Although we know that a smaller amount of high-quality native forest still exists, we do not have enough survey information to calculate its acreage or quality. Other high-quality plant communities do exist in this area, but their acreage is so small that we did not find them in our detailed study. The majority of remaining areas of high-quality native prairie and forest are owned by private landowners, and it is thanks to them that these native communities still exist.

4.4.a. Landowners and Managers

With the majority of remaining high-quality prairies and forests being held as private property, encouragement of continued good management is essential. In addition, various means need to be found to encourage good management for biological diversity, including funding through U.S. Department of Agriculture programs, state programs, and local monies, for both direct management and conservation of these high-quality native tracts.

A substantial number (perhaps 10%) of tracts of native prairie and forest are owned by public and nonprofit entities, including the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Kansas Department of Wildlife & Parks, the University of Kansas, county and city governmental entities, and nonprofit organizations. These public and nonprofit landowners also need to be encouraged to manage these tracts appropriately because they may have other management interests, may not have significant staff or funding, or may not fully recognize the ecological values of the lands they manage.

4.4.b. Conservation Easements

One way to maintain the natural areas that remain in Anderson and Linn counties is for property owners to preserve the high-quality property that they have. Conservation easements are a tool that provides landowners with tax benefits when they agree to limit the kind of development that can occur on their property. Planning commissions and nonprofit organizations can educate landowners about conservation easements and encourage their use. Conservation easements held by the Kansas Land Trust, The Nature Conservancy, and the Kansas Department of Wildlife & Parks have already been put into place to protect the ecological values of forests and prairies in the two-county area. Funds for programs to purchase conservation easements on additional highquality parcels of forest and prairie would significantly help conserve these tracts.

4.4.c. Restoration and Other Uses of Low-Quality Sites

Programs can be developed by state and local government to provide funding to landowners to restore lower-quality areas adjacent to high-quality property. When high-quality areas are surrounded with buffers of restored land, corridors can be created that give native plants and animals the opportunity to expand and find appropriate habitat in which to live. Where clusters of prairies and forests occur, lands that connect them could be appropriate places to encourage and fund restoration in voluntary programs. In addition, there are larger acreages of rangeland habitat in southern Anderson County that serve as important habitiat for grassland birds and other species. These areas also need restoration and other conservation practices.

4.4.d. Other Management Recommendations

The information obtained by this survey work can be helpful to landowners as we have provided plant species lists to all landowners who gave us permission to visit their land. This study can also be useful to several organizations in northeast Kansas that are involved with planning and land-use management. We will encourage them to create new programs to encourage the conservation of these lands by working with private property owners. We will be sharing this information with the following entities:

- Kansas Department of Wildlife & Parks;
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service;
- planning commissions in Anderson and Linn counties;
- the Kansas Land Trust; and
- The Nature Conservancy.

We intend to update and supplement this information on our County Inventory web page. We encourage others to look at it, or to obtain an additional copy of this report at:

http://www.kbs.ku.edu/people/staff_www/kindscher/County_Inventory/html/Co_Inv_Website_No_Frames_051705.htm.

Chapter 5: Animal Surveys

5.1. Project Purpose

In addition to systematic surveys of high-quality prairies and forests in Anderson and Linn counties, surveys of selected animal species also were conducted. Two main questions were addressed: First, what threatened and endangered species and Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) (KDWP 2005) have the potential to occur in these plant communities? Second, do plant communities in the study area provide important habitat for selected species of conservation-priority wildlife? Question 1 is addressed in Table 5.2 (SGCN that may occur in forest habitats in Anderson and Linn counties), Table 5.1 (SGCN that may occur in tallgrass prairie habitats in Anderson and Linn counties), and Appendix E, (potentially occurring threatened and endangered animal species in the two-county area). Question 2 is more challenging to address as it requires field surveys for individual species or taxa. Targeted surveys were employed for a small number of animal species and species groups, including two insect species (prairie mole cricket, Gryllotalpa major, and regal fritillary butterfly, Speyeria idalia), one forest bird (whippoor-will, Caprimulgus vociferus), grassland nesting birds, and grassland butterflies. These species and species groups were selected for inventory based on likelihood of occurrence in the plant communities identified during the study and the feasibility of conducting inventories in a time and budget-efficient manner. The primary purpose of this project was to identify remaining high-quality plant communities. A thorough assessment of all conservation priority animals that inhabit and benefit from these plant communities was beyond the scope of this project.

Table 5.1. Tallgrass Prairie Species of Greatest Conservation Need known or likely to occur in high quality prairies in Anderson and Linn counties. Source: Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan (KDWP 2005). Species are listed in decreasing order of total points in the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan. Presence codes: A = verified in this study, B = verified in past 10 years in Anderson County, C = potentially occurs (sources: Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory database).

Group	Common Name	Scientific Name	Tier	Presence	Seasonal
					Status
Bird	Henslow's Sparrow	Ammodramus henslowii	Ι	А	Breeder
Insect	Prairie Mole Cricket	Gryllotalpa major	Ι	А	Resident
Bird	Loggerhead Shrike	Lanius ludovicianus	Ι	В	Breeder
Bird	Greater Prairie-Chicken	Tympanuchus cupido	Ι	А	Resident
Amphibian	Crawfish Frog	Rana areolata	Ι	В	Resident
Bird	American Golden-Plover	Pluvialis dominica	Ι	В	Migrant
Bird	Short-eared Owl	Asio flammeus	Ι	В	Migrant
Bird	Bell's Vireo	Vireo bellii	Ι	А	Breeder
Bird	Smith's Longspur	Calcarius pictus	Ι	В	Migrant
Reptile	Massasauga	Sistrurus catenatus	II	В	Resident

Insect	Regal Fritillary	Speyeria idalia	II	А	Resident
Insect	Ottoe Skipper	Hesperia ottoe	II	С	Resident
Insect	Byssus Skipper	Probema byssus	II	С	Resident
Insect	Arogos Skipper	Atrytone arogos	II	А	Resident
Bird	Grasshopper Sparrow	Ammodramus savannarum	II	А	Breeder
Bird	Scissor-tailed Flycatcher Tyrannus forficatus		II	А	Breeder
Bird	Eastern Meadowlark	Sturnella magna	II	А	Resident
Bird	Dickcissel	Spiza americana	II	А	Breeder
Bird	Northern Bobwhite	Colinus virginianus	III	А	Resident

Table 5.2. Deciduous Forest Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) known or likely to occur in upland or riparian forest in Anderson and Linn counties. Source: Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan (KDWP 2005). Species are listed in decreasing order of total points in the Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan. Presence codes: A = verified in this study, B = verified in past 10 years in Anderson County, C = potentially occurs (source: Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory database).

Group	Common Name	Scientific Name Tie		Presence	Seasonal Status
Bird	Rusty Blackbird	Euphagus carolinus	I B		Winter Resident
Bird	Cerulean Warbler	Dendroica cerulea I B		В	Summer Resident
Mammal	Spotted Skunk (T)	Spilogale putorius	Ι	С	Resident
Reptile	Timber Rattlesnake	Crotalus horridus	Ι	С	Resident
Insect	Linda's Roadside Skip- per	Amblyscirtes Linda	Ι	C	Resident
Mammal	Little Brown Myotis	Myotis lucifugus	I C		Summer Resident
Bird	Whip-poor-will	Caprimulgus vociferus	Ι	A	Summer Resident
Bird	Yellow-throated Warbler	Dendroica dominica	I B		Summer Resident
Bird	Kentucky Warbler	Oporornis formosus	Ι	В	Summer Resident
Bird	Painted Bunting	Passerina ciris	Ι	С	Summer Resident
Mammal	Southern Flying Squirrel	Glaucomys volans	Ι	С	Resident
Reptile	Redbelly Snake (T)	Storeria occipitomaculata	Ι	С	Resident
Reptile	Smooth Earth Snake (T)	Virginia valeriae	II	С	Resident
Insect	Bell's Roadside Skipper	Amblyscirtes belli	II	С	Summer Resident
Amphibian	Northern Cricket Frog	Acris crepitans	Π	В	Resident

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas

Mammal	Texas Mouse	Peromyscus attwateri	II	С	Resident
Mammal	Fulvous Harvest Mouse	Reithrodontomys fulvescens	Π	С	Resident
Amphibian	Eastern Newt (T)	Notophthalmus viridescens	Π	В	Resident
Bird	Brown Thrasher	Toxostoma rufum	II	А	Summer Resident
Bird	Chuck-will's-widow	Caprimulgus carolinensis	II	В	Summer Resident
Reptile	Broadhead Skink (T)	Eumeces laticeps	II	В	Resident
Reptile	Coal Skink	Eumeces anthracinus	II	С	Resident
Reptile	Rough Earth Snake	Virginia striatula	II	С	Resident
Bird	Eastern Wood-Pewee	Contopus virens	II	В	Summer Resident
Bird	Orchard Oriole	Icterus spurius	II	В	Summer Resident
Bird	Baltimore Oriole	Icterus galbula	II	В	Summer Resident
Bird	Pileated Woodpecker	Dryocopus pileatus	II	В	Summer Resident
Amphibian	Spring Peeper (T)	Pseudacris crucifer	III	В	Resident
Bird	Harris' Sparrow	Zonotrichia querula	III	В	Winter Resident
Bird	Northern Bobwhite	Colinus virginianus	III	А	Resident
Bird	Red-headed Woodpecker	Melanerpes erythrocephalus	III	В	Resident
Reptile	Milk Snake	Lampropeltis triangulum	III	В	Resident
Mammal	Common Gray Fox	Urocyon cinereoargenteus	III	С	Resident

5.2. Species Accounts

5.2a. Prairie Mole Cricket (Gryllotalpa

major)

Introduction. — This large, burrowing cricket is endemic to the southern tallgrass prairie region in Kansas, Missouri, Arkansas, and Oklahoma. Believed to be extinct in the early 1980s, surveys have since shown that the species persists in prairies with appropriate soil structure and vegetation. In Kansas, the prairie mole cricket inhabits high quality prairie hay meadows east of the Flint Hills and rangeland in the Flint Hills and Chautauqua Hills.



Figure 5.1. Prairie Mole Cricket, *Gryllotalpa major*. Photo Courtesy of Thomas J. Walker, University of Florida.

Methods. — Prairie mole crickets are most readily detected by listening for calling males during the spring (April-May) breeding season. Males construct acoustical chambers at the soil surface on prairie slopes and hilltops and often cluster together with other males. Calling occurs on calm, rainless evenings with an air temperature > 16.7°C. Calling commences at sunset and usually lasts for approximately one hour.

Surveys were conducted by listening at selected prairies under suitable calling conditions. Calling is generally continuous during the calling period, so if no calling was heard after 5 minutes, the surveyor would then drive to the next site, and so on. If calling was heard, the approximate location and number of calling males was recorded. Surveys in this study were conducted in May 2009 in Anderson and Linn counties.

Results and Discussion. — Surveys for calling male crickets were conducted on 26 May 2009 in Anderson County and on 28 May 2009 in Linn County (Table 5.3). In Linn County, nine prairies were surveyed and no prairie mole crickets were heard. In Anderson County, many males were detected at one site, Sunset Prairie, where the species had been confirmed in previous years. Overall, no new sites for prairie mole cricket were located during this study. However, survey effort was minimal. Based on records of prairie mole cricket in nearby counties in Kansas and Missouri (Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory 2009, Dennis Figg, pers. comm.) it is likely that additional populations remain to be discovered in high-quality prairie hay meadows in Linn and Anderson counties.

County	Site Name	Lat	Long	Date	Crickets	Est. #	Notes
					Heard?	Males	
LN	Trail Through Woods Prairie	38.09392	-94.78716	5/28/2009	No	0	8:40 p.m.; good conditions
LN	Caddy-Corner Prairie	38.09555	-94.77599	5/28/2009	No	0	good conditions
LN	Prickly Pear Prairie	38.10068	-94.76875	5/28/2009	No	0	good conditions
LN	Two Fence Prairie	38.10402	-94.7688	5/28/2009	No	0	good conditions
LN	Centenarian Prairie	38.10861	-94.76874	5/28/2009	No	0	good conditions
LN	Butterfly Hill Prairie	38.12384	-94.76895	5/28/2009	No	0	good conditions
LN	Windsock Prairie	38.12628	-94.75053	5/28/2009	No	0	good conditions
LN	Three Arm Prairie	38.16053	-94.7518	5/28/2009	No	0	good conditions
LN	Secret Garden Prairie	38.1705	-94.76893	5/28/2009	No	0	9:35 p.m.; good conditions
AN	Sunset Prairie	38.18123	-95.32536	5/26/2009	Yes	>20	good conditions

Table 5.3. Results Of Surveys For Prairie Mole Cricket in Anderson and Linn counties at Tallgrass Prairie Hay Meadows in 2009.

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas
5.2.b. Regal Fritillary (Speyeria idalia)

Introduction. — This large orange butterfly (see Figure 5.2) is a grassland specialist that feeds on violets in the larval stage. Regal fritillary populations have declined range-wide, and the species has disappeared from much of its eastern range. Remaining populations are found in the prairie regions of the central U.S.; the species largely is restricted to prairie habitats. It is adversely affected by fire (which kills eggs and young) but will readily colonize post-burn habitat. Conservation management for this species consists of managing for forb and wildflower diversity, particularly violets (*Viola* sp.) and nectar plants such



Figure 5.2. Regal fritillary butter-fly, *Speyeria idalia*.

as milkweeds (*Asclepias* sp., thistles (*Cirsium* and *Carduus* sp.), *Liatris* sp., *Echinacea* sp., and ironweed (*Vernonia* sp.), and avoiding frequent use of fire.

Methods. — During plant community surveys, field personnel recorded the presence and numbers of regal fritillary butterflies encountered. Regal fritillary counts were incidental to other activities and not always conducted during a site visit. In addition, many plant community surveys were conducted at times unsuitable for regal fritillary activity (before mid-June, during cold or wet weather, etc.).

Results and Discussion. — Regal fritillary butterflies were observed on 28 prairies in Anderson and Linn counties during plant community surveys. In 2008, the species was documented at 17 sites, with 1 to 20 butterflies reported per prairie. In 2009, regal fritillaries were observed at 11 prairies, with 1 to 7 butterflies recorded per prairie. Regal fritillary populations, like those of many insects, fluctuate greatly from year to year. During this study, 2008 appeared to be a year of low abundance in Kansas (Moranz pers. obs.). Population levels in 2009 were somewhat better but still below normal. The fact that regal fritillary was documented in so many tallgrass prairie hay meadows in each county, despite the modest effort devoted, indicates that this species is a frequent resident of high-quality prairies in this region. This finding is consistent with results of studies in other counties in eastern Kansas (Powell et al. 2007; Busby pers. obs.) that report that remnant hay meadows often support high densities of regal fritillary despite the small size and isolated nature of such sites. Possible factors in their high abundance in prairie hay meadows are high plant species diversity, including native violets and wildflowers that produce nectar utilized for food by the regal fritillary, and infrequent burning.

5.2.c. Whip-poor-will (*Caprimulgus vociferous*)

Introduction. — The whip-poor-will, named for the sound of its nocturnal call, is a mediumsized night bird that feeds on flying insects captured in the air. A migratory species, it nests on the ground during May through July, and occurs on wooded slopes in eastern Kansas, primarily east of the Flint Hills. Due to its ground-nesting habit, the whip-poor-will is vulnerable to a wide variety of terrestrial predators. Populations have been declining, possibly due to habitat loss and fragmentation, and disturbance during the nesting season. However, the whip-poor-will remains common in suitable habitat in eastern Kansas (Busby and Zimmerman 2001). It calls mostly at dawn and dusk, but during the early breeding season (May) birds may call off-and-on all night. Calling activity is dependent on the moon cycle and other variables.

Methods. — Surveys for the whip-poor-will are most easily accomplished by listening for calling birds during the early part of the nesting season (May to about mid-June). Whip-poor-wills continue to call throughout the nesting season but less frequently. Listening surveys were conducted by following a driving route in suitable habitat with stops at regular intervals (about 0.5 miles). At each 2-minute listening stop, the presence or absence of calling whip-poor-wills was recorded. Distance to the nearest suitable habitat, defined as a 20-acre or larger patch of upland woodland, from each listening stop was calculated in ArcView software using 2008 USDA aerial photography.

Results and Discussion. — A whip-poor-will survey was conducted in Linn County on 28 May 2009 (Table 5.4). Birds were recorded at six of eight stops. Birds were heard at all stops where suitable habitat was present within 500 m of the listening point. Results from one survey cannot be generalized, but these results are consistent with casual observations during other field work in Linn and Anderson counties that indicate that the whip-poor-will is common and widespread in upland forests and can reliably be heard during favorable calling conditions. The high-volume call can carry a considerable distance (1 km or more), and the presence of several calling birds combined with the repetitive nature of calling in late spring can, however, create the mistaken impression of great abundance.

The whip-poor-will survey is this study was not conducted in high-quality forest sites identified during this project. Consequently, the role of forest quality (from a plant community perspective) on whip-poor-will occurrence was not addressed. Given the apparent abundance in the two-county area and the rarity of high-quality forest, it seems unlikely that the whip-poor-will is dependent on high quality forests as habitat.

County	County Road	Lat	Long	Distance	WPWI
				to Upland	heard?
	500 D 1	0000555	04 77 500	Forest (III)	
LN	500 Rd	38.09555	-94.77599	400	Yes
LN	Quail Rd	38.10068	-94.76875	440	Yes
LN	Quail Rd	38.10402	-94.7688	400	Yes
LN	Quail Rd	38.10861	-94.76874	70	Yes
LN	Quail Rd & 700th Rd	38.12384	-94.76895	560	No
LN	Read Rd & 700th Rd	38.12628	-94.75053	975	No
LN	Read Rd & 950th Rd	38.16053	-94.7518	760	Yes
LN	Quail Rd	38.1705	-94.76893	0	Yes

Table 5.4. Results of a whip-poor-will (WPWI) survey conducted in south-central Linn County, Kansas from 8:54 to 9:40 pm on 28 May 2009.

5.3. Surveys of Species Groups

5.3.a. Butterflies

Introduction. — In 2005, the State of Kansas selected 10 butterfly species as Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN) and indicated the need for more field data on these species (KDWP 2005). This study addressed this need by conducting surveys of all butterfly species present and their relative abundance on high-quality tallgrass prairie plant communities identified in the study. The surveys were conducted in Anderson County in summer, 2009, by Ray Moranz. The primary purpose of this work was to provide the Kansas Biological Survey with results from butterfly monitoring that was performed in Anderson County during the summer of 2009. Additionally, results were interpreted and management practices were recommended for maintenance and/or enhancement of populations of butterfly Species of Greatest Conservation Need (SGCN).

Methods. — Butterfly surveys used two sampling methods, line transects and non-random walks, to estimate the abundance of the entire butterfly fauna. The primary sampling method used in this study was the non-random walk survey. These surveys consisted of recording butterfly observations while walking in a non-random fashion, without recording the precise waypoints of the walk. Though clearly less repeatable and more biased than line-transect surveys, they were a means to maximize the likelihood of seeing butterflies of interest. During non-random walk surveys, the biologist walked at a pace of approximately 2 km/hour. The amount of time spent on each transect was also recorded. In addition some line transects were also surveyed. Line-transect routes were straight, and were placed randomly within each unit, except all portions of each transect route were at least 50 m from unit boundaries (to avoid edge effects) and 50 m from the nearest transect route (to minimize repeat sightings). Transects ranged in length from 100 m to 300 m.

Most sampling was performed during weather conditions appropriate for butterfly flight (temperature > 20°C, cloud cover < 70%, wind < 20 km/hr), but some sampling was performed under heavy cloud cover as long as temperatures surpassed 20°C and there was no precipitation. During line-transect sampling, the biologist walked each transect at a speed of 1.2 km/hr and recorded data on butterflies seen within the 180° field of view spanning from the observer's left to the observer's right. Data were collected in 100 m transect segments, allowing for future calculation of the species richness of each segment.

Each butterfly was identified to the species level if possible and its behavior when first detected was recorded. If a butterfly was nectaring, the plant species upon which it nectared was recorded. This allows for the determination of which nectar sources were used most frequently during each sampling session.

Results and Discussion. — During the summer of 2009, 35 butterfly species were observed during surveys at 20 prairies in Anderson County (Table 5.5). Of these, two species, arogos skipper and regal fritillary, are SGCN butterflies. Arogos skippers were observed at three sites; they were almost always nectaring on pale purple coneflower, *Echinacea pallida*, when observed. Regal fritillaries were observed at 10 locations, or one-half of the prairies surveyed. Many hay meadows that were not burned in 2009 had SGCN butterfly species (regal fritillaries and/or arogos

skippers). Almost all hay meadows that were burned in 2009 lacked SGCN butterfly species.

The arogos skipper records are the first for Anderson County. While this species is widely distributed in Kansas (Ely et al. 1986) and the Great Plains, populations are declining, and its current status is poorly known (NatureServe 2009, Xerces Society 2009). Loss of prairie habitat and frequent use of fire are considered threats to this butterfly.

The high proportion of prairie sites where regal fritillaries were found is significant but not unexpected. Regal fritillary populations are often associated with high-quality prairie hay meadows in northeastern and east-central Kansas (Powell et al. 2007; Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory 2009). At such sites, the species appears to benefit from good populations of its host plant (native violets, *Viola*) and the infrequent use of fire.

In summary, high-quality prairie hay meadows appear to be an important habitat for conservative prairie butterflies, even where such sites are small in size (< 200 acres) and found in fragmented landscapes.

Common Name	Scientific Name	Occurrence # sites	Occurrence %
American Lady	Vanessa virginiensis	4	20
Arogos skipper	Atrytone arogos	3	15
Black swallowtail	Papilio polyxenes	12	60
Cabbage white	Pieris rapae	1	5
Checkered skipper	Pyrgus communis	1	5
Clouded sulfur	Colias philodice	8	40
Common buckeye	Junonia coenia	2	10
Crossline skipper	Polites origenes	5	25
Delaware skipper	Anatrytone logan	8	40
Dun skipper	Euphyes vestries	4	20
Eastern tailed-blue	Everes comyntas	10	50
Eastern tiger swallowtail	Papilio glaucus	1	5
Giant swallowtail	Papilio cresphontes	1	5
Gray copper	Lycaena dione	5	25
Gray hairstreak	Strymon melinus	1	5
Great spangled fritillary	Speyeria cybele	9	45
Hackberry emperor	Asterocampa celtis	1	5
Monarch	Danaus plexippus	12	60
Northern broken dash	Wallengrenia egeremet	1	5
Orange sulfur	Colias eurytheme	18	90
Painted lady	Vanessa cardui	1	5
Pearl crescent	Phyciodes tharos	8	40

Table 5.5. Results Of Butterfly Surveys At 20 High-Quality Prairie Hay Meadows in Anderson County in 2009.

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas

Red admiral	Vanessa atalanta	1	5
Regal fritillary	Speyeria idalia	10	50
Silvery checkerspot	Chlosyne nycteis	1	5
Tawny-edged skipper	Polites themistocles	12	60
Unknown duskywing	Eyrnnis sp.	1	5
Unknown fritillary	Speyeria sp.	1	5
Unknown grass skipper		3	15
Unknown lady	Vanessa sp.	2	10
Unknown spreadwing		1	5
Zebra swallowtail	Eurytides marcellus	1	5

5.3.b. Grassland Birds

Introduction. — Several species of grassland birds that occur in eastern Kansas are highly ranked in the Kansas Wildlife Conservation Plan (KDWP 2005), including grasshopper sparrow, Henslow's sparrow, dickcissel, eastern meadowlark, greater prairie-chicken, and upland sandpiper (Table 5.1). To determine grassland breeding bird use of high quality prairies, surveys of grassland birds were conducted. The goal was to determine the species and their relative abundance on tallgrass prairies, most of which are privately-owned and managed for hay production.

Methods. — To determine the relative abundance of bird species on prairies, line transect counts were conducted in 2009. Linear transects were set up in previously identified high-quality prairies. Transect length and width were fit to prairie size but generally were at least 200-400 m in length and 150 m in width. Coordinates of start and ending points were recorded with a handheld GPS unit. Transect location was random with respect to grassland habitat but avoided trees and other woody habitat. In some cases, two transects were established in a prairie. Transect lines within a prairie were at least 250 m apart. Transects were run between dawn and 1100 h during dry weather with winds <15 mph. Each transect was sampled once in June 2009. All birds seen or heard within the surveyed area were recorded except for birds flying over the transect area. Bird abundance was calculated as birds per 10 ha.

Results and Discussion. — Descriptive statistics for five grassland-obligate species found in high-quality prairies in 2009 are shown in Table 5.6. Three species were regularly encountered at prairie sites: dickcissel, eastern meadowlark, and grasshopper sparrow. Two additional species, Henslow's sparrow and upland sandpiper, were found at relatively few sites. These results are consistent with other data for eastern Kansas (Zimmerman 1993). Clearly, high-quality hay meadow prairies are attractive to dickcissels, eastern meadowlarks, and grasshopper sparrows. Upland sandpipers were encountered infrequently and then only where the site was surrounded by larger areas of grassland. All upland sandpipers observed on grassland transects were in Anderson County, which has substantially larger areas of tallgrass prairie. Henslow's sparrow was observed in both Linn and Anderson counties, but only where the prairie had not been hayed the previous year or burned in the year of the survey. Other studies suggest Henslow's sparrow requires dense grass cover (Herkert 2003). Thus, hay meadow management is not compatible with

Henslow's sparrow, at least if hay is harvested every year.

This study was limited primarily to small prairies managed for hay production. It does not address several important questions related to the conservation value of such sites for grassland birds. First, it does not compare the relative attractiveness of hay meadows to prairie managed for grazing or other purposes. Grazed prairies may be more or less attractive to different species of grassland birds than hayed sites (Zimmerman 1993, With et al. 2008). Hayed prairies tend to support relatively large numbers of grasshopper sparrow and dickcissel, but are less attractive to species that prefer greater structural complexity, such as Henslow's sparrow or greater prairiechicken. Second, this study did not measure the reproductive success of grassland birds at the study sites. The abundance of species in a habitat type may not be closely related to the productivity of birds at the site. For example, dickcissels were relatively abundant in the habitat studied, but birds may produce few offspring if sites are hayed before eggs are hatched or young are mobile. These and other questions need to be addressed before the conservation value of prairie hay meadows for grassland birds can be determined more precisely.

Species	No. of	Mean	Standard	Minimum	Median	Maximum
	sites		Deviation			
Upland sandpiper	56	0.300	1.007	0.000	0.000	5.000
Grasshopper sparrow	56	2.323	3.289	0.000	0.000	14.245
Henslow's sparrow	56	0.139	0.594	0.000	0.000	4.000
Dickcissel	56	7.536	7.037	0.000	6.508	50.000
Eastern meadowlark	56	2.239	3.537	0.000	1.250	21.429

Table 5.6. Descriptive Statistics For Five Species of Grassland Birds Found in Surveys of High-Quality Prairies in Anderson and Linn Counties in 2009. Units are Number of Birds Per 10 Ha.

Literature Cited and Data Sources

- Busby, W. and J. Zimmerman. 2001. Kansas Breeding Bird Atlas. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence. 466 pp.
- Ely, C., M. Schwilling, and M. Rolfs. 1986. An Annotated List of the Butterflies of Kansas. Fort Hays Studies, Fort Hays State University, Hays, Kansas. 224 pp.
- Ewing, R., J. Kostyack, D. Chen, B. Stein, and M. Ernst. 2005. Endangered by sprawl: how runaway development threatens America's wildlife. National Wildlife Federation, Smart Growth America, and NatureServe. Washington, D.C., January.
- Freeman, C. C., and S. M. Hall. 1991. Status survey for western prairie fringed orchid (*Platan-thera praeclara* Sheviak & Bowles) on the Fort Riley Military Reservation.
- Freeman, C. C., and C. A. Morse. 2002. Kansas floristic quality assessment: coefficients of con servatism. Unpublished report of the R. L. McGregor Herbarium and Kansas Biological Survey, University of Kansas. Lawrence.
- Great Plains Flora Association. 1991 (second edition). The flora of the Great Plains. University Press of Kansas, Lawrence.
- Herkert, J. R. 2003. Effects of management practices on grassland birds: Henslow's Sparrow. Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center, Jamestown, ND. Northern Prairie Wildlife Research Center Online. http://www.npwrc.usgs.gov/resource/literatr/grasbird/hesp/hesp. htm.
- Herman, K. D., L. A. Masters, M. R. Penskar, A. A. Reznicek, G. S. Wilhelm, and W. W. Brodo wicz. 1997. Floristic quality assessment: development and application in the state of Michigan (USA). Natural Areas Journal 17:265–279.
- KDWP. 2005. A Future for Kansas Wildlife: Kansas' Comprehensive Wildlife Conservation Plan. Kansas Department of Wildlife and Parks, Pratt, KS. 147 pp.
- Kansas Natural Heritage Inventory database. 2009. Lawrence: Kansas Biological Survey.
- Kansas State Board of Agriculture. 1877. Fifth annual report of the State Board of Agriculture to the legislature of the State of Kansas. Geo. W. Martin, Kansas Publishing House, Topeka.
- Lauver, C. L., K. Kindscher, D. Faber-Langendoen, and R. Schneider. 1999. A classification of the natural vegetation of Kansas. Southwestern Naturalist 44:421–443.
- NatureServe. 2005a. Comprehensive report: *Speyeria idalia* (Regal fritillary). NatureServe explorer: an online encyclopedia of life. Version 4.5. NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Avail able at http://www.natureserve.org/explorer, accessed December 1, 2009.
- NatureServe. 2005b. NatureServe conservation status. NatureServe explorer: an online encyclo pedia of life. Version 4.5. NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available at http://www. natureserve.org/explorer/ranking.htm, accessed December 1, 2009.
- NatureServe. 2005c. Natural Heritage methodology: supporting interoperability within the NatureServe network. NatureServe, Arlington, VA. Available online at http://www. natureserve.org/prodServices/heritagemethodology.jsp, accessed September 1, 2009.
- Powell, A., W. Busby, and K. Kindscher. 2007. Status of the regal fritillary (*Speyeria idalia*) and effects of fire management on its abundance in northeastern Kansas, USA. Journal of Insect Conservation 11(3): 299-308.

- Public Land Surveys of Kansas. 1850s. Published on CD by the Kansas Society of Land Surveyors and Kansas Historical Society. Cameron Howell, Project Manager. National Archives, Record Group 49: Land Entry Files of the U.S. General Land Office, Bureau of Land Management. General Land Office Township Surveys, Kansas. Leavenworth, KS: Duke West Interactive Graphics, Inc.
- Rooney, T. P., and D. A. Rogers. 2002. The modified floristic quality index. Natural Areas Jour nal 22:340 –344.
- Swengel, A. B., 1996. Effects of fire and hay management on abundance of prairie butterflies. Biological Conservation 76:73–85.
- Swengel, A. B. 1998. Effects of management on butterfly abundance in tallgrass prairie and pine barrens. Biological Conservation 83:77–89.
- Swink, F., and G. S. Wilhelm. 1979. Plants of the Chicago region. 3rd ed. Morton Arboretum, Lisle, IL.
- Taft, J. B., G. S. Wilhelm, D. M. Ladd, and L. A. Masters. 1997. Floristic quality assessment for vegetation in Illinois: a method for assessing vegetation integrity. Erigenia 15:3–23.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2003. Natural color compressed county mosaics of Anderson and Linn Counties. National Agricultural Imagery Program NAIP-03. Photo Imaging Branch, Aerial Photography Field Office, Farm Service Agency. Salt Lake City.
- U.S. Department of Agriculture. 2010. Natural Resource Conservation Service Plants Database. http://plants.usda.gov/. website accessed 1/27/2010.
- U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. 2003. Mead's milkweed (*Asclepias meadii*) recovery plan. U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service, Fort Snelling, MN.
- Wilhelm, G. S. 1977. Ecological assessment of open land areas in Kane County, Illinois. Kane County Urban Development Division. Geneva, Illinois.
- Wilhelm, G. S., and D. Ladd. 1988. Natural area assessment in the Chicago region. In Transac tions of the 53rd North American Wildlife and Natural Resources Conference, pp. 371–375.
- With, K., A. King, and W. Jensen. 2008. Remaining large grasslands may not be sufficient to prevent grassland bird declines. Biological Conservation 141: 3152-3167.
- Xerces Society. 2009. Skippers: arogos skipper (*Atryone arogos*). http://www.xerces.org/arogos-skipper/ website accessed 12/28/2009.
- Zimmerman, J. 1993. Birds of Konza Prairie: the avian ecology of the tallgrass prairie. Univer sity Press of Kansas. Lawrence, KS. 186 pp.

Appendix A



Appendix B



Appendix C Prairie Plant Species Found During the County Inventory 2008-2009 (No. of Prairie Sites = 235)

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites
		Where Found
Acalypha virginica	Virginia copperleaf	36
Acer negundo	boxelder	3
Achillea millefolium	yarrow	214
Ageratina altissima	white snakeroot	1
Agrimonia parviflora	harvestlice	4
Agrostis gigantea	redtop	1
Agrostis hyemalis	winter bentgrass	158
Agrostis stolonifera	redtop	12
Allium canadense	meadow garlic	160
Allium vineale	field garlic	6
Amaranthus sp.	pigweed	2
Ambrosia artemisiifolia	common ragweed	27
Ambrosia bidentata	lanceleaf ragweed	1
Ambrosia psilostachya	western ragweed	96
Ambrosia trifida	giant ragweed	15
Ammannia coccinea	purple toothcup	2
Amorpha canescens	leadplant	217
Amorpha fruticosa	false indigo	60
Amphicarpaea bracteata	American hogpeanut	2
Andropogon gerardii	big bluestem	225
Andropogon ternarius	splitbeard bluestem	1
Andropogon virginicus	broomsedge bluestem	72
Antennaria neglecta	field pussytoes	168
Apocynum cannabinum	Indianhemp	210
Arenaria serpyllifolia	thyme-leaved sandwort	1
Aristida oligantha	prairie threeawn	1
Arnoglossum atriplicifolium	pale Indian plantain	1
Arnoglossum plantagineum	groovestem Indian plantain	174
Artemisia ludoviciana	white sage	2
Asclepias hirtella	prairie milkweed	72
Asclepias incarnata	swamp milkweed	2
Asclepias meadii	Mead's milkweed	91

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Asclepias purpurascens	nurple milkweed	2
Asclepias stenophylla	narrowleaf milkweed	26
Asclenias sullivantii	Sullivant's milkweed	86
Asclepias svriaca	common milkweed	30
Asclepias tylerosa	butterfly milkweed	124
Asclepias verticillata	whorled milkweed	87
Asclepias viridiflora	green-flowered milkweed	112
Asclepias viridis	green Antelopehorn milkweed	224
Asparagus officinalis	asparagus	3
Astragalus canadensis	Canadian milk-vetch	5
Astragalus crassicarpus	common ground plum	20
Astragalus distortus	Ozark milk-vetch	31
Baptisia alba	white wild indigo	72
Baptisia australis	blue false indigo	150
Baptisia bracteata	plains wild indigo	215
Barbarea vulgaris	garden yellowrocket	49
Bidens frondosa	devil's beggartick	2
Boltonia asteroides	white false aster	2
Bouteloua curtipendula	side-oats grama	38
Bouteloua gracilis	blue grama	3
Bouteloua hirsuta	hairy grama	11
Brassica nigra	black mustard	2
Brickellia eupatorioides	false boneset	97
Bromus arvensis	field brome	158
Bromus inermis	smooth brome	28
Buchnera americana	blue hearts	35
Callirhoe alcaeoides	pale poppy mallow	180
Calystegia sepium	hedge bindweed	20
Camassia angusta	prairie camas	56
Camassia scilloides	Atlantic camas	18
Campsis radicans	trumpet creeper	1
Capsella bursa-pastoris	shepherd's purse	1
Carduus nutans	musk thistle	4
Carex aggregata	glomerate sedge	2
Carex annectens	yellowfruit sedge	42
Carex arkansana	Arkansas sedge	3
Carex bicknellii	Bicknell's sedge	38

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Carex blanda	eastern woodland sedge	1
Carex brevior	straw sedge	78
Carex bushii	Bush's sedge	204
Carex caroliniana	Carolina sedge	1
Carex conjuncta	soft fox sedge	2
Carex frankii	Frank's sedge	12
Carex granularis	meadow sedge	6
Carex gravida	heavy sedge	33
Carex grayi	Gray's sedge	1
Carex hisutella	hairy-leaf hirsute sedge	1
Carex lupulina	hop sedge	1
Carex meadii	Mead's sedge	76
Carex mesochorea	midland sedge	1
Carex microdonta	littletooth sedge	36
Carex muhlenbergii	southern sedge	1
Carex pellita	woolly sedge	8
Carex shortiana	Short's sedge	2
Carex sp.	sedge	3
Carex vulpinoidea	fox sedge	17
Carex x subimpressa	sedge	1
Carya illinoinensis	pecan	1
Castilleja coccinea	Indian paintbrush	24
Ceanothus americanus	New Jersey tea	92
Ceanothus herbaceus	inland New Jersey tea	51
Ceanothus sp.	New Jersey tea	1
Celastrus scandens	American bittersweet	1
Celtis occidentalis	common hackberry	1
Cephalanthus occidentalis	common buttonbush	4
Cerastium fontanum	mouse-ear chickweed	1
Cercis canadensis	eastern redbud	2
Chaerophyllum tainturieri	wild chervil	42
Chamaecrista fasciculata	partridge pea	8
Chamaesyce maculata	spotted sandmat	1
Chamaesyce nutans	eyebane	3
Chamaesyce prostrata	prostrate sandmat	1
Chamaesyce sp.	sandmat	1
Chasmanthium latifolium	Indian woodoats	2

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Cicuta maculata	water hemlock	5
Cirsium altissimum	tall thistle	71
Cirsium undulatum	wavyleaf thistle	43
Cirsium vulgare	bull thistle	12
Claytonia virginica	Virginia springbeauty	7
Clematis pitcheri	bluebill	1
Comandra umbellata	bastard toadflax	28
Convolvulus arvensis	field bindweed	4
Conyza canadensis	Canada horseweed	10
Coreopsis grandiflora	bigflower coreopsis	91
Coreopsis palmata	finger coreopsis	81
Cornus drummondii	roughleaf dogwood	34
Crataegus sp.	hawthorn	3
Croton capitatus	woolly croton	2
Croton monanthogynus	one-seeded croton	12
Cruciata pedemontana	piedmont bedstraw	20
Cuscuta sp.	dodder	3
Cyperus echinatus	globe flatsedge	43
Cyperus esculentus	yellow nut-sedge	1
Cyperus lupulinus	Great Plains flatsedge	16
Cyperus pseudovegetus	marsh flatsedge	2
Cyperus setigerus	lean flatsedge	2
Cyperus sp.	flatsedge	3
Cyperus squarrosus	bearded flatsedge	1
Cyperus strigosus	strawcolored flatsedge	1
Dactylis glomerata	orchardgrass	10
Dalea candida	white prairie clover	208
Dalea multiflora	roundhead prairie clover	2
Dalea purpurea	purple prairie clover	185
Daucus carota	wild carrot	87
Delphinium carolinianum	Carolina larkspur	130
Desmanthus illinoensis	Illinois bundleflower	115
Desmodium ciliare	hairy small-leaf ticktrefoil	1
Desmodium glutinosum	pointedleaf ticktrefoil	1
Desmodium illinoense	Illinois tickclover	123
Desmodium paniculatum	panicledleaf ticktrefoil	44
Desmodium sessilifolium	sessile-leaf tickclover	140

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Dianthus armeria	Deptford pink	177
Dichanthelium acuminatum	pointed dichanthelium	161
Dichanthelium linearifolium	slimleaf panicgrass	5
Dichanthelium oligosanthes	Scribner's panicum	183
Dichanthelium scoparium	velvet panicum	22
Dichanthelium sphaerocarpon	roundseed dichanthelium	73
Diodia teres	rough buttonweed	2
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	9
Dipsacus fullonum	teasel	1
Dodecatheon meadia	shooting star	4
Draba cuneifolia	wedge leaf-draba	3
Echinacea atrorubens	Topeka purple coneflower	4
Echinacea pallida	pale purple coneflower	180
Eleocharis compressa	flatstem spikesedge	13
Eleocharis erythropoda	bald spikerush	1
Eleocharis montevidensis	sand spikerush	1
Eleocharis palustris	common spikerush	3
Eleocharis sp.	spikerush	118
Eleocharis tenuis	slender spikerush	14
Eleocharis wolfii	Wolf's spikerush	1
Elymus canadensis	Canada wildrye	53
Elymus hystrix	eastern bottlebrush grass	1
Elymus virginicus	Virginia wildrye	94
Equisetum hyemale	common scouring rush	1
Erigeron annuus	eastern daisy fleabane	53
Erigeron philadelphicus	Philadelphia fleabane	29
Erigeron strigosus	prairie fleabane	217
Eryngium leavenworthii	Leavenworth's eryngo	1
Eryngium yuccifolium	button snakeroot	129
Erythronium albidum	white fawnlily	2
Erythronium mesochoreum	midland fawnlily	4
Eupatorium altissimum	tall thoroughwort	13
Eupatorium perfoliatum	clasping-leaf joe-pye-weed	1
Eupatorium serotinum	lateflowering thoroughwort	1
Euphorbia corollata	flowering spurge	190
Euphorbia dentata	toothed spurge	1
Euphorbia spathulata	spurge	5

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Euthamia graminifolia	grassleaf euthamia	1
Euthamia gymnospermoides	viscid euthamia	98
Fimbristylis puberula	hairy fimbristylis	133
Fragaria virginiana	Virginia strawberry	127
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	1
Galium aparine	cleavers	10
Galium concinnum	shining bedstraw	2
Galium obtusum	bluntleaf bedstraw	40
Galium sp.	bedstraw	1
Galium virgatum	southwestern bedstraw	1
Gaura mollis	velvetweed	32
Gentiana puberulenta	downy gentian	132
Geranium carolinianum	Carolina cranesbill	34
Glandularia canadensis	rose mock vervain	32
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	8
Hedeoma hispidum	rough false pennyroyal	19
Helenium autumnale	common sneezeweed	5
Helenium flexuosum	purple-head sneezeweed	11
Helianthus annuus	common sunflower	6
Helianthus grosseserratus	sawtooth sunflower	87
Helianthus maximiliani	Maximilian's sunflower	27
Helianthus mollis	ashy sunflower	185
Helianthus pauciflorus	stiff sunflower	110
Helianthus salicifolius	willowleaf sunflower	47
Helianthus tuberosus	Jerusalem artichoke	1
Heliopsis helianthoides	rough ox-eye	3
Heliotropium tenellum	pasture heliotrope	2
Hemerocallis fulva	orange daylily	1
Hesperostipa spartea	porcupinegrass	21
Hibiscus laevis	halberdleaf rosemallow	1
Hieracium longipilum	longbeard hawkweed	186
Hordeum jubatum	foxtail barley	5
Hordeum pusillum	little barley	10
Houstonia pusilla	tiny bluet	1
Hymenopappus scabiosaeus	Carolina woollywhite	1
Hypericum perforatum	common St. Johnswort	118
Hypericum punctatum	spotted St. Johnswort	14

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Hypericum sphaerocarpum	roundseed St. Johnswort	12
Hypoxis hirsuta	yellow star grass	58
Iva annua	marsh elder	1
Juncus acuminatus	taper-leaf rush	1
Juncus dudleyi	Dudley's rush	7
Juncus interior	inland rush	52
Juncus marginatus	shore rush	7
Juncus nodosus	knotted rush	2
Juncus sp.	rush	6
Juncus tenuis	path rush	15
Juncus torreyi	Torrey's rush	9
Juniperus virginiana	eastern red cedar	36
Koeleria macrantha	Junegrass	168
Krigia cespitosa	weedy dwarf-dandelion	16
Kummerowia striata	Japanese clover	14
Lactuca canadensis	Canada lettuce	3
Lactuca ludoviciana	Louisiana lettuce	1
Lactuca serriola	prickly lettuce	2
Leersia oryzoides	rice cutgrass	2
Lepidium campestre	field peppergrass	8
Lepidium densiflorum	peppergrass	68
Lepidium virgincum	Virginia peppergrass	1
Lespedeza capitata	roundhead lespedeza	160
Lespedeza cuneata	sericea lespedeza	57
Lespedeza sp.	lespedeza	1
Lespedeza stuevei	tall lespedeza	2
Lespedeza violacea	violet lespedeza	133
Lespedeza virginica	slender bush lespedeza	118
Leucanthemum vulgare	oxeye daisy	153
Liatris aspera	tall blazing star	98
Liatris mucronata	eastern dotted gayfeather	1
Liatris punctata	dotted gayfeather	52
Liatris pycnostachya	thickspike gayfeather	148
Lilium michiganense	Michigan lily	3
Lindernia dubia	yellow false pimpernel	2
Linum sulcatum	grooved flax	66
Lithospermum canescens	hoary gromwell	45

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Lithospermum incisum	narrowleaf gromwell	11
Lobelia spicata	palespike lobelia	200
Lomatium foeniculaceum	wild pasley	10
Ludwigia alternifolia	bush seedbox	5
Ludwigia palustris	water purslane	1
Lycopus americanus	American bugleweed	8
Lysimachia ciliata	fringed loosestrife	9
Lysimachia nummularia	moneywort	1
Lythrum alatum	winged loosestrife	24
Medicago lupulina	black medick	33
Medicago sativa	alfalfa	1
Melilotus officinalis	yellow sweet clover	84
Mimosa quadrivalvis	cat-claw sensitive briar	151
Minuartia patula	pitcher's stitchwort	6
Mirabilis albida	white four-o'clock	9
Mirabilis nyctaginea	wild four-o'clock	3
Monarda citriodora	lemon beebalm	7
Monarda fistulosa	wild bergamot	18
Morus alba	white mulberry	6
Morus rubra	red mulberry	1
Muhlenbergia frondosa	wirestem muhly	1
Muhlenbergia sp.	muhly	1
Myosotis verna	Virginia forget-me-not	73
Nothoscordum bivalve	crowpoison	27
Oenothera macrocarpa	Missouri evening primrose	10
Oenothera speciosa	white evening primrose	40
Oligoneuron rigidum	stiff goldenrod	152
Ophioglossum engelmannii	limestone adderstongue	4
Opuntia macrorhiza	bigroot prickly pear	29
Oxalis dillenii	green wood sorrel	104
Oxalis violacea	violet wood sorrel	60
Packera plattensis	prairie groundsel	41
Packera pseudaurea	falsegold groundsel	2
Panicum capillare	common witchgrass	1
Panicum obtusum	vine mesquite	6
Panicum virgatum	switchgrass	184
Parthenocissus quinquefolia	Virginia creeper	1

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Pascopyrum smithii	western wheatgrass	1
Paspalum setaceum	sand paspalum	5
Pedicularis canadensis	wood betony	56
Pediomelum argophyllum	silverleaf Indian breadroot	1
Pediomelum esculentum	large Indian breadroot	111
Penstemon cobaea	cobaea beardtongue	9
Penstemon digitalis	talus slope penstemon	19
Penstemon tubiflorus	tube beardtongue	219
Perideridia americana	eastern yampah	6
Phalaris arundinacea	reed canarygrass	5
Phalaris caroliniana	Carolina canarygrass	2
Phleum pratense	timothy	38
Phlox pilosa	prairie phlox	45
Phyla lanceolata	lanceleaf fogfruit	3
Physalis heterophylla	clammy groundcherry	24
Physalis longifolia	common groundcherry	7
Physalis pumila	dwarf ground cherry	87
Physalis sp.	groundcherry	1
Physalis virginiana	Virginia groundcherry	42
Physostegia angustifolia	narrowleaf false dragonhead	64
Physostegia virginiana	Virginia lion-heart	50
Phytolacca americana	American pokeweed	1
Pilea pumila	Canadian clearweed	1
Plantago aristata	bottlebrush plantain	8
Plantago lanceolata	English plantain	6
Plantago patagonica	woolly plantain	13
Plantago rugelii	Rugel's plantain	3
Plantago sp.	plantain	4
Plantago virginica	pale-seeded plantain	80
Pluchea odorata	sweetscent	1
Poa pratensis	Kentucky bluegrass	90
Polygala incarnata	slender milkwort	43
Polygala sanguinea	blood milkwort	43
Polygala verticillata	whorled milkwort	32
Polygonum amphibium	water smartweed	5
Polygonum punctatum	dotted smartweed	1
Polytaenia nuttallii	prairie parsley	213

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Populus deltoides	cottonwood	1
Portulaca oleracea	little hogweed	1
Potentilla arguta	tall cinquefoil	1
Potentilla recta	sulphur cinquefoil	172
Potentilla simplex	old-field cinquefoil	113
Prenanthes aspera	rough rattlesnakeroot	74
Prunella vulgaris	self-heal	65
Prunus americana	wild plum	1
Prunus serotina	black cherry	4
Prunus sp.	plum	4
Pseudognaphalium obtusifolium	sweet everlasting	16
Psoralidium tenuiflorum	slimflower scurfpea	202
Ptilimnium nuttallii	Nuttall's mock bishop-weed	31
Pycnanthemum tenuifolium	slender mountain mint	198
Pyrrhopappus carolinianus	Carolina false dandelion	1
Quercus muehlenbergii	chinkapin oak	1
Quercus palustris	pin oak	1
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	1
Ranunculus sp.	buttercup	1
Ratibida columnifera	yellow prairie coneflower	4
Ratibida pinnata	pinnate prairie coneflower	96
Rhus aromatica	fragrant sumac	8
Rhus copallinum	dwarf sumac	16
Rhus glabra	smooth sumac	38
Rhynchospora harveyi	Harvey's beaksedge	1
Robinia pseudoacacia	black locust	2
Rosa arkansana	prairie rose	116
Rosa blanda	smooth rose	4
Rosa carolina	pasture rose	51
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	10
Rosa setigera	climbing rose	14
Rosa sp.	rose	6
Rubus argutus	sawtooth blackberry	28
Rubus flagellaris	northern dewberry	25
Rubus occidentalis	black raspberry	3
Rubus sp.	blackberry	17
Rudbeckia hirta	black-eyed Susan	227

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Rudbeckia subtomentosa	sweet coneflower	10
Ruellia humilis	fringeleaf ruellia	204
Rumex acetosella	sheep sorrel	1
Rumex altissimus	pale dock	47
Rumex crispus	curly dock	68
Salix nigra	black willow	2
Salvia azurea	blue sage	192
Sambucus nigra	black elderberry	3
Saponaria officinalis	bouncingbet	1
Schedonorus phoenix	tall fescue	165
Schizachyrium scoparium	little bluestem	217
Schoenoplectus acutus	hardstem bulrush	1
Scirpus atrovirens	green bulrush	16
Scirpus georgianus	Georgia bulrush	5
Scirpus pendulus	rusty bulrush	121
Scleria triglomerata	whip razorsedge	120
Scutellaria parvula	small skullcap	98
Securigera varia	crownvetch	1
Sedum pulchellum	widowscross	15
Setaria parviflora	knotroot bristlegrass	63
Setaria pumila	yellow bristlegrass	1
Setaria verticillata	hooked bristlegrass	1
Silene antirrhina	sleepy catchfly	14
Silene stellata	widowsfrill	4
Silphium integrifolium	rosinweed	72
Silphium laciniatum	compass plant	126
Sisyrinchium angustifolium	narrowleaf blue-eyed grass	2
Sisyrinchium campestre	prairie blue-eyed grass	114
Smilax tamnoides	bristly greenbrier	1
Solanum carolinense	Carolina horse nettle	118
Solidago canadensis	Canada goldenrod	154
Solidago gigantea	giant goldenrod	8
Solidago missouriensis	Missouri goldenrod	186
Solidago nemoralis	gray goldenrod	52
Solidago speciosa	noble goldenrod	16
Sorghastrum nutans	Indiangrass	169
Spartina pectinata	prairie cordgrass	86

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Sphenopholis obtusata	prairie wedgescale	67
Spiranthes vernalis	spring ladies'-tresses	1
Sporobolus compositus	rough dropseed	135
Sporobolus heterolepis	prairie dropseed	25
Stellaria media	common chickweed	25
Stenosiphon linifolius	false gaura	1
Strophostyles leiosperma	slick-seed bean	8
Symphoricarpos orbiculatus	coralberry	24
Symphyotrichum ericoides	white heath aster	172
Symphyotrichum laeve	smooth blue aster	2
Symphyotrichum lanceolatum	white panicle aster	15
Symphyotrichum oblongifolium	aromatic aster	15
Symphyotrichum oolentangiense	skyblue aster	105
Symphyotrichum pilosum	hairy white oldfield aster	110
Symphyotrichum praealtum	willowleaf aster	112
Symphyotrichum sericeum	western silver aster	2
Symphyotrichum sp.	aster	1
Taraxacum officinale	common dandelion	3
Tephrosia virginiana	goat's rue	10
Teucrium canadense	Canada germander	16
Thalictrum dasycarpum	purple meadow-rue	4
Thlaspi arvense	pennycress	4
Torilis arvensis	hedge parsley	9
Toxicodendron radicans	poison ivy	24
Tradescantia bracteata	bracted spiderwort	13
Tradescantia ohiensis	Ohio spiderwort	223
Tragia betonicifolia	nettleleaf noseburn	38
Tragopogon dubius	goat's beard	94
Tragopogon porrifolius	salsify	1
Tridens flavus	purpletop tridens	8
Trifolium campestre	low hop clover	119
Trifolium hybridum	alsike clover	8
Trifolium pratense	red clover	153
Trifolium reflexum	buffalo clover	27
Trifolium repens	white clover	16
Triodanis biflora	small Venus' looking-glass	1
Triodanis leptocarpa	slimpod Venus' looking glass	16

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Triodanis perfoliata	Venus' looking glass	33
Triosteum perfoliatum	horse gentian	1
Tripsacum dactyloides	eastern gammagrass	180
Triticum aestivum	wheat	1
Typha latifolia	broadleaf cattail	3
Ulmus americana	American elm	3
Ulmus pumila	Siberian elm	2
Ulmus rubra	red elm	33
Valerianella radiata	beaked cornsalad	111
Veratrum virginicum	Virginia bunchflower	1
Verbascum blattaria	moth mullein	1
Verbascum thapsus	woolly mullein	4
Verbena bracteata	bigbract verbena	2
Verbena hastata	blue verbena	13
Verbena simplex	narrowleaf verbena	25
Verbena stricta	woolly verbena	14
Verbena urticifolia	white verbena	2
Verbesina alternifolia	wingstem crownbeard	2
Verbesina helianthoides	gravelweed	1
Vernonia baldwinii	Baldwin's ironweed	187
Vernonia fasciculata	western ironweed	11
Veronica peregrina	purslane speedwell	7
Vicia americana	American vetch	1
Viola nephrophylla	northern bog violet	26
Viola pedatifida	prairie violet	149
Viola sagittata	arrowleaf violet	2
Vitis riparia	riverbank grape	5
Vulpia octoflora	sixweeks fescue	45
Xanthium strumarium	common cocklebur	1
Yucca filamentosa	Adam's needle	1
Zizia aurea	golden zizia	53

Appendix D Forest Plant Species Found During the County Inventory 2008-2009 (No. of Forest Sites = 27)

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites
		Where Found
Acer negundo	boxelder	10
Acer saccharinum	silver maple	7
Acer saccharum	sugar maple	16
Aesculus glabra	Ohio buckeye	12
Agastache nepetoides	yellow giant hyssop	1
Ageratina altissima	white snakeroot	9
Agrimonia parviflora	harvestlice	11
Agrimonia sp.	agrimony	4
Ailanthus altissima	tree of heaven	1
Alliaria petiolata	garlic mustard	6
Allium canadense	meadow garlic	9
Allium sp.	onion	1
Allium vineale	field garlic	3
Ambrosia trifida	great ragweed	4
Amorpha canescens	leadplant	1
Amphicarpaea bracteata	American hogpeanut	5
Aplectrum hyemale	Adam and Eve	1
Apocynum cannabinum	Indianhemp	6
Aquilegia canadensis	red columbine	6
Arabis canadensis	sicklepod	6
Arisaema dracontium	green dragon	11
Arisaema triphyllum	Jack in the pulpit	12
Arnoglossum atriplicifolium	pale Indian plantain	10
Asclepias purpurascens	purple milkweed	2
Asclepias tuberosa	butterfly milkweed	1
Asimina triloba	pawpaw	15
Asplenium platyneuron	ebony spleenwort	1
Astragalus crassicarpus	common ground plum	1
Botrychium virginianum	rattlesnake fern	21
Brassica nigra	black mustard	1
Bromus inermis	smooth brome	1
Bromus pubescens	hairy woodland brome	10
Bromus sp.	brome	3

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Calvstegia sp	false bindweed	1
Camassia scilloides	Atlantic camas	4
Campanulastrum americanum	American bellflower	4
Campsis radicans	trumpet creeper	1
Cardamine concatenata	cutleaf toothwort	15
Cardamine pensylvanica	Pennsylvania bittercress	1
Carex aggregata	glomerate sedge	3
Carex albicans	whitetinge sedge	6
Carex bicknellii	Bicknell's sedge	1
Carex blanda	eastern woodland sedge	19
Carex cephalophora	oval-leaf sedge	1
Carex conjuncta	soft fox sedge	2
Carex davisii	Davis' sedge	2
Carex gravida	heavy sedge	1
Carex grayi	Gray's sedge	3
Carex grisea	inflated narrow-leaf sedge	5
Carex hyalinolepis	shoreline sedge	1
Carex jamesii	James' sedge	7
Carex meadii	Mead's sedge	1
Carex oligocarpa	richwoods sedge	2
Carex radiata	eastern star sedge	1
Carex rosea	rosy sedge	1
Carex sp.	sedge	4
Carex sparganioides	bur-reed sedge	1
Carya cordiformis	bitternut hickory	15
Carya illinoinensis	pecan	6
Carya laciniosa	shellbark hickory	10
Carya ovata	shagbark hickory	24
Carya sp.	hickory	1
Celastrus scandens	American bittersweet	2
Celtis occidentalis	common hackberry	25
Cercis canadensis	eastern redbud	23
Chaerophyllum procumbens	spreading chervil	17
Chaerophyllum tainturieri	wild chervil	2
Chasmanthium latifolium	Indian woodoats	9
Chenopodium sp.	goosefoot	1
Cirsium altissimum	tall thistle	5

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Cirsium sp.	thistle	1
Cirsium vulgare	bull thistle	1
Claytonia virginica	Virginia springbeauty	12
Clematis pitcheri	bluebill	2
Clematis sp.	leather flower	2
Collinsia sp.	blue eyed Mary	1
Collinsia verna	spring blue eyed Mary	1
Collinsia violacea	violet blue eyed Mary	1
Corallorhiza sp.	coralroot	2
Corallorhiza wisteriana	spring coralroot	4
Cornus drummondii	roughleaf dogwood	16
Corydalis flavula	yellow fumewort	8
Corylus americana	American hazelnut	1
Crataegus sp.	hawthorn	1
Cystopteris tennesseensis	Tennessee bladderfern	11
Dasistoma macrophylla	mullein foxglove	2
Delphinium tricorne	dwarf larkspur	3
Descurainia pinnata	western tansymustard	1
Desmodium glutinosum	pointedleaf ticktrefoil	11
Desmodium paniculatum	panicledleaf ticktrefoil	3
Desmodium perplexum	perplexed ticktrefoil	1
Desmodium sp.	ticktrefoil	5
Dicentra cucullaria	dutchman's breeches	12
Dichanthelium clandestinum	deertongue	1
Dichanthelium latifolium	wide leaf panicgrass	2
Dichanthelium sp.	rosette grass	1
Dioscorea sp.	yam	2
Diospyros virginiana	common persimmon	4
Draba cuneifolia	wedge leaf-draba	2
Elaeagnus angustifolia	Russian olive	1
Ellisia nyctelea	Aunt Lucy	17
Elymus canadensis	Canada wildrye	4
Elymus virginicus	Virginia wildrye	14
Enemion biternatum	eastern false rue anemone	16
Eragrostis sp.	lovegrass	1
Erigeron annuus	eastern daisy fleabane	1
Erigeron strigosus	prairie fleabane	1

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Ervthronium albidum	white fawnlily	18
Ervthronium mesochoreum	midland fawnlily	4
Euonymus atropurpureus	burningbush	4
Euonymus fortunei	winter creeper	1
Eupatorium altissimum	tall thoroughwort	2
Eupatorium purpureum	sweetscented joe pye weed	8
Eupatorium serotinum	lateflowering thoroughwort	1
Euphorbia corollata	flowering spurge	1
Festuca subverticillata	nodding fescue	12
Fragaria virginiana	Virginia strawberry	1
Fraxinus americana	white ash	14
Fraxinus pennsylvanica	green ash	12
Fraxinus sp.	ash	1
Galium aparine	stickywilly	23
Galium circaezans	licorice bedstraw	19
Galium concinnum	shining bedstraw	14
Galium obtusum	bluntleaf bedstraw	1
Geum canadense	white avens	18
Geum vernum	spring avens	3
Glandularia canadensis	rose mock vervain	3
Gleditsia triacanthos	honeylocust	8
Gymnocladus dioicus	Kentucky coffeetree	7
Hackelia virginiana	beggarslice	7
Helianthus hirsutus	hairy sunflower	17
Humulus lupulus	common hop	1
Hybanthus concolor	eastern greenviolet	4
Hydrophyllum appendiculatum	great waterleaf	3
Hydrophyllum virginianum	eastern waterleaf	8
Hypericum sphaerocarpum	roundseed St. Johnswort	6
Impatiens capensis	jewelweed	18
Iodanthus pinnatifidus	purplerocket	3
Juglans nigra	black walnut	21
Juniperus virginiana	eastern red cedar	18
Lactuca floridana	woodland lettuce	6
Lactuca serriola	prickly lettuce	3
Lamium amplexicaule	henbit deadnettle	1
Lamium purpureum	purple deadnettle	7

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites
Lanortoa ognadonsis	Canadian woodnattla	
		1 /
	whitegrass	1
Leonurus caraiaca		1
Lespedeza capitata	roundnead lespedeza	I
Lespedeza violacea	violet lespedeza	5
Liatris aspera	tall blazing star	3
Lilium michiganense	Michigan lily	14
Lithospermum canescens	hoary gromwell	1
Lonicera sp.	honeysuckle	1
Lysimachia nummularia	moneywort	4
Maclura pomifera	osage orange	8
Maianthemum racemosum	feathery false lily of the valley	12
Maianthemum sp.	false lily of the valley	2
Maianthemum stellatum	starry false lily of the valley	4
Melilotus sp.	sweetclover	2
Menispermum canadense	common moonseed	17
Mirabilis sp.	four o'clock	1
Monarda fistulosa	wild bergamot	1
Morus alba	white mulberry	3
Morus rubra	red mulberry	6
Muhlenbergia sp.	muhly	5
Myosotis verna	Virginia forget-me-not	1
Nothoscordum bivalve	crowpoison	7
Ophioglossum engelmannii	limestone adderstongue	2
Opuntia humifusa	devil's-tongue	2
Osmorhiza longistylis	longstyle sweetroot	12
Ostrya virginiana	hophornbeam	17
Oxalis dillenii	green wood sorrel	1
Oxalis violacea	violet woodsorrel	10
Packera glabella	butterweed	2
Packera obovata	roundleaf ragwort	18
Parietaria pensylvanica	Pennsylvania pellitory	9
Parthenocissus quinquefolia	Virginia creeper	25
Pellaea atropurpurea	purple cliffbrake	2
Penstemon sp.	beardtongue	1
Phalaris arundinacea	reed canarygrass	1
Phlox divaricata	wild blue phlox	23

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Physalis virginiana	Virginia groundcherry	1
Phytolacca americana	American pokeweed	4
Pilea pumila	Canadian clearweed	1
Pilea sp.	clearweed	1
Plantago rugelii	Rugel's plantain	2
Platanus occidentalis	American sycamore	17
Poa sylvestris	woodland bluegrass	11
Podophyllum peltatum	mayapple	22
Polygonatum biflorum	smooth Solomon's seal	9
Polygonum virginianum	jumpseed	17
Polymnia canadensis	whiteflower leafcup	2
Populus deltoides	cottonwood	4
Prunus serotina	black cherry	11
Ptelea trifoliata	common hoptree	1
Quercus alba	white oak	3
Quercus macrocarpa	bur oak	14
Quercus muehlenbergii	chinkapin oak	22
Quercus palustris	pin oak	6
Quercus rubra	northern red oak	21
Quercus shumardii	Shumard's oak	3
Quercus sp.	oak	1
Quercus stellata	post oak	9
Quercus velutina	black oak	16
Ranunculus abortivus	littleleaf buttercup	7
Ranunculus hispidus	bristly buttercup	2
Ratibida pinnata	pinnate prairie coneflower	3
Rhus aromatica	fragrant sumac	7
Rhus glabra	smooth sumac	2
Ribes aureum	golden currant	1
Ribes missouriense	Missouri gooseberry	19
Rosa multiflora	multiflora rose	2
Rosa setigera	climbing rose	4
Rubus occidentalis	black raspberry	6
Rubus sp.	blackberry	7
Rudbeckia laciniata	cutleaf coneflower	4
Rumex sp.	dock	1
Sambucus nigra	black elderberry	13

Species Name	Common Name	No. of Sites Where Found
Sanguinaria canadensis	bloodroot	6
Sanicula canadensis	Canadian blacksnakeroot	17
Sanicula odorata	clustered blacksnakeroot	5
Schizachyrium scoparium	little bluestem	1
Scrophularia marilandica	carpenter's square	7
Securigera varia	crownvetch	1
Setaria sp.	bristlegrass	1
Sicyos angulatus	oneseed bur cucumber	2
Sideroxylon lanuginosum	gum bully	2
Silene stellata	widowsfrill	8
Silphium perfoliatum	cup plant	2
Sisyrinchium campestre	prairie blue-eyed grass	1
Smilax ecirrhata	upright carrionflower	2
Smilax herbacea	smooth carrionflower	7
Smilax tamnoides	bristly greenbrier	24
Solidago gigantea	giant goldenrod	6
Solidago nemoralis	gray goldenrod	1
Solidago ulmifolia	elmleaf goldenrod	9
Staphylea trifolia	American bladdernut	17
Stellaria media	common chickweed	2
Stellaria sp.	starwort	3
Symphoricarpos orbiculatus	coralberry	27
Symphyotrichum drummondii	Drummond's aster	3
Symphyotrichum laeve	smooth blue aster	5
Symphyotrichum lanceolatum	white panicle aster	5
Taenidia integerrima	yellow pimpernel	5
Taraxacum officinale	common dandelion	7
Teucrium canadense	Canada germander	2
Thalictrum thalictroides	rue anemone	4
Tilia americana	American basswood	12
Toxicodendron radicans	poison ivy	20
Trillium sessile	toadshade	5
Triosteum perfoliatum	horse gentian	5
Ulmus americana	American elm	14
Ulmus rubra	red elm	19
Urtica dioica	stinging nettle	8
Valerianella radiata	beaked cornsalad	1

Species Name Common Name		No. of Sites Where Found		
Verbascum thapsus	woolly mullein	1		
Verbena urticifolia	white vervain	5		
Verbesina alternifolia	wingstem crownbeard	9		
Vernonia baldwinii	Baldwin's ironweed	3		
Veronica arvensis	corn speedwell	1		
Veronica hederifolia	ivyleaf speedwell	1		
Viburnum prunifolium	blackhaw	1		
Viburnum rufidulum	rusty blackhaw	6		
Viburnum sp.	viburnum	1		
Vinca minor	common periwinkle	1		
Vinca sp.	periwinkle	1		
Viola bicolor	field pansy	2		
Viola nephrophylla	northern bog violet	25		
Viola pubescens	downy yellow violet	22		
Vitis riparia	riverbank grape	21		
Woodsia obtusa	bluntlobe cliff fern	3		
Zanthoxylum americanum	common pricklyash	13		
Zizia aurea	golden zizia	18		

Appendix E

Animal and Plant Species Protected by Federal and/or State Laws with Historic or Current Occurrences in Anderson and/or Linn Counties, Kansas

Common Name	Scientific Name	Status ¹
ANIMALS		
Mammals		
Eastern spotted skunk	Spilogale putorius	Т
Franklin's ground squirrel	Spermophilus franklinii	S
Southern bog lemming	Synaptomys cooperi	S
Southern flying squirrel	Glaucomys volans	S
Birds		
Black tern*	Chlidonias niger	S
Cerulean warbler	Dendroica cerulea	S
Ferruginous hawk*	Buteo regalis	S
Golden eagle*	Aquila chrysaetos	S
Henslow's sparrow	Ammodramus henslowii	S
Least tern*	Sterna antillarum	LE, E
Piping plover*	Charadrius melodus	LT, T
Short-eared owl*	Asio flammeus	S
Snowy plover*	Charadrius alexandrinus	Т
Whip-poor-will	Caprimulgus vociferus	S
Yellow-throated warbler	Dendroica dominica	S
Reptiles		
Broadhead skink	Eumeces laticeps	Т
Common map turtle	Graptemys geographica	Т
Redbelly snake	Storeria occipitomaculata	Т
Smooth earth snake	Virginia valeriae	Т
Timber rattlesnake	Crotalus horridus	S
Amphibians		
Eastern newt	Notophthalmus viridescens	Т
Crawfish frog	Rana areolata	S
Spring peeper	Pseudacris triserata	Т
Fishes		
Bluntnose darter	Etheostoma chlorosoma	S
Bobolink	Dolichonyz oryzivorus	S
Greenside darter	Etheostoma blenniodes	S
Hornyhead chub	Nocomis biguttatus	Т
Tadpole madtom	Noturus gyrinus	S

Invertebrates		
Creeper	Strophitus undulatus	S
Deertoe mussel	Truncilla truncata	S
Elktoe	Alasmidonta marginata	E
Fatmucket	Lampsilis siliquoidea	S
Fawnsfoot	Truncilla donaciformis	S
Flat floater	Anodonta suborbiculata	E
Fluted shell	Lasmigona costata	Т
Mucket	Actinonaias ligimentina	E
Prairie mole cricket	Gryllotalpa major	S
Rock pocketbook	Arcidens confragosus	Т
Round pigtoe mussel	Pleurobema sintoxia	S
Spike mussel	Elliptio dilatata	S
Wabash pigtoe mussel	Fusconaia flava	S
Wartyback mussel	Quadrula nodulata	S
Washboard	Megalonaias nervosa	S
Yellow Sandshell	Lampsilis teres	S
PLANTS		
Mead's milkweed	Asclepias meadii	LT
Western prairie fringed orchid	Platanthera praeclara	LT

* Migrant only

1 Status abbreviations (federal, then state) are as follows:

- LE = listed as endangered by the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
- LT = listed as threatened the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service
- S = listed as species in need of conservation by Kansas Dept. of Wildlife & Parks
- E = listed as endangered by Kansas Dept. of Wildlife & Parks
- T = listed as threatened by Kansas Dept. of Wildlife & Parks

Appendix F State Rank List of Prairie and Forest Plant Species Found in County Inventory 2008-2009

Habitat	Species	Common Name	State Rank	CoC	# of Loca-
					tions
Prairie	Eleocharis tenuis var. verrucosa	slender spikerush	S2	8	18
Forest	Ranunculus hispidus	bristly buttercup	S2	6	6
Forest	Aplectrum hyemale	Adam and Eve	S2	8	1
Prairie	Asclepias meadii	Mead's milkweed	S2	10	92
Prairie	Camassia angusta	prairie camas	S2	8	61
Prairie	Carex arkansana	Arkansas sedge	S1	7	7
Prairie	Carex caroliniana	Carolina sedge	S2	7	1
Prairie	Carex hisutella	hairy-leaf hirsute sedge	S2	5	2
Forest	Carex hitchcockiana	Hitchcock's sedge	S1	10	1
Forest	Carex radiata	eastern star sedge	S2	6	3
Forest	Carex retroflexa	reflexed sedge	S2	5	1
Forest	Carex rosea	rosy sedge	S2	7	2
Prairie	Carex squarrosa	squarrose sedge	S1	7	1
Forest	Carya laciniosa	shellbark hickory	S2	7	19
Forest	Collinsia verna	spring blue eyed Mary	S1	8	2
Forest	Crataegus viridis	green hawthorn	S2	4	1
Prairie	Cyperus pseudovegetus	marsh flatsedge	S2	7	2
Prairie	Desmodium ciliare	hairy small-leaf ticktrefoil	S2	5	2
Prairie	Dichanthelium latifolium	broadleaf rosette grass	S2	7	0
Forest	Dichanthelium latifolium	broadleaf rosette grass	S2	7	4
Prairie	Dichanthelium linearifolium	slimleaf panicgrass	S2	7	5
Prairie	Dichanthelium scoparium	velvet panicum	S2	7	24
Prairie	Eleocharis montevidensis	sand spikerush	S2	5	1
Prairie	Eleocharis wolfii	Wolf's spikerush	S1	5	1
Prairie	Helenium flexuosum	purple-head sneezeweed	S2	6	11
Forest	Hybanthus concolor	eastern greenviolet	S2	8	5
Forest	Hydrophyllum appendiculatum	great waterleaf	S2	7	5
Forest	Maianthemum stellatum	starry false lily of the valley	S2	8	7
Forest	Packera glabella	butterweed	S2	2	5
Prairie	Perideridia americana	eastern yampah	S1	8	6
Prairie	Phalaris caroliniana	Carolina canarygrass	S2	1	2

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas

Habitat	Species	Common Name	State	CoC	# of
			Rank		Loca-
					tions
Prairie	Physostegia angustifolia	narrowleaf false dragonhead	S1	5	71
Forest	Polymnia canadensis	whiteflower leafcup	S1	7	2
Forest	Prunus hortulana	hortulan plum	S1	3	1
Prairie	Rosa blanda	smooth rose	S1	6	4
Prairie	Rubus alumnus	nursling highbrush black-	S1	4	1
		berry			
Prairie	Rubus argutus	sawtooth blackberry	S1	4	29
Forest	Rubus argutus	sawtooth blackberry	S1	4	1
Forest	Smilax ecirrhata	upright carrionflower	S1	5	6
Prairie	Sporobolus heterolepis	prairie dropseed	S2	8	28
Forest	Taenidia integerrima	yellow pimpernel	S2	7	6
Forest	Thalictrum thalictroides	rue anemone	S2	8	8
Prairie	Trifolium reflexum	buffalo clover	S2	10	27
Forest	Trillium sessile	toadshade	S2	7	8
Prairie	Verbesina helianthoides	gravelweed	S2	5	1
Forest	Viburnum prunifolium	blackhaw	S2	6	1

Appendix G Floristic Quality Indices for Prairie Sites (No. of Sites = 235)

Site Number	FQI	County	Site Grade	No. of Acres	No. of
					Species
					Found
No. 1	50.18	Linn	С	130.07	136
No. 2	47.44	Linn	С	26.19	118
No. 3	46.71	Anderson	С	35.04	119
No. 4	45.85	Linn	В	55.99	97
No. 5	45.52	Linn	С	52.18	76
No. 6	45.38	Anderson	В	12.06	123
No. 7	45.33	Linn	В	88.28	99
No. 8	45.18	Linn	С	13.13	112
No. 9	45.14	Linn	В	32.92	111
No. 10	44.72	Anderson	В	50.71	113
No. 11	44.58	Linn	С	78.85	100
No. 12	44.53	Linn	В	15.12	105
No. 13	44.49	Anderson	В	40.30	105
No. 14	44.38	Linn	C	8.86	103
No. 15	44.32	Linn	В	21.46	108
No. 16	44.13	Linn	В	19.87	103
No. 17	44.04	Anderson	В	41.29	107
No. 18	43.96	Linn	В	12.05	97
No. 19	43.96	Linn	С	84.58	104
No. 20	43.88	Linn	В	89.63	125
No. 21	43.86	Linn	В	42.50	116
No. 22	43.86	Anderson	С	59.73	114
No. 23	43.84	Linn	В	20.27	88
No. 24	43.57	Anderson	В	20.83	103
No. 25	43.50	Linn	В	86.41	109
No. 26	43.44	Anderson	С	142.92	93
No. 27	43.38	Linn	В	14.06	96
No. 28	43.22	Linn	В	11.28	126
No. 29	43.20	Anderson	В	120.44	112
No. 30	43.13	Linn	С	14.06	113
No. 31	43.11	Anderson	С	50.97	106
No. 32	43.06	Linn	C	7.42	114

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas
Site Number	FQI	County	Site Grade	No. of Acres	No. of
					Species
					Found
No. 33	43.01	Anderson	В	36.15	88
No. 34	42.88	Linn	В	6.42	103
No. 35	42.85	Linn	С	35.20	101
No. 36	42.81	Anderson	С	22.75	94
No. 37	42.74	Anderson	В	278.71	106
No. 38	42.67	Linn	В	10.16	90
No. 39	42.60	Linn	С	22.15	113
No. 40	42.60	Anderson	С	2.35	88
No. 41	42.56	Anderson	C	22.99	129
No. 42	42.54	Anderson	С	70.94	127
No. 43	42.49	Anderson	С	30.33	88
No. 44	42.29	Linn	С	25.69	112
No. 45	42.07	Anderson	В	89.62	78
No. 46	42.04	Anderson	В	49.60	92
No. 47	42.00	Linn	C	16.63	92
No. 48	41.78	Anderson	В	38.39	106
No. 49	41.70	Linn	С	24.59	92
No. 50	41.67	Anderson	C	26.03	94
No. 51	41.61	Linn	С	28.92	117
No. 52	41.43	Anderson	В	25.81	97
No. 53	41.43	Linn	С	11.02	95
No. 54	41.41	Linn	С	31.88	94
No. 55	41.29	Linn	С	5.64	93
No. 56	41.24	Anderson	В	23.88	72
No. 57	41.17	Anderson	C	128.04	99
No. 58	41.16	Linn	В	88.50	92
No. 59	41.16	Anderson	В	5.15	93
No. 60	41.11	Anderson	В	5.01	84
No. 61	41.11	Linn	В	7.54	91
No. 62	41.11	Anderson	В	36.23	90
No. 63	41.00	Linn	В	17.43	92
No. 64	40.94	Linn	C	29.94	107
No. 65	40.89	Anderson	C	41.15	95
No. 66	40.81	Anderson	С	5.01	77
No. 67	40.78	Anderson	С	15.15	90
No. 68	40.72	Linn	В	5.27	104

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas

Site Number	FQI	County	Site Grade	No. of Acres	No. of
					Species
No. 60	40.65	Andorson		20.05	Found
No. 70	40.03	Linn	C	15.09	04
No. 70	40.04	Linn	C	13.96	105
No. 72	40.54	Linn	C	12.40	02
No. 72	40.34	Linn		44.70	93
No. 74	40.42	Linn	D	5 11	97
No. 75	40.37	Linn	C	5.02	95
No. 75	40.30	Andorson		15.60	01
No. 77	40.11	Linn	D	13.09	91 60
No. 79	40.11	Linn		9.40	80
No. 78	39.93		C	12.12	80
NO. 79	39.94	Anderson		32.96	93
No. 80	39.94	Linn		30.47	105
No. 81	39.92	Linn	В	5.07	79
No. 82	39.92	Linn	C	7.21	86
No. 83	39.84	Anderson	В	14.15	79
No. 84	39.80	Linn	В	7.84	110
No. 85	39.57	Anderson	С	73.34	102
No. 86	39.53	Anderson	С	81.36	97
No. 87	39.52	Anderson	С	7.83	84
No. 88	39.49	Anderson	С	33.17	83
No. 89	39.44	Linn	В	6.66	93
No. 90	39.26	Linn	C	13.23	86
No. 91	39.22	Anderson	C	9.30	79
No. 92	39.17	Linn	С	12.77	98
No. 93	39.09	Linn	В	8.06	113
No. 94	38.94	Linn	В	73.68	90
No. 95	38.88	Anderson	С	81.28	81
No. 96	38.86	Anderson	В	22.65	84
No. 97	38.75	Linn	С	5.12	74
No. 98	38.69	Linn	С	11.69	100
No. 99	38.68	Anderson	С	25.46	97
No. 100	38.67	Linn	В	8.65	62
No. 101	38.59	Anderson	С	19.60	88
No. 102	38.57	Anderson	В	6.43	90
No. 103	38.45	Linn	В	11.70	80
No. 104	38.44	Anderson	С	77.74	93

Site Number	FQI	County	Site Grade	No. of Acres	No. of
					Species
					Found
No. 105	38.32	Anderson	С	20.89	96
No. 106	38.25	Linn	С	6.81	82
No. 107	38.25	Anderson	C	31.54	87
No. 108	38.17	Linn	В	5.06	114
No. 109	38.11	Linn	В	8.55	99
No. 110	38.01	Linn	С	5.02	80
No. 111	37.99	Linn	C	33.93	84
No. 112	37.95	Anderson	С	14.35	105
No. 113	37.86	Linn	В	23.82	83
No. 114	37.80	Anderson	С	36.23	81
No. 115	37.59	Anderson	С	52.39	103
No. 116	37.48	Anderson	С	19.63	70
No. 117	37.47	Anderson	В	5.01	68
No. 118	37.44	Linn	В	12.71	82
No. 119	37.38	Linn	В	7.76	76
No. 120	37.36	Anderson	С	29.98	84
No. 121	37.35	Anderson	С	34.68	79
No. 122	37.29	Anderson	В	112.49	71
No. 123	37.26	Linn	В	5.10	70
No. 124	37.16	Linn	В	7.06	61
No. 125	37.14	Linn	В	25.04	107
No. 126	37.08	Linn	С	13.94	70
No. 127	37.02	Linn	В	18.87	82
No. 128	37.01	Linn	В	6.41	76
No. 129	36.93	Anderson	С	27.09	81
No. 130	36.82	Linn	С	11.30	85
No. 131	36.73	Linn	С	5.08	81
No. 132	36.62	Anderson	С	8.61	69
No. 133	36.47	Linn	С	5.04	78
No. 134	36.45	Anderson	С	7.38	84
No. 135	36.43	Anderson	С	34.11	80
No. 136	36.35	Linn	С	8.94	90
No. 137	36.28	Anderson	С	21.93	85
No. 138	36.24	Linn	В	8.34	67
No. 139	36.14	Linn	В	25.04	83
No. 140	36.09	Anderson	C	11.93	76

Site Number	FQI	County	Site Grade	No. of Acres	No. of
					Species
				1.52.52	Found
No. 141	36.04	Anderson	C	153.73	79
No. 142	36.04	Linn	B	33.89	71
No. 143	35.96	Linn	C	7.38	78
No. 144	35.85	Linn	В	8.29	62
No. 145	35.80	Anderson	С	13.14	88
No. 146	35.79	Linn	С	36.75	101
No. 147	35.72	Linn	В	5.09	77
No. 148	35.71	Linn	С	12.18	76
No. 149	35.67	Anderson	В	11.86	98
No. 150	35.67	Linn	С	5.00	89
No. 151	35.56	Anderson	C	13.81	71
No. 152	35.48	Anderson	С	16.14	86
No. 153	35.48	Linn	С	48.88	106
No. 154	35.45	Linn	С	7.39	77
No. 155	35.44	Linn	С	17.35	104
No. 156	35.31	Linn	С	24.82	80
No. 157	35.10	Anderson	С	44.40	91
No. 158	34.93	Linn	В	13.31	75
No. 159	34.90	Anderson	С	101.83	85
No. 160	34.76	Linn	C	21.11	115
No. 161	34.66	Linn	В	5.01	68
No. 162	34.65	Anderson	С	36.67	87
No. 163	34.51	Anderson	С	5.12	71
No. 164	34.42	Linn	С	6.70	72
No. 165	34.30	Linn	С	23.67	87
No. 166	34.30	Linn	C	8.22	92
No. 167	34.30	Anderson	В	10.19	83
No. 168	34.23	Anderson	C	15.42	78
No. 169	34.21	Linn	С	7.72	68
No. 170	34.18	Linn	С	3.98	88
No. 171	34.07	Linn	В	5.96	55
No. 172	34.06	Anderson	С	11.45	57
No. 173	33.89	Linn	С	5.56	91
No. 174	33.84	Anderson	С	21.78	84
No. 175	33.84	Linn	В	10.20	75
No. 176	33.78	Anderson	С	39.73	78

Site Number	FQI	County	Site Grade	No. of Acres	No. of
					Species
					Found
No. 177	33.71	Linn	С	5.04	67
No. 178	33.70	Linn	В	11.65	85
No. 179	33.59	Linn	В	11.83	62
No. 180	33.51	Linn	С	5.57	74
No. 181	33.38	Linn	С	31.45	69
No. 182	33.28	Anderson	С	26.47	68
No. 183	33.24	Linn	С	11.23	76
No. 184	33.24	Anderson	С	7.32	60
No. 185	33.16	Anderson	C	156.80	76
No. 186	33.05	Anderson	С	5.23	98
No. 187	32.83	Linn	С	31.37	66
No. 188	32.81	Linn	С	5.06	92
No. 189	32.74	Anderson	C	15.75	80
No. 190	32.50	Linn	С	6.01	87
No. 191	32.45	Anderson	С	31.02	66
No. 192	32.39	Anderson	С	9.87	68
No. 193	32.38	Linn	С	12.90	74
No. 194	32.37	Linn	В	23.75	76
No. 195	32.35	Linn	С	19.88	88
No. 196	32.27	Linn	С	5.02	69
No. 197	32.25	Anderson	С	20.47	60
No. 198	32.24	Anderson	С	40.39	54
No. 199	32.13	Anderson	C	15.79	84
No. 200	32.07	linn	В	13.33	62
No. 201	32.04	Anderson	С	29.03	76
No. 202	31.80	Anderson	С	45.99	68
No. 203	31.37	Anderson	С	5.05	76
No. 204	30.87	Linn	С	25.35	71
No. 205	30.86	Anderson	С	19.21	71
No. 206	30.84	Linn	С	7.47	95
No. 207	30.80	Anderson	С	27.15	91
No. 208	30.73	Anderson	C	66.28	71
No. 209	30.69	linn	В	70.31	63
No. 210	30.36	Anderson	С	65.48	59
No. 211	30.23	Anderson	С	60.53	71
No. 212	30.22	Anderson	С	17.41	61

A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas

Site Number	FQI	County	Site Grade	No. of Acres	No. of Species Found
No. 213	30.00	Anderson	С	19.32	60
No. 214	29.97	Linn	С	5.07	69
No. 215	29.93	Anderson	С	7.92	68
No. 216	29.89	Linn	С	17.02	106
No. 217	29.73	Anderson	C	16.00	57
No. 218	29.59	Linn	С	7.93	70
No. 219	29.49	Linn	C	5.13	83
No. 220	29.29	Anderson	С	14.40	58
No. 221	29.27	Anderson	C	47.19	57
No. 222	29.25	Linn	С	20.31	86
No. 223	28.77	Linn	C	11.06	68
No. 224	28.43	Anderson	C	39.21	66
No. 225	28.03	Anderson	С	15.94	68
No. 226	27.55	Linn	C	6.97	67
No. 227	26.85	Anderson	C	19.32	46
No. 228	26.53	Anderson	C	33.05	51
No. 229	26.50	Linn	C	5.20	73
No. 230	25.91	Anderson	C	14.19	58
No. 231	25.78	Linn	C	7.22	72
No. 232	24.23	Anderson	С	18.19	52
No. 233	19.27	Linn	В	104.73	58
No. 234	17.34	Linn	В	8.43	56
No. 235	17.27	Anderson	С	54.03	34

Acknowledgments

The work for this project, "A Natural Areas Inventory of Anderson and Linn Counties in Kansas," was carried out under a subgrant of the State Wildlife Grants program, a federal program through the U.S. Fish & Wildlife Service. It was administered by the Kansas Department of Wildlife & Parks. Special thanks to Kansas Department of Wildlife & Parks employees Carl Magnuson and Ken Brunson.

We are grateful to property owners who gave us permission to visit their properties, without whom this inventory would not have been possible.

Many individuals worked on the County Inventory, from field workers to office support personnel. They include Lauren Ashman, Sharon Ashworth, Lynn Byczynski, England Porter, and Steve Roels.